

Thinking

(at-tafkeer)



Al-Khilafah Publications
Suite 298
56 Gloucester Road
London SW7 4UB

e-mail: info@khilafah.com
website: <http://www.khilafah.com>

Al-Khilafah Publications
Suite 298
56 Gloucester Road
London SW7 4UB
e-mail: info@khilafah.com
website: http://www.khilafah.com

8 Safar 1393 AH
12 March 1973 CE

ISBN 1 899 574 247

Translation of the Qur'an

It should be perfectly clear that the Qur'an is only authentic in its original language, Arabic. Since perfect translation of the Qur'an is impossible, we have used the translation of the meaning of the Qur'an' throughout the book, as the result is only a crude meaning of the Arabic text.

Qur'anic *Ayat* and transliterated words have been *italicised* in main part of the book.

Saying of the Messenger ﷺ appear in **bold**

ﷻ - subhanahu wa ta'ala
ﷺ - sallallahu 'alaihi wa sallam
RA - radhi allaho anha/anho
AH - After Hijrah
CE - Common Era

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

Thinking (*at-tafkeer*)



Bismillah ir-Rahman ir-Raheem

Man is absolutely the most favoured creature; even to the point that it was said - which is true - that he is favoured over the angels. The preference of man lies in his intellect ('*aqal*). The intellect ('*aqal*) of man is what raised his status, and made him superior to all creatures. Therefore, it is necessary to understand this intellect ('*aqal*), and accordingly it is necessary to know what is thinking (*at-tafkeer*), and what is the method of thinking? (*Tareeqat ut-tafkeer*). This is because this reality designated as thinking (*at-tafkeer*) is what gives the intellect its value, and what brings those elaborate fruits, with which life revives and man revives. The whole universe, including everything, even the inanimate beings, plants and animals, revive.

Sciences ('*uloom*), arts (*funoon*), literature (*adaab*), philosophy (*falsafah*), jurisprudence (*fiqh*), language (*lughah*) and knowledge (*ma'rifah*), are themselves the output of the mind ('*aqal*), and consequently the output of thinking (*at-tafkeer*). Therefore, it is necessary for the sake of man, life and the whole universe, that the reality of the mind ('*aqal*) is comprehended, and the reality of thinking (*at-tafkeer*) and the method of thinking (*Tareeqat ut-tafkeer*) be comprehended accordingly.

Humanity has made this great advance in life and in the time, whilst being mostly concerned with the output of the mind ('*aqal*) and with the output of thinking (*at-tafkeer*), without being concerned with the reality

(*waaqi*) of the mind (*'aqh*) and the reality (*waaqi*) of thinking (*at-tafkeer*). It is true that there were those who endeavoured to comprehend the reality of the mind, from the Muslim scholars ('ulemaa'), and non-Muslim thinkers, in the past and in the modern times; however, they failed to comprehend this reality (of the mind). There were also those who endeavoured to prescribe a method (*Tareeqah*) for thinking (*at-tafkeer*). Though they succeeded in respect of some fruits of this method (by the means of scientific accomplishments) they were misled from comprehending the process of thinking (*at-tafkeer*) itself. They also misled others who followed them and they were dazzled by this scientific success. In the past, since the time of the Greeks and those who came after them, they rushed to grasp the thinking (*at-tafkeer*), but rather they attained logic (*manTiq*), and succeeded in attaining some thoughts (*afkar*). However, they distorted knowledge (*ma'rifah*) itself. So logic (*manTiq*) became detrimental to knowledge (*ma'rifah*), instead of becoming - as it was wished to be - as a means to attain knowledge and a criterion for judging its authenticity. Moreover, those who rushed to attain the thinking (*at-tafkeer*) had also attained what is called philosophy (*falsafah*) or what is known as 'the love of wisdom (*Hikmah*)' and the deep thinking of what exists beyond the universe (*al-wujood*), i.e. the supernatural. So they initiated a discussion regarding interesting knowledge and interesting results, but it was detached from the reality (*al-waaqi*) and remote from authenticity (*Sidq*). As a result, such research distanced (the mind) from the truth (*al-Haqeeqah*) and from the reality (*al-waaqi*); and accordingly misled many (people) and misdirected thinking from the right course.

It is allowed to call such a subject research in thinking (*at-tafkeer*) and research in the method of thinking (*Tareeqat ut-tafkeer*). However, in spite of the fact that it produced disciplines (*ma'arif*), a field for research, and produced what benefits man; it was not focused on the reality of thinking nor proceeding on the right course. Therefore, it is not considered a research in the reality of thinking, rather a research in its results and fruits. It was also an incorrect method of thinking, rather it was of its styles (*asaaleeb*), which came by coincidence, as a result of the discussion of the output of the mind or the fruits; and it did not come by way of the research in the reality of thinking. Therefore, it is true to say that the research regarding a correct method for the thinking is still just an endeavour that takes place concerning the output of the thinking

and not concerning the reality of the thinking (*at-tafkeer*) itself.

The reason of not discovering until now, the reality of the thinking and consequently the method of thinking is because the researchers discussed thinking before they discussed the mind (*'aqh*). It is not possible to discover the reality of thinking except after finding out the reality of the mind in a definite (*yaqeen*) and decisive (*jaazim*) way. This is because thinking (*at-tafkeer*) is the fruit of the mind (*'aqh*), and the sciences, arts and the various aspects of culture (*thaqafah*) are only the fruit of the thinking. Therefore, it is first necessary to know the reality of the mind in a definite and decisive way. After that, it is possible to understand the reality of the thinking and a correct method for thinking. In light of that, it is then possible to make a judgment on the knowledge (*ma'rifah*), whether it is a science (*ilm*) or not. In other words, it is possible to comprehend that chemistry is a science, and what are known as psychology (*ilm un-nafs*) and sociology (*'ilm ul-ijtimaa'*) are not sciences. It also becomes possible to make a judgment on the knowledge (*ma'rifah*), whether it is a culture (*thaqafah*) or not. In other words, it is possible to understand that legislation (*tashree*) is culture (*thaqafah*) while painting (*tasweer*) is not culture (*thaqafah*). So the whole issue is built on the basis of understanding the reality (*waaqi*) of the mind (*'aqh*) in a definite and decisive way. Thereafter, and in light of this understanding, the reality of thinking (*waaqi' ut-tafkeer*) is discussed. Subsequently, the method of thinking (*Tareeqat ut-tafkeer*) is understood, and in its light, it is possible to attain, in a correct manner, the style (*usloob*) of thinking or styles of thinking.

This is the issue. Attaining the science (*'ilm*) and culture (*thaqafah*) must be a result of discovering the reality of thinking, the method of thinking and the style of thinking. Grasping the reality of thinking must be a result of understanding the reality of the mind (*'aqh*). Therefore, it is necessary to understand the reality of the mind in a definite and decisive way before understanding the reality of the thinking (*waaqi' ut-tafkeer*).

Those who defined the mind (*'aqh*) i.e. what it is and endeavoured to understand the reality of the mind, are many. Whether in the past, from the Greek philosophers, Muslim scholars or the Western thinkers, or in the modern times, none of them are worth mentioning, or reach the level of consideration, except the Communist thinkers. Their definition

only is the one that might be worth mentioning, and might reach the level of consideration. This is because it is a serious attempt, undermined only by their erroneous insistence to deny there is a Creator for the universe (*wujood*). Had they not insisted on denying there is a Creator (*Khaaliq*) for the universe (*wujood*), they would have reached comprehension of the reality (*waaqi*) of the mind properly, i.e. they would have reached understanding the reality of the mind ('*aqh*) in a definite and decisive way. They started the discussion of the reality (*waaqi*) and thought (*fikr*), by saying: Did the thought (*fikr*) exist before the reality (*waaqi*)? Or did the reality (*waaqi*) exist before the thought (*fikr*), with the thought (*fikr*) being the result of the reality (*waaqi*)? They differed in this matter. Some of them said the reality (*waaqi*) existed before the thought (*fikr*), and some others said the thought (*fikr*) existed before the reality (*waaqi*). Their final view concluded that the reality (*waaqi*) existed before the thought (*fikr*). Based on this, or as a result of this, they came to the definition of thought. So they said: Thought (*fikr*) is the reflection of the reality on the brain (*dimagh*). Thus their understanding of the reality of the thought (*fikr*) is that it is a reality (*waaqi*), a brain (*dimagh*) and a reflecting process of the reality on the brain. So thought (*fikr*) is the result of the reflection of the reality on the brain. This is their opinion, which indicates proper study, a serious endeavour, and closeness to the truth (*Haqeeqah*). Had they not insisted on denying the existence of a Creator of this reality, and insisted that the universe (*wujood*) is eternal (*azali*), the error in understanding the reality of the mind ('*aqh*) would have not occurred. This is because it is true that there is no thought (*fikr*) without a reality (*waaqi*), and that every knowledge (*ma'rifah*) that has no reality is only fantasy (*khayal*) or imagination (*takhreef*). So the reality (*waaqi*) is the basis of thought (*fikr*), and the thought (*fikr*) is the import of the reality or a judgment on that reality. Thus the reality is the basis of the thought and the basis of thinking. Without the (existence of) reality, it is not possible for the thought or thinking to exist. Furthermore, the judgment on the reality, even every thing in man and whatever originates from man, is linked with the brain. Thus, the brain is the fundamental and basic centre in man. Therefore, it is not possible for the thought to exist except after the existence of the brain, and the brain itself is a reality (*waaqi*). The existence of the brain (*dimagh*) is accordingly a fundamental condition (*shart*) for the existence of thought (*fikr*); and the existence of the reality (*waaqi*) is also a fundamental condition (*shart*) for the existence of

thought (*fikr*). Thus, for the mind ('*aqh*) to exist, i.e. for thinking (*tafkeer*) or thought (*fikr*) to exist, there must be a reality (*waaqi*) and a brain. The Communist thinkers have discovered these two matters. In other words, they discovered that for the mind ('*aqh*) to exist there must be a reality and a brain; and the existence of both of them is a principal and fundamental condition for the thought (*fikr*) to exist, i.e. for the existence of the mind ('*aqh*). Therefore, their endeavour was serious and correct. Upto this point they were proceeding on the right course that leads to the thought, i.e. for generating the thinking (*tafkeer*). They lost the way; for they made the linkage between them the reflection of the reality (*waaqi*) on the brain. Thus they came out with the wrong result in understanding the mind ('*aqh*); that is why they defined the mind ('*aqh*) incorrectly. The reason of that error is their insistence on denying the existence of a Creator who created the universe (*wujood*) out of nothing. Had they advocated that the knowledge precedes the thought (*fikr*), they would find themselves in front of an established fact. That is, from where did the thought (*fikr*) come before the existence of the reality? It must have come from other than the reality. From where, accordingly the thought came to the first human being? It must have come to him from other than himself and from other than the reality. Therefore, the first human being and the reality were created by the One who gave the knowledge (*ma'rifah*) to the first human being. This is different to what they consider decisive information (*ma'rifah*), that the world is eternal (*azali*) and the reality (*waaqi*) is also eternal (*azali*). Therefore, they said the reflection of the reality on the brain is the mind ('*aqh*), which generated the thought (*fikr*), and by which the thinking (*tafkeer*) existed. In order to evade the necessity of the presence of information (*ma'rifah*), they started to introduce fantastic notions and assumptions; that the first human being had experimented on the reality, so he attained the knowledge (*ma'rifah*). These experiments carried out on the reality became information that helped him to carry out further experiments on the reality, and so on. They insisted that the reality together with the reflection of it on the brain is the mind ('*aqh*) and the thought (*fikr*), and it is that which generates the thinking (*tafkeer*). They were unaware of noticing the difference between the sensation (*iHsas*) and reflection (*in'ikas*); and that the thinking process (*amaliyat ut-tafkeer*) did not result from the reflection of the reality on the brain, nor from the imprint of the reality on the brain, rather it resulted from the sensation (*iHsas*), whose centre is the brain. Had there not been sensation of the reality (by

the brain), thought would not have occurred, nor would any thinking (*tafkeer*) exist. Their failure to differentiate between the sensation (*iHsas*) and reflection (*in'ikas*) made things even worse, and deviated them from the course that they were proceeding on. So the result was their definition of the mind ('*aqh*) and the error of this definition. However, the source of the error was not the absence of differentiation between the sensation and the reflection. Otherwise they would have discovered that the matter is sensation and not reflection. Rather the source of the error, and the main ground of deviation result from their denial of a Creator of this world (*wujood*). So they did not realise that presence of information precedent to this reality is a necessary condition to the generation of thought, i.e. a necessary condition for the thinking (*tafkeer*) to exist. Accordingly, it is a necessary condition to develop the mind, i.e. for the mind to exist, or for the thought and thinking to exist. Otherwise, the donkey would have a mind, because it has a brain, and the reality is reflected on its brain, i.e. it senses the reality. Mind ('*aqh*) is one of the characteristics of man. It was said in the past; Man is a rational being, i.e. a thinking being. This is because thinking or mind ('*aqh*) is specific to it, and there is no other animal or the like, that has mind or thinking.

Whatever the case may be, the Communist thinkers are the only people who endeavoured seriously to understand the meaning (*ma'na*) of the mind ('*aqh*), and proceeded with a correct approach to understand the reality of the mind ('*aqh*). Though they were mistaken in defining the mind and deviated from the course they followed to reach to a definite and decisive definition, they paved the way for those who followed them and proceeded in their course to reach this definite and decisive definition. In addition Muslims have that which indicates the necessity of the presence of previous information about a thing in order to understand it. Despite the fact that it is true, it has to be considered being an identification of a reality and a means of compelling all the people to accept the definition of mind ('*aqh*). Based on that, the definition of the mind must be based on the present (not absent) and perceptible, in order to compel all the people, and not only the Muslims, to accept it.

Allah ﷻ says in His Glorious Book;

وَعَلَّمَ آدَمَ الْأَسْمَاءَ كُلَّهَا ثُمَّ عَرَضَهُمْ عَلَى الْمَلَائِكَةِ فَقَالَ
أَنْبِئُونِي بِأَسْمَاءِ هَؤُلَاءِ إِنْ كُنْتُمْ صَادِقِينَ* قَالُوا سُبْحَانَكَ لَا
عِلْمَ لَنَا إِلَّا مَا عَلَّمْتَنَا إِنَّكَ أَنْتَ الْعَلِيمُ الْحَكِيمُ* قَالَ يَا آدَمُ
أَنْبِئْهُمْ بِأَسْمَائِهِمْ فَلَمَّا أَنْبَأَهُمْ بِأَسْمَائِهِمْ قَالَ أَلَمْ أَقُلْ لَكُمْ إِنِّي
أَعْلَمُ غَيْبَ السَّمَاوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضِ وَأَعْلَمُ مَا تُبْدُونَ وَمَا كُنْتُمْ
تَكْتُمُونَ

'And He taught Adam all the names; then He placed them before the angels, and said: 'Tell Me the names of these if you are truthful.' They said: 'Glory be to You. We have no knowledge except that which You taught us. In truth it is You who are the All-Knowing and the Wise'. He said: 'O Adam tell them their names.' When he had told them their names. He said: 'Did I not tell you that I know the secrets of the heavens and earth, and I know what you reveal and what you conceal?' [TMQ 2:31-33].

These *ayaat* (verses) indicate that the previous information is necessary in order to reach any knowledge (*ma'rifah*). So Allah ﷻ taught Adam the names or the meanings of things, so when they were placed before him he recognised them. Thus the first human being, Adam, had information given to him by Allah ﷻ; and that is why he recognised the things; if he had not had this information he would not have known them. Since the cause of the deviation in the course followed by the Communist thinkers, in order to reach an understanding of the reality of the mind, was the necessity of the presence of previous information this is enough to show the error of the Communists in the definition of the mind. It is also sufficient to demonstrate the cause of deviation. Accordingly in order to generate thought (*fikr*), it is necessary to have the previous information about the reality which is displayed to the brain. Since the aim is to compel all the people, and not only the Muslims, it is necessary, from the examination of the present (*mushahad*) and perceptible (*maHsoos*), that there must exist previous information about the reality so as to generate thought, i.e. so that the mind ('*aqh*) can develop and exist. This is because the mind's ('*aqh*) existence is established on the presence of the previous information at the brain,

though the reality is a fundamental condition for the presence of the rational (*aqli*) process, i.e. for the presence of the thought and thinking.

It is not enough to realise that the reason for the deviation of the Communists away from the correct approach towards understanding the mind was the (issue of) the brain's sensation of the reality rather than the reflection of the reality on the brain, since this is easy (to prove) and it is not the main reason for their deviation. Rather the main cause of the deviation is (the issue of) the presence of previous information about the reality so as to be able to produce the rational process, i.e. so as to have intellect. It became understood that what occurred is the brain's sensation of the reality and not the reflection of the reality (upon it) after understanding the verses. From the examination of the present and perceptible (things) it became understood also that the previous information about the reality or about what is related to it, is necessary for the mind (*'aqil*) - i.e. for comprehension (*idrak*) - to exist. Without this information it is not possible to have intellect or comprehension, i.e. it is not possible for the mind to have any existence. Thus the understanding of the meaning of the mind was achieved, followed by the correct definition of the mind in a definite and decisive way.

What occurs in the thinking process, i.e. the rational process (*al-'amaliyyah al-'aqliyyah*) is sensation (*iHsas*) and not reflection (*ini'kas*). This is because there is no reflection between matter (tangible things) and the brain, so the brain is not reflected on the matter and the matter is not reflected on the brain. Reflection needs the presence of reflectivity in the tangible object, which reflects things such as the mirror and light. This capacity does not exist, either in the brain or in the object. Therefore, there is no reflection between the matter/tangible thing and the brain at all, because the matter is neither reflected on the brain nor it is transferred to it. What is actually transferred to the brain is the sensation of the matter by the senses. In other words the matter is perceived by the senses - anyone of them - and this sensation is carried to the brain that makes its judgment (*Hukm*) on it. Transferring the sensation of the matter to the brain is not a reflection on the brain of the matter; it is rather sensing of the matter. In this regard, there is no difference between the eye and the other senses. So sensation results from touching, smelling, tasting, hearing just as it results from seeing. Thus what occurs from the objects is not reflection on the brain, rather

perception of them. Man perceives the objects with his five senses, and objects are not reflected on his brain.

This matter is as clear as the sun with regards the material objects, where sensation is what takes place. In regards to the immaterial matters, such as the semantic (*ma'nawi*) and spiritual (*rouhi*) ones, there also exists sensation of them, in order that the rational process develops regarding them. So regarding the declined society, it is necessary to have sensation of the decline (*inHiTaT*) in order for a judgment to be made on it that it is declined, and this (is a) materialistic (*maaddi*) matter. With regards to what hurts the dignity, it is necessary to sense the hurt that occurred, or to perceive that this thing or action hurts the dignity. This is necessary in order to judge that a hurt took place, or that the thing has a blade (aspect) that wounds the honour. This is a semantic (*ma'nawi*) matter. In regards to what angers Allah, it is necessary to sense the anger of Allah that took place, or to perceive that this action or thing provokes the Lord of Might. In other words it has the flame of provocation and the rankling resentment to the High Supreme. This is a spiritual (*rouhi*) matter. Without the presence of that sensation it is not possible for the rational process to take place. However, the sensation of the material objects occurs naturally, though it increases or decreases according to the understanding of their (objects) nature. Therefore, they said the intellectual sensation (*al-iHsas ul-fikri*) is the strongest. As for immaterial matters, sensation of them can't take place except after understanding them or through imitation.

However, the fact that what takes place is sensation and not reflection is almost self-evident, though it is more obvious in material objects than in immaterial (semantic) matters. Yet it is not the most fundamental issue, since it is tangible for everybody. There is no disagreement about it except that the explanation of it may disagree with the reality as they explained it by (their theory of) reflection, or it may agree with the reality, such as the way we explained it by sensation (*iHsas*) or perception (*Hiss*). The main cause of the deviation was the previous information about the reality. It is what made the deviation of the Communist thinkers awful, and it is the main point in the subject of the mind or it is the main work in the rational process.

The summary of the subject of "the previous information" (*al-*

ma'loomat us-saabiqah) is: sensation alone does not produce thought (*fikr*). What takes place is only sensation (*iHsas*) of the reality. However, no matter how much the sensation was compounded and varied, it would only produce sensation. It would not generate any thought at all, (*fikr*) absolutely. There must be previous information with man by which he understands the reality which he sensed so as thought (*fikr*) takes place. Let us consider the present man, any man, and give him a book in Syriac (language), and he has no any information relating to the Syriac language, and make his senses fall on the script, even millions of times, he will not be able to know a single word until he is given information about the Syriac (language) and about what is related to the Syriac (language). At that point he starts to think about it and understand it. It is not correct to say this is specific to languages; and they are invented by man, hence they need information about them. This is because the subject matter is a rational process, and the operation is a process of the mind, whether in issuing a judgment, or in understanding a meaning or in understanding the truth (*Haqeeqah*). So the rational process is the same in everything. Thus the thinking over an issue is the same as thinking about an opinion. The understanding of the meaning of a word is the same as the understanding of the meaning of a reality. Each of them requires a rational process, which is the same regarding every thing and every matter in every reality.

So as not to raise argument over a language and reality (tangible reality), let us discuss reality (*al-waaqi'*) directly. Let us observe a child who has sensation (*iHsas*) without having previous information. Let us put before him a piece of gold, a piece of copper and a piece of stone, and make all his senses participate in sensing these things. He would not be able to understand them, no matter how much these sensations were repeated or varied. However, if he was given information about them and he sensed them, he would use this information and understand them. If this child grew up and became 20 years old, and was not given any information, he would remain as he was when born, he sensed the things only without understanding them however big his brain became. This is because what makes him comprehend is not the brain; rather it is the previous information, together with the brain and the reality that he senses. Let us also take a child of four years old, who did not see or hear about lions, and did not see or hear about weighing scales. He also did not also see or hear about dogs and elephants. If we placed before

him a lion, some weighing scales, a dog, and an elephant, or the picture of a lion, some scales, a dog or an elephant; and we then asked him to recognise any one of them, or its name and what it is, he would know nothing. He would also not have any rational process relating to anyone of them. If we made him memorise by heart their names, detached from them and without being linked with any one of them, and we then placed before him these things and told him their names, meaning the names you memorised are the names of these things, he would not be able to recognise the name of any one of them. However, if we gave him the name of each one of them in front of its reality, and linked them together, until he memorised the names, each one linked with its reality, then he would know each thing by its name. In other words he would know what the thing is; whether it is a lion or it is some scales; and he will not make a mistake. If you tried to cheat him, he will not agree with you. He would rather insist, "that is a lion", when pointing at the lion or its picture, and, "those are scales", when pointing at the scales or its picture, and so on. Thus the subject matter is not related to the reality or to the sensation of it. It is rather related to the previous information about the reality, i.e. the information related to the reality according to his knowledge.

So the previous information about the reality, or related to that reality is a fundamental and main condition for the rational process to take place. In other words it is a main and fundamental condition for the mind (*'aql*).

This is regarding the rational comprehension (*al-idrak al-'aqli*). With regard to the emotional comprehension (*al-idrak ash-shu'oori*), it results from the instincts (*al-gharai'z*) and organic needs (*al-Hajat al-u'Dwiyyah*). This comprehension occurs in animals as it occurs in man. So man knows, from giving him an apple and a stone repeatedly, that the apple could be eaten while the stone cannot. This is the same as the donkey, which knows that the barley could be eaten while the soil cannot be eaten. This type of differentiation is not thought (*fikr*) neither is it comprehension (*idrak*). It is rather due to the instincts and the organic needs. It exists in the animal as it does in man. Therefore, it is not possible for thought to take place unless there is previous information together with transferring the sensation of the reality by the senses to the brain.

What appears doubtful to many people is that the previous information could be obtained from the experience of the person himself, or obtained by learning (from others). These people think that the experiences themselves generated information; accordingly the initial experiences themselves generated the rational process. This doubt could be removed by drawing attention to the difference between the brain of the man and the brain of the animal in terms of the capacity to connect information (*rabT*), and to the difference between what is related to the instincts and organic needs and what is related to the judgment on objects. As for the difference between the brain of the man and the brain of the animal, the brain of the animal has no capacity to connect information. It rather has the capacity to recollect (*istirjaa'*) the sensation, particularly if it is repeated. This recollection, which the animal does naturally, is specific to what is related to the instincts and organic needs exclusively. So if you rang the bell and offered food to the dog at the same moment, and repeated that process, the dog would understand that when the bell is rung the food is coming, therefore, its saliva flows. Similarly when the donkey sees a mare its desire is aroused, but it does not do so if it saw a bitch, likewise when the cow, when it grazes, it avoids the poisonous grass and that which harms it. All off this and the like is an instinctive (*ghareezi*) differentiation (*tamyeez*). As regards what people see of animals carrying out some movements or actions that is not related to the instincts, they do them as imitation and copying (others) and not based on mind or comprehension. This is because the brain of the animal does not have the characteristic of connecting information. Rather it has the capacity to recollect the sensation, and instinctive differentiation (*at-tamyeez al-ghareezi*). So whatever is related to the instincts it remembers it, and whatever it senses, it can recollect its sensation; particularly if this sensation was repeated. In regard to whatever is related to the instinct, the animal undertakes it naturally, whether it senses it or it recollected its sensation of it, but whatever has no relation with the instinct, it cannot undertake it naturally if it senses it. However, if this sensation was repeated and it recollected it, it can undertake it as an imitation and copying but not as a natural action.

This is different to man, where his brain has the capacity to connect the information (*rabT ul-ma'loomat*) and not only recollecting the sensation. So a person may see somebody in Baghdad, then after 10 years, he sees him in Damascus, and thus recollects his sensation of him,

but because he has no information about him he can't connect anything with him. While if he has seen this man in Baghdad and got information about him, then he will connect his presence in Damascus with the previous information about him. This is unlike the animal, if it recollected the sensation of that man, it would not understand the meaning of his presence, it would rather sense only what is related to its instincts in it when seeing that man. The animal thus recollected the sensation, but it does not connect the information, even if the animal was given it by training or imitation. This is different to man, who recollects the sensation and connects the information. The brain of man has the capacity to connect and to recollect the sensation; whilst the animal does not have the ability to connect rather it only has the recollection of the sensation.

There is a difference between what is pertains to the instincts and organic needs and what is pertains to the judgment on matters. What is pertaining to the instincts, man can, through the repetition of sensation, recollect the sensation. Through using the capacity of, connection, he can form information, from the combining together of what he senses and what he recollects of sensations. He can also recollect these sensations together with their information in what is pertaining to the instincts and organic needs. But he can't connect this information in other than what pertains to the instincts and organic needs, i.e. he can't connect them for (issuing a) judgment on the object relating to what it is. Therefore many were confused regarding the differentiation between the process of recollecting and the process of connecting. The process of recovering does not occur except in what pertains to the instincts and organic needs, but the process of connecting takes place in everything; whether it pertains to the instincts and organic needs, or whether it pertains to the issuing of judgement on objects, in respect to what they are. So the previous information is necessary for the connection process, and the advantage of man over the animal is the capacity of relating (*rabT*).

The fact that man knows from the floating of a piece of wood that he can make a ship from wood, is the same like the monkey knows about bringing down a banana from a bunch of bananas with a stick or something else, for all this pertains to the instincts and the organic needs. Its occurrence, even if it was connected and transformed into

information, is a process of recollection and not a process of connection. Therefore, it is not a rational process, neither does it indicate that there is a mind or thought process. What indicates that there is a mind or thought process, and it is a rational process, is (issuing a) judgment on subjects by understanding them. Judgments on things by understanding them do not come about except by a process of connection, and connecting to previous information. Hence there must be previous information for any process of connection so that thought takes place, i.e. so that the rational process can occur.

Many people attempt to cite the first human being in terms of how, through his experiments and formation of information from these experiments, he discovered thought and thinking, to prove that through the reflection of the brain on the reality itself, or through man's sensation of it, made man think and generated in him a rational process. In other words this initiated thought in him, i.e. thinking. Despite what we discussed before - that this is recollection and not connection, and that it is specific to the instincts and can't be applied to judgment on things by understanding them - and that is enough to refute it and disprove it; the subject matter, however, it is not the study of the first human being, nor it is related to assumptions, speculation and fantasies. It is rather related to man. So instead of choosing the first human being and comparing him to the present man, thus comparing the present to the absent, we must take (for discussion) the present man before us, whom we see and sense, and compare to him the absent, i.e. compare the absent to the present. Thus what applies to the present man through sensation and inspection applies to every man, including the first human being. Therefore it is incorrect to reverse the argument, but we have to put it forth in its right course. The present man is before us, where we witness him and sense him, so, let us examine him rationally, regarding his instincts and what is related to his judgment on things by understanding them. Then we may examine the recollecting (*istirjaa'*) and what it is, and the connecting (*rabT*) and what it is, and find out the difference between them. We would then notice that the previous information is necessary for man to connect, so it is a necessary requirement in the rational process. This is different to the recollection (*istirjaa'*) of sensation, which exists in man and animal, and it does not represent a rational process; it is neither the use of the intellect, thought or thinking. The young child, who does not know the objects and has no

information and is able to receive information, is the true proof of the meaning of the mind.

Accordingly, the mind ('*aqL*') does not exist except in man, and the rational process can't be performed except by man. The instincts and organic needs exist in both man and the animal, and the sensation of the instincts and organic needs exist in both man and the animal. However, all of that is neither the mind, nor is it comprehension (*idrak*), or thought (*fikr*) or thinking (*tafkeer*). It is only instinctive (*ghareezee*) identification (*tamyeez*), while the mind needs a brain that has the capacity of relating the information; a matter which only exists in man. Therefore, the rational process can't occur except by the presence of the capacity of connecting, which connects the information with the reality.

Thus, for any rational process, whether in the first human being or the present man, there must exist previous information about the reality (object), which must exist before this reality (object) exists in front of this person who wants to understand it. Hence, the first human being must have previous information about the reality (object), before this reality is presented to him. That is what the saying of Allah ﷻ about Adam, the first human being, point to '*And He taught Adam all the names (meanings of the names)*'. Then He ﷻ said to him '*O Adam, inform them of their names*'. So the previous information is a fundamental and principal condition for the rational process, i.e. for the meaning of the mind.

The Communist thinkers progressed in the comprehension of the meaning of the intellect ('*aqL*'). They realised there must exist a reality (object) for the rational process to take place. They also realised a human brain must exist for the rational process to exist. Thus they progressed in the right course. However they were mistaken in the expression of connecting the brain with the reality, calling it reflection and not sensation. However, they completely deviated when they denied the presence of previous information as a necessity for the rational process to be accomplished. Without this previous information, it is not possible for this process to take place whatsoever. Therefore, the right course that leads to understand the meaning of the intellect in a definite and decisive way is that there must exist four elements for the rational process to take place, i.e. for the intellect or the thought to exist. It is necessary to have a reality, an appropriate brain, sensation and previous

information. These four matters together must all be realised, together with their combination, in order for the rational process to be accomplished, i.e. so that intellect, or thought or comprehension exists.

Thereupon, the mind (*'aql*), or thought (*fikr*), or comprehension (*idrak*) is transferring the sensation of the reality (object) by the senses to the brain in the presence of previous information, by which this reality is understood.

This alone is the correct definition, and there is no other definition at all. This definition is binding to all people at all times, because it alone is the true description of the reality of the mind, and it alone agrees with the reality of the mind.

When we know the meaning of the mind (*'aql*) in a definite and decisive way and know the definition of the mind in a definite and decisive way, it becomes obligatory upon us to know the method (*Tareeqah*) by which the mind functions to conclude thoughts; i.e. to know the manner according to which the mind produces thoughts. This is the method of thinking (*Tareeqat ut-tafkeer*). So there is the style of thinking (*usloob ut-tafkeer*) and there is the method of thinking (*Tareeqat ut-tafkeer*). The style of thinking is the mode which the study of the thing (object) requires, whether the thing was tangible material or immaterial; or it is the means (*wasa'il*) which the study of the thing requires. Therefore the styles vary and differ, according to the type of thing, their variety and differences. The method of thinking (*Tareeqat ut-tafkeer*) is the mode in which the rational process i.e. the process of thinking, takes place, depending on its nature and its reality. Therefore, the method does not change, rather it remains the same, and it certainly does not vary or differ. So it must be constant, and must be the basis in thinking, however much the styles of thinking varied.

The method of thinking, i.e. the mode in which the intellect produces thoughts, whatever are those thoughts, is itself the definition of the intellect. In other words it is what applies to the reality of the intellect, and does not depart from it by any means. Therefore it was called the rational method (*at-Tareeqat 'aqliyyah*) in relation to the intellect (*'aql*) itself. The definition of this method, i.e. the rational method, is that it is a particular approach in study, which is followed to attain knowledge

of the reality of the thing under study, through transferring the sensation of the reality (of the thing), by the senses, to the brain, and the presence of previous information, by which the reality (of the thing) is understood, and thus the brain issues its judgment on the thing. This judgment is the thought of the rational comprehension (*al-idrak ul-'aql*). This method is used in the study of the material objects, such as physics, in the study of thoughts, such as the study of creeds (*a'qaid*) and legislation (*tashree*) and in understanding the speech, such as the study of literature (*adaab*) and jurisprudence (*fiqh*). This method is the natural one in attaining comprehension as it is. Through the practical process of this method the things are understood, i.e. comprehended. It is itself the definition of the mind, and in accordance with this approach, man attains the comprehension of anything he happened to realise before or he wants to comprehend.

This is the rational method, and it alone is the method of thinking. Any other so-called methods of thinking, such as the scientific method and the logical method, are only either subdivisions of it like the scientific method, or one of its styles that is required by the study of the thing, or the means of its study, like what is called the logical method. These are not basic methods of thinking, for the thinking method is only one, and it does not vary; it is only the rational method.

In the definition of the rational method (of thinking), a differentiation should be made between the previous opinions we hold about a matter and the previous information about it or that pertaining to it. In the rational method, it is inevitable that no opinion or opinions exist about the reality, rather what is necessary is the presence of previous information about it or related to it. So what should inevitably exist is the information and not the opinion. It is not right for the previous opinion or opinions about the reality (subject) to exist. In other words, it is not right to be used in the rational process. What is used is only the previous information, thus preventing the presence and intervention of an opinion at the time of the thinking process. If the previous opinion (about the reality) was used it might cause error in the comprehension, because it might dominate over the information, leading to its misinterpretation, and thus error occurs in the comprehension. Therefore, it is necessary to notice the differentiation between the previous opinion and the previous information; where only the

information is used to exclusion of the opinion.

If the rational method is used in its right manner, through transferring the sensation of the reality by the senses to the brain and the presence of the previous information (excluding the opinions) by which the reality is understood, then the brain issues its judgment on this reality. If this method is used in its right manner, it will give correct results. However, the result that is reached by the researcher using the rational method has to be examined. If the result was the judgment on the existence of the reality, then it is definite, without the possibility of any error involved in it absolutely, under any circumstances. This is because the judgment came through the sensation of the reality, and sensation never makes a mistake in regards to the existence of the reality, for the sensation of the senses in the existence of the reality is definite. Thus the judgment issued by the mind (*'aqh*) about the existence of the reality in this method is definite. However, if the output was the judgment on the nature of the thing or its characteristic, the output will be probable (*DHanni*), including the possibility of error. That is because this judgment came through the previous information, or through the analysis of the perceived reality together with the previous information, and errors could creep into them. However, the result remains as a sound thought until its error is proved, and only then it is judged as wrong. Therefore, the thoughts that the mind concludes by the rational method of thinking, if they were pertaining to the presence of the thing like the creeds, then they are definite thoughts (*qat'i*). However, if they pertain to the judgment on the nature of the thing or its characteristic such as the divine rules (*al-ahkam ash-shar'iyah*), then they are probable (*DHanni*) thoughts. In other words, the rule (*Hukm*) of this thing is probably so, and the rule of that thing is probably so. So the rule is correct with the possibility of error, but it remains as correct until its error is proved.

The rational method, whether correctly defined or not, is the method that man, as a man, follows in his thinking and his judgment on things, and his understanding of their nature and their characteristics. However, the West, meaning Europe and America, followed by Russia, initiated the industrial revolution in Europe, and succeeded in the empirical sciences in a way that was unmatched. Its influence since the nineteenth century extended to include the whole world, and it called the style of research in the empirical disciplines a scientific method of thinking and

thus the scientific method came into existence. It started to advocate it as the method of thinking and made it the basis of thinking. The Communist thinkers adopted it, and followed it in other than the empirical sciences. Similarly, the thinkers in Europe continued to proceed according to it in the empirical disciplines. The thinkers in America followed their approach. The people of the whole world imitated them due to the control and influence of the West and then the influence of the Soviet Union. Thus, this method became generally prevalent in the world. So because of this, there existed in the society in the whole of the Islamic world a great respect for the scientific thoughts and the scientific method. Therefore, it is necessary to explain this scientific method.

The scientific method is a particular approach in study that is adopted in order to attain knowledge of the nature (*Haqeeqah*) of the thing under study, through carrying out experiments on the thing. This method cannot function except in the study of the tangible objects and it is not possible for it to function in the (study of) thoughts, for it is specific to the empirical disciplines. It works through subjecting the matter (object) to new conditions and factors other than its original conditions and factors, and observing the matter (object) and both its original and new conditions and factors. As a result of this process carried on the matter (object), a material tangible fact is concluded, as is the case in laboratories.

This method assumes the renunciation of all the previous information about the object under study, and ignores their presence, and then it starts to observe the matter (object) and exercise experiment on it. This is because this method requires from you - if you wanted to study something using this method - to eliminate from yourself every previous opinion and every previous conviction you have regarding this subject, and to start observation and experimentation, followed by comparison, collation of results and then forming conclusions based on these scientific premises. If a result was concluded from that, it would be a scientific result, which is naturally subject to study and investigation. However, it remains a scientific result unless the scientific research proved that an error crept into one of its aspects. The result reached by the researcher according to the scientific method, despite being called a scientific fact or a scientific rule, it is not definite (*qat'i*); rather it is speculative (*DHanni*), and susceptible to error. The susceptibility of error

in the scientific method is one of the main fundamentals that must be observed in it, in accordance with what is firmly established in scientific research.

From the study of this method, it is clarified that it is correct and not erroneous. Its designation as a method is not wrong, for it is a constant and specific approach in study; and the method is the way (of thinking) that does not change. However, the error is to adopt it as a basis for thinking, since taking it as a basis does not work. This is because it is not suitable as a basis for things to be built upon, it is rather a branch emanating from a basis. Furthermore, making it a basis excludes most disciplines and facts from study, and leads one to judge that many disciplines which people study and which contain facts, are non-existent, despite the fact that they actually exist and they are tangible through sensation and reality.

Thus the scientific method is correct, but it is not a basis in thinking, rather it is a constant style of thinking. It is not applied in every matter, rather applied in one area; that is the tangible, material object, in order to know its reality, through carrying out experiments on it. It does not work except in the study of the material objects, so it is specific to the empirical sciences and not used in other than them.

This method is not a basis. This is obvious from two perspectives: The first is that it can't be followed except with the presence of previous information even if it is of a preliminary type. This is because thinking can't exist without the presence of previous information. So the scientist in chemistry, physics and in the laboratory, can't proceed in the scientific method for a moment unless he has previous information. Their claim that the scientific method assumes the renunciation of the previous information means the renunciation of the previous opinions and not the previous information. This means the scientific method requires from the researcher - when he wants to study - that he eliminates from himself every previous opinion and every previous conviction he had regarding this subject. He has to start observation and experimentation, then comparison and collation then finally conclusion based on these scientific premises. Despite the fact that it is equivalent to observation, experimentation and conclusion, it is necessary to have previous information in it. This information would come from other than

observation and experimentation, i.e. it would come through the transferring of the reality by the senses. This is because the preliminary information for the initial scientific study is not able to be empirical information, because this (experiment) did not exist at that point. Hence it must have come through the transferring of the reality, by the means of the sensation, to the brain. That is to say the previous information must have come through the way of the rational method. Therefore, the scientific method cannot be a basis; rather the rational method is the basis. The scientific method is built on this basis. So it is one of its branches and not a basis to it. Therefore, it is wrong to make the scientific method as a basis for thinking.

The second perspective is that the scientific method requires that everything that can't be touched materially has no existence in the view of the scientific method. Accordingly, there is no existence for logic, history, jurisprudence (*fiqh*), politics (*siyasah*), or other disciplines, because they can't be touched (by the hand), neither can they be subjected to experiments. In its view, Allah ﷻ will have no existence, neither the angels, nor *shayateen* (Satans) or any other creatures, because they were not proved scientifically, i.e. through observation of the material (objects), experimenting upon them and the material conclusion. This is the flagrant error, for the natural (related to nature) sciences are one of the branches of knowledge (*ma'rifah*), and one of the types of thoughts. The other information (*ma'rifah*) of life is many, and they were not proved by the scientific method, rather by the rational method. The existence of Allah ﷻ was proved by the rational method in a definite way. The existence of the angels and *shayateen* (Satans) was proved by a text, definite in its establishment (*qat'iy uth-thuboot*) and definite in its meaning (*qat'iy ud-dalalah*); where the certainty of its establishment and the certainty of its meaning were proved by the rational method. Therefore it is not allowed to adopt the scientific method as a basis for thinking. Its inadequacy and failure to prove the existence of a thing that exists in a definite way is definite evidence that it is not a basis for thinking.

Furthermore, the susceptibility of error in the scientific method is one of its fundamentals that has to be noticed in it, in accordance with what is firmly established in scientific research. Error has actually occurred in its results, and it appeared in many scientific disciplines that

reveal its invalidity, after they were called scientific facts. For example, the atom was said to be the smallest part of the matter and it is indivisible. The error of that became clear and, by the scientific method itself, it was clarified that it can be divided. It was said that matter does not cease to exist but the error of that appeared, and by the scientific method itself, it became clear that it ceases to exist. Thus it became clear that much of what has been called scientific facts and scientific law, has come to be wrong, according to the scientific method. This means that by the same scientific method, it became clear that they are not scientific facts or scientific laws. Therefore, the scientific method is speculative (*DHanni*) and not definite (*qat'i*). It produces a speculative result about the existence of the thing, its characteristic and its nature. So the scientific method should not be taken as a basis for thinking. However, it is a correct method for thinking, a thinking method, but good only in the empirical sciences. In other words, it is good in that which observation; experimentation, comparison and arrangement can take place. Anything, in which these can't take place, is absolutely no good for the scientific method, so it is specific to the empirical sciences and nothing else.

Though it is possible to conclude thoughts by the scientific method, thought can't be originated by it alone. It can't originate any unprecedented thought, as is the case with the rational method. It can only conclude new thoughts that are deduced, as opposed to those that are originated without precedent.

The unprecedented thoughts are those that the mind adopted directly. For example the realisation of the existence of Allah; the knowledge that thinking about the people is higher than thinking of oneself; that wood burns, oil floats on top of water and the thinking of the individual is stronger than the thinking of the group (of people). All such thoughts were adopted by the mind directly. This is different to the thoughts that are not originated without precedent; they are the thoughts derived from the scientific method, where the mind did not adopt them directly. It rather took them from many thoughts that the mind took before, beside the experiments.

So knowing that water is composed of oxygen and hydrogen, that the atom can be divided and that the matter ceases to exist; these thoughts were not taken by the mind directly, nor were they originated without

precedent. They were rather taken from thoughts that the mind happened to adopt before, then experiments were carried out beside these thoughts, then thought was concluded. So it is not thought originated without precedent but it is concluded from present thoughts that are concluded from thoughts and an experiment. Accordingly, the scientific method concludes thought but can't originate thought. Therefore it is naturally and inevitably not to be the basis for thinking. However the confidence of the West - i.e. Europe and America followed by Russia - in the scientific method reached the level of sanctification or almost so, particularly in the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth century, to the extent they became perverted in thinking and going astray from the right path, because they made the scientific method their method in thinking, and they made it alone the basis of thinking, and they chose it for judging on all things. They came to view the correct study as that which proceeds based on the scientific method. They overstepped the limit such that some of them actually started discussing matters that have no relationship with the scientific method, such as the thoughts pertaining to life and society, following the scientific method and copying it. They started to study some of the information related to man, society and people rationally but in accordance with the style of the scientific method. They call such thoughts scientific, based on their generalisation of the scientific method and their respect to it, and making it the basis of thinking.

The Communist thinkers for example proceeded in their viewpoint in life and in the system of society, on the scientific method. So they got into the excessive error that they declined in. The examples of their error are many and present in every single one of their thoughts. This is because they compared nature and society to the objects that are studied in the laboratory, so they came out with results of considerable error. To realise the error in them, it is enough to examine two main thoughts and demonstrate the sense of error in each one of them and that the reason of the error is the following up of the scientific method. Their view, for example, about nature; that it is a whole which is indivisible that is in continuous change, and that change occurs by means of the mutual contradictions that inevitably exist in the objects and incidents. Let us study the concept of the mutual contradictions that is one of their main thoughts. If it is true that the mutual contradictions exist in objects, however, they do not exist in all of them, for there are objects that do

not have mutual contradictions in them. The living bodies, which they advocate to have in them mutual contradictions, under the pretence that they have in them cell which die and cells that live. These living bodies do not have in them mutual contradictions. What is noticed in the living body regarding the presence of cells which die and cells which live is not a mutual contradiction. The fact that things are born and those they die; cease to exist and come into existence, does not mean that there are mutual contradictions. Rather, this results from the strength and weakness of the cell and its ability in resistance or its inability. All of these are not mutual contradictions. However, in the inanimate objects, extinction occurs but not birth and growth. Yet they claim there exist mutual contradiction in the things. Even if we admitted there exist mutual contradictions in things, this does not mean that mutual contradictions exist in events. Thus, the transactions, activities of trade (selling and purchasing), leasing and companies and the like, all take place without any mutual contradictions in them. The same can be said about the prayer, fasting, pilgrimage (*Hajj*) and the likes. Certainly, there are no mutual contradictions in them. However, their advocacy of the scientific method is what lead to their erroneous view, particularly with regard to events. As a consequence of the error in this view of theirs (that events contain mutual contradictions) they were led to what they thought that mutual contradictions in Europe would definitely occur. The result was that no mutual contradictions occurred in Europe, and it is completely influenced by the Capitalist system, and goes away from Communism. What involved them in the error is their advocacy of the scientific method in issuing judgments on things and in issuing judgments on incidents.

Their view about the society, that it is consisted of the geographic medium, the growth of the population and their solidarity and the modes of production. Thus the physical life in society determines, at the end, the form of the society, and its thoughts, opinions and political situations. Since the material life is affected by the mode of production, then the mode of production is the factor that affects the society. This is their view; that the means of production, the people who use these means and the technique of using them, all together constitute the production forces in the society. Thus they form one of the aspects of the society, which represents the behaviour of the people towards the objects of nature and its production forces. The other aspect is the

relationship amongst the people during the process of production. This view is wrong. For the society is formed of the people together with the relationships between them, regardless of the means of production. Even regardless of whether there are means of production or not. This is because what generates relationships between them are interests; which are not determined by the means of production. Rather they are determined by the thoughts that the people carry regarding the satisfaction of the needs that they aim to satisfy. What created the error is that they viewed the society in the same way that they view the objects in a laboratory. So they tried to study what they saw of elements (as they did with the matter) in application to their theory. They also started to apply what takes place within matter on the people and their relationships; hence they fell into error. This is because people are different to things; and events can't be subjected to research in the same way as matter in the laboratory. Their subjugation of the relationships and events to the observations and experiments and then deriving theories is what plunged them in the error. So the cause of the error of Communism is one; which is following the scientific method in events and relationships. This resulted from the widespread reverence of the scientific method in the 19th century and the overuse of it to the extent of applying it on everything, and proceeding with it in every study.

The thinkers of the West, meaning the thinkers of Europe and America mixed between the deducted thoughts resulting from the rational method and the scientific thoughts resulting from the scientific method. So they applied the scientific method on the behaviour and conditions of man and produced what is called psychology, sociology and the education disciplines. The result of this was the apparent error in what is called psychology, sociology and the education disciplines. They consider psychology as a science, and its thoughts as scientific thoughts, because they resulted from observations on children at various conditions and various ages. They called the repetition of these observations experiments. The truth is that the thoughts of psychology are not scientific thoughts; rather they are rational thoughts. This is because the scientific experiments are the subjugation of the matter (object) to conditions and factors different to its original conditions and factors, and observing the effect of this subjugation. In other words they are the same experiments conducted on matter, such as the experiments in physics and chemistry. However, observing the thing at

different conditions and at different ages is not included in the subject of scientific experiments. So it is not considered a scientific method, it is rather only an observation, which is repeated, and then a conclusion drawn. So it is a rational method and scientific one. Thus it is incorrect to consider them scientific thoughts. This mistake was the result of the flagrant error of applying the scientific method on man. The scientific method mainly depends on the experiment, and this is not possible except with matter, for it is the one that is subjected to experimentation in the laboratory. Observation is not watching the actions or noticing the things under different conditions. It is rather watching the matter itself and noticing the original conditions and factors, together with the conditions and factors to which it was subjected. Conclusion must result from this particular observation and not from just any observation. Therefore, the application of the scientific method in other than this particular format, i.e. on other than the matter and subjugating it, is a manifest error that leads to errors and wrong conclusions. This is what occurred with the thinkers of the West in the rational studies that they proceeded with in accordance with the scientific method, and considered them as science and scientific thoughts, hence they fell into the error which they found themselves in. Examples on their error are many and exist in every one of their thoughts and in every one of their researches. They compared man with the objects under study, and came out with results of considerable error. It is enough, in order to comprehend the error, that we study just one idea, which is the idea of instincts, and demonstrate the aspect of error in it.

Due to their practice of applying the scientific method on man, they started to observe the actions of man and attribute them to motives. They preoccupied themselves with the observation of numerous actions. This distracted them from the true subject and made them come out with erroneous results. If they had actually followed the rational method, they would have carried their sensation of man and his behaviour to the brain; and by using the previous information, they would have explained the reality of man and the reality of these actions, and come out with results other than the results they concluded, even if they were speculative results. They say, for example, that the instincts are many and not limited in number. So they said there is the ownership instinct, the fear instinct, the sexual instinct and the instinct of flocking together (*ghareezat ul-qaTee*), beside others. The reason of this is that they did not

differentiate between the instinct and the manifestation of the instinct, i.e. whether it is the primary life energy or just one of its manifestations. The primary life energy or the instinct is part of the entity of man. So it can't be modified, eliminated or suppressed. It would necessarily exist in any one of its manifestations. This is different to the manifestation of the primary life energy, i.e. the manifestation of the instinct, which is not part of the entity of man. Therefore, the manifestation (*maDHar*) can be treated, eliminated and suppressed. For example, with the survival instinct (*ghareezat ul-baqaa*), one of its manifestations is egoism and also altruism. So it is possible to treat the egoism and also altruism. It is possible even to eliminate it and suppress it. Similarly, the lustful inclination towards women is one of the manifestations of the species instinct (*ghareezat un-nau*), and the inclination to the mother is also one of the appearances of the species instinct. So the instinct of species can't be treated nor eliminated, or suppressed. However, the treatment of the manifestations of this instinct is possible, it is even possible to eliminate them and suppress them. For example, the manifestations of the species instinct are the lustful inclination towards women; and the inclination toward the mother, the inclination toward the sister and the inclination toward the daughter and so on. So it is possible to treat the lustful inclination towards women by the compassionate tendency towards the mother, since tenderness treats desire as altruism treats egoism. It is often that tenderness to the mother distracts from the wife, even from marriage and sexual desire. Also it is often found that the sexual desire of man distracts him from compassion towards his mother. So any manifestation of the species instinct can replace another manifestation, and it is possible to treat one manifestation (of the instinct) with another one of its manifestations. Thus the manifestations can be treated, it can even be suppressed or eliminated. However, the instinct can't be suppressed or eliminated, since the instinct is part of the entity of man, and different to the manifestation (*maDHar*), which is not part of him.

Hence psychologists were mistaken regarding the instincts, their understanding, their limitation and their scope. The truth is that the instincts are limited to three; which are the survival instinct, species instinct and the sanctification instinct. This is because man is concerned about his own survival, thus he possesses (things), fear, bursts of bravery, gathering with others together (flocking together), beside other similar

actions, for the sake of protecting himself. Fear is not an instinct, neither is ownership an instinct. Similarly, neither bravery nor gathering together are instincts. They are rather manifestations of one instinct that is the survival instinct. Inclining towards women with lust, inclining towards women with compassion, inclining towards rescuing a drowning person, and the inclination to help the needy, etc. are all not instincts; rather they are manifestations of one instinct, which is the species instinct, and not the sexual instinct. This is because sex includes both the animal and the human being. The natural inclination is of a human being towards a human being, and from an animal to an animal. The inclination with lust of a man towards an animal is abnormal and not natural, meaning when it occurs it occurs abnormally and not naturally. The instinct is the natural inclination, so the inclination of the male towards the female is abnormal and not natural, and it does not take place naturally but rather abnormally. Thus, inclining towards woman with lust, and the inclination to be compassionate to the mother, and towards the daughter with tenderness; all of these are manifestations of the species instinct. However, the lustful inclination of a man towards an animal, or a male towards a female are not natural; rather they are deviation of the instinct, so they are abnormal. So the instinct is that of the species and not that of sex. It is for the sake of the continuation of the human species and not the continuation of the animal species. Likewise, the inclination towards the worship of Allah, reverence to the heroes and respect to the strong people, all of these are appearances to one instinct, which is the instinct of religiousness or sanctification (*ghareezat ut-tadayyun*). This is because man has an innate feeling for survival and living eternally. So anything that threatens this survival, man naturally responds to it with a feeling that depends on the type of threat, such as with fear or bravery, meanness or generosity, individuality or grouping together. All of that is according to what he notices. This creates in him a feeling that drives him to act. Accordingly, all actions resultant from the feeling of survival appear in him. He also has feeling for the survival of the human race, because the extinction of the human being threatens his (personal) survival. So anything that threatens the survival of his race, he naturally responds to it with a feeling that depends on the type of the threat. The sight of a beautiful lady incites lust in him, and seeing the mother, incites compassion in him, and seeing the child incites pity in him. Thus he responds with a feeling that drives him to act. These actions that appear in him, might be in harmony with each other or contradictory. His

inability to satisfy the feeling of his personal survival or the survival of his race incites other feelings in him; which are the submission and surrender to whomever - according to his feeling - deserves the submission and surrender. Thus, he prays humbly to Allah, applauds the leader and respects the strong, according to his feeling of natural inability. Thus, the origin of the instincts is the feeling of (personal) survival, the continuity of the race or the natural deficiency. This feeling resulted in actions, which are manifestations of these natural sources (instincts). These manifestations in general, are attributed to one of these three sources. Therefore, the instincts are only three.

However, originally man has in him a life energy, which has innate feelings that drive him to achieve satisfaction. This drive generates feelings or sensations that require satisfaction. Some of these feeling or sensations need to be satisfied necessarily, since if they were not satisfied man dies, because they pertain to the existence of the (life) energy itself. Some others require satisfaction, but not in a necessary manner. So if satisfaction did not occur man will be worried, but he remains alive, because they pertain to the needs rather than the existence of the (life) energy. Therefore, the life energy is of two parts: One of them requires satisfaction necessarily, and that is called the organic needs, such as hunger, thirst, and answering the call of nature. The second of them requires just satisfaction, and that is called the instincts. These are three: the instinct of survival (*ghareezat ul-baqaa*), the species instinct (*ghareezat un-nau*) and the instinct of sanctification (*ghareezat ut-tadayyun*).

This is the truth regarding the instincts, and the truth regarding man. Had the Western thinkers followed the rational method, by carrying the sensation about man and his actions to the brain, and explained this reality or their sensation of this reality by using the previous information, they would have discovered the truth of this reality. However, their adherence to the scientific method, viewing man like matter, and thinking that observing the actions of man is like observing matter, misled them from the truth, and hence they came out with these erroneous results about the instincts and other areas like the studies in psychology. This erroneous view applies to what is called sociology and education. All of these are not sciences and are, in general, all incorrect. The errors that occurred in the West, in Europe, America and then Russia, i.e. with the Communist thinkers and with the scientists of psychology, sociology,

and education, are due to their advocacy of the scientific method in studying everything, and their exaggeration in the appraisal of the scientific method and its application on all subjects. This is what involved them in error and misguidance, and this is what involves every man who adopts the scientific method in subjects.

The scientific method is a correct method for thinking and it is not wrong. However, it is only correct in scientific study. So it must be restricted to the use in scientific research, i.e. in the object that submits to experimentation. Its error is its use in other than the scientific studies, i.e. in other than the study of the object that submits to experimentation. It is wrong and a mistake for it to be used in the study of the viewpoint about life, i.e. what is called ideology. It is also wrong for it to be applied on man, society or nature or in the study of history, jurisprudence or education and the like. It should rather be restricted only to the scientific study i.e. to the study of the object that submits to experimentation.

The error that occurred, in the application of the scientific method on every subject, results from advocating the scientific method as a basis for every study. Adopting it as a basis in thinking is what led to taking it as a basis for building upon it, and as a basis for every study. Adopting it as a basis in thinking leads to its application on subjects to which this method can't be applied, such as the study of the systems (of life), the instincts, the brain and education and the like. This led to the occurrence of aberrations in the socialist idea, in what is called psychology, education and sociological sciences. Moreover, advocating it as a basis in thinking will exclude most disciplines and facts from discussion, and will lead to the disappearance of many disciplines which are subjects of study and contain facts, despite their actual existence which is tangibly sensed. It would also lead to denying the existence of many existent things.

Furthermore, the scientific method is speculative (*DHanni*), and the possibility of error in its conclusions is one of the fundamentals that have to be observed about it. So it can't be taken as a basis in thinking. The scientific method produces a probable result about the existence of the thing, its nature and its description; while there are things where the result regarding their existence must be definite and decisive. So it is not correct to use the speculative method as a basis to reach a definite

result. This alone is enough to consider the speculative method as an invalid basis for thinking.

Accordingly, thinking has two methods only, which are the rational method and the scientific method. After study and deduction, there appears no any other method. The scientific method is not good except in one branch of knowledge, which relates to the study of the object that submits to experimentation. This is different to the rational method, it is good for every subject, and therefore it should be the basis in thinking. By the rational method, thought can be originated. By the rational method, the comprehension of the scientific facts is established, through the observation, experiment and conclusion, i.e. by the rational method, the scientific method itself can exist. By the rational method, the logical facts can be obtained; by it, the historical facts can be obtained and the incorrect and the correct in them can be differentiated; by it the collective thought about the universe, man and life, and the facts of the universe, man and life can be established. The rational method provides a definite result about the existence of the object. Though it gives a probable result about its nature and about its description, but it provides a definite result about its existence. Thus it is definite and decisive in terms of its judgment on the existence of the thing. Therefore, it alone should be taken as a basis for study, i.e. as a primary method, considering that its results are definite. Therefore, if a rational result was in conflict with a scientific result about the existence of the thing, then the rational method is adopted definitely, while the scientific result that disagrees with the rational method is rejected, because the definite rather than the probable is adopted.

Therefore, the error was the adoption of the scientific method as a basis for thinking, and adopting it as an arbitrator in the judgment on things. This error must be corrected, and the rational method must become the basis of thinking, and reference should be made to it for the judgment on matters.

As for the logical study, it is not a method for thinking. It is rather an approach towards study based on the rational method. This is because the logical study is to construct a thought upon another thought such that it ends up with sensation, and to obtain through this construction (of thoughts), a specific result. Such as to say: The writing board is of

wood; every wood burns; so the result is that the writing board burns. Similarly, had there been life in the slaughtered sheep it would have moved, but it did not move, so the result is there is no life in the slaughtered sheep, and so on. In the first example the idea that every wood burns was connected to the idea that the writing board is of wood. From this connection the result was that the writing board burns. In the second example, the idea that the slaughtered sheep did not move, was connected with the idea that life in the slaughtered makes it move. The result of this connection (of ideas) was that the slaughtered sheep has no life. This logical study, if it is with issues that contain thoughts that were connected and were correct, then the result will be correct. If its issues were false, the result will be false. The condition required in the logic is that in its premises, every issue must end with sensation. Thus it returns to the rational method, and the sensation has to be the arbiter so as to realise the soundness of the issues. Therefore it is one of the modes that are based on the rational method, and it is susceptible to falsification and deception. Instead of examining the validity of the logic by referring to the rational method, it is more preferable to use the rational method in research in the first place, and not resort to the logical style.

It is worth mentioning two questions. Firstly, the foremost thing that is required of you by the scientific method is that when you make a study you must eliminate from yourself any opinion or any conviction you had before regarding this subject you wish to study, and this is what makes the study proceed along the scientific method. According to this basis, they view this study as a scientific research, and that it proceeds in accordance with the scientific method. The answer to that is that this opinion is correct, but it is not scientific, nor does it proceed according to the scientific method. It is rather rational, and proceeds according to the scientific method. This is because the subject is not related to the opinion, but to the study. The rational study works by transferring the reality by the sensation to the brain. While the scientific study works by the experiment and the observation. This is what distinguishes the rational method from the scientific method. So the object, if the person sensed it would be the judge of its existence according to the rational method. While the thing, if the experiment and observation did not indicate its existence, it is not judged to exist. Take the fact that the wood burns; it is enough in the rational method to sense of its burning.

However, in the scientific method, the (piece of) wood must be subjected to experimentation and observation in order to judge that it burns. So the existence of previous information is necessary in the rational method. While the scientific method obliges the abandonment of the previous information, though it is not possible for thinking to take place unless they existed. As regards the previous opinions and the previous conviction, they mean what he had of previous information and previous judgments. So the subject of the existence of previous opinions does not mean in the view of the opinion as such, but it means the previous judgment. Thus the issue in the scientific method is not the existence of a previous opinion or a previous conviction, rather it means the previous judgment (on the thing studied) as previous information by which the experiment and the observation are explained. So the important matter in the scientific method is the experiment and the observation and not the opinion or the information.

As regards the previous opinion or the previous conviction, and their use or not in study, and their intervention or not in study, the soundness of study and the correctness of the result of study require the abandonment of every previous opinion on the subject. In other words they require the abandonment of what is in the mind of opinions and judgments about the subject under study, so as not to influence the person in the study or influence the result of the study. For example, I have an opinion that France and Germany can't be unified in one state and can't form one nation. When discussing their unification to form one nation and one state, it is incorrect that this (previous) opinion exists when discussing their unification, because it undermines my study and undermines my (concluded) result. Similarly, I have an opinion that revival (*nahDah*) can't exist except with industry, inventions and education. When discussing the awakening of my people and my nation, I have to give up this opinion. Also I have the opinion that the atom is the smallest part in the matter and that it can't be divided. When discussing the splitting or dividing the atom, I have to relinquish this opinion from my mind. Thus the person, when studying anything, he must give up every previous opinion he had about the subject and about the thing that he wants to study it or research it.

However, these opinions that he must abandon for study have to be examined. If they were definite opinions established by the definite

evidence that is not open to any shred of doubt, then it is not right to abandon them, under any circumstances, if the subject he discusses is speculative, and the result which it leads to is speculative. This is because if there was a conflict between the definite and the speculative, then the definite is adopted and the speculative is rejected. Therefore the definite must dominate the speculative. However, if the subject is definite and the concluded result is definite, then in this case it is necessary to abandon every previous opinion and conviction. Abandonment of every previous opinion is necessary for the soundness of the study and the soundness of the result. However if the subject is speculative, it is not correct when studying it to abandon the definite opinions and the decisive conviction. However, he must abandon every speculative previous opinion in the subject. There is no difference in this regard between the rational method and the scientific method. The evil of the studies lies in the interference of the previous opinions in the study.

In regards to what is called objectivity, it is not only the abandonment of every previous opinion, rather restricting the discussion to the subject, besides abandoning every previous opinion. When you discuss the analysis of the olive oil, it is not correct that any other subject; thing or opinion penetrates to reach to this subject. When you study the policy of industry, it is not correct that any other subject, or thing or an opinion interferes with this subject. So the markets, profit or dangers should not be thought of; or any other thing save the state's policy for industry. When you discuss the deduction of a divine rule (*Hukm shar'i*) it is not correct to think of the interest, the harm, or the opinion of the people or any other thing except the deduction of the divine rule. Thus in every subject, the mind should be restricted to the subject of discussion. So objectivity is not only the non-interference of the previous opinion on the subject, but beside that, restricting the discussion to the subject itself, and the removal of any other thing from it, and restricting the mind to the discussed subject only.

As for the second issue, it is the logic. Logic together with the matters related to it, is susceptible to being deceptive and misleading, which causes great harm in legislation and politics. This is because the results of logic are built upon premises. The falsehood of these premises and their truth are not easily detected, in all circumstances. Therefore, the falsehood of one of these premises could be hidden. Similarly its truth

could be based on erroneous information, thus leading to erroneous results. Furthermore, through using logic, contradictory results could be obtained. As an example: the Qur'an is the speech of Allah. The speech of Allah is old. Thus the Qur'an is old (eternal). The opposite result comes from the following: The Speech of Allah is in Arabic language. The Arabic language is created. Thus the Qur'an is created. Logic could lead to misleading results. As an example, the Muslims are backward. Every backward (thing) is declined. Thus Muslims are declined. So you can find horrible dangers brought up by logic. These could lead to error, misguidance, even to destruction. The peoples and nations that adhered to logic were deviated from progress in life. Therefore, though logic is one of the styles of the rational method, it is unproductive, and harmful. Its danger is destructive. Therefore, it must be renounced, and guarded against and the people must be prevented from using it.

Though the logical style is one the styles of the rational method, it is a complicated style, and it is susceptible to being deceptive and misleading, and it could lead to the opposite of what the facts aimed at obtaining. Furthermore, whether he needed to learn the science of logic or he was innately logical, logic does not lead to results through the direct sensation of the reality, rather it ends with the sensation of the reality. Therefore it is almost a third method in thinking. Since thinking has only two methods, then it is better to avoid the use of this style. It is safer to trust in the validity of the results that are from the rational method directly, because it is the one in which the validity of the result is guaranteed.

Whatever the case may be, the natural method in thinking, and the one that must be the fundamental method is the rational method. It is the method of the Qur'an and thus the method of Islam. A quick review of the Qur'an shows that it followed the rational method, whether in establishing the proof or in demonstrating the rules (*ahkam*). Look at the Qur'an to find it say

فَلْيَنْظُرِ الْإِنْسَانُ مِمَّ خُلِقَ

'So let man think from what he is created!' [TMQ At-Tariq: 5],

أَفَلَا يَنْظُرُونَ إِلَى الْإِبِلِ كَيْفَ خُلِقَتْ

'Do they not look at the camels, how they are made?' [TMQ Al-Ghashiyah: 17],

وَأَيَّةٌ لَهُمْ اللَّيْلُ نَسْلَخُ مِنْهُ النَّهَارَ فَإِذَا هُمْ مُظْلَمُونَ

'And a sign for them is the night. We withdraw there from the day, and behold they are plunged in darkness' [TMQ Ya-Sin: 37],

'No son did Allah beget, nor is there any god along with Him (if there were many gods), behold, each god would have taken away what he had created, and some would have lorded it over others!' [TMQ 22:91],

يَا أَيُّهَا النَّاسُ ضُرِبَ مَثَلٌ فَاستَمِعُوا لَهُ إِنَّ الَّذِينَ تَدْعُونَ مِنْ

دُونِ اللَّهِ لَنْ يَخْلُقُوا ذُبَابًا وَلَوْ اجْتَمَعُوا لَهُ وَإِنْ يَسئَلُهُمُ

الذُّبَابُ شَيْئًا لَأَسْتَفِذُّهُ مِنْهُ ضَعُفَ الطَّالِبِ وَالْمَطْلُوبِ

'Those, on whom, besides Allah, you call, cannot create (even) a fly, if they all met together for the purpose! And if the fly should snatch anything from them, they would have no power to release it from it (the fly). Feeble are those who petition and those whom they petition' [TMQ Al-Hajj: 73],

لَوْ كَانَ فِيهِمَا آلِهَةٌ إِلَّا اللَّهُ لَفَسَدَتَا فَسُبْحَانَ اللَّهِ رَبِّ الْعَرْشِ

عَمَّا يَصِفُونَ

'If there were, in the heavens and the earth, other gods beside Allah, there would have been ruin in both!' [TMQ Al-Anbiya: 22]; beside other verses. All of these verses command the use of the sensation to carry/transfer the

reality so as to reach the correct result. You find the Quran also says in terms of the rules (aHkam),

حُرِّمَتْ عَلَيْكُمْ أُمَّهَاتُكُمْ

'Your mothers are prohibited to you (for marriage).' [TMQ An-Nisa: 23],

حُرِّمَتْ عَلَيْكُمْ الْمَيْتَةُ

'Forbidden to you (for food) are the dead meat' [TMQ Al-Ma'idah: 3],

كُتِبَ عَلَيْكُمُ الْقِتَالُ وَهُوَ كُرْهٌ لَكُمْ

'Fighting is prescribed upon you, and you dislike it' [TMQ Al-Baqarah: 216],

فَمَنْ شَهِدَ مِنْكُمُ الشَّهْرَ فَلْيَصُمْهُ

'Who is present (at his home) during that month should spend it in fasting' [TMQ Al-Baqarah: 185],

وَشَاوِرْهُمْ فِي الْأَمْرِ

'And consult them in affairs' [TMQ Al-Imran: 159],

أَوْفُوا بِالْعُقُودِ

'Fulfil (all) obligations (contracts)' [TMQ Al-Ma'idah: 1],

بَرَاءَةٌ مِنَ اللَّهِ وَرَسُولِهِ إِلَى الَّذِينَ عَاهَدْتُمْ مِنَ الْمُشْرِكِينَ

'A declaration of immunity from Allah and His Messenger to those of the pagans with whom you have contracted mutual alliances' [TMQ At-Tauba: 1],

وَأَحَلَّ اللَّهُ الْبَيْعَ وَحَرَّمَ الرِّبَا

'But Allah has permitted trade and forbidden usury' [TMQ Al-Baqarah: 275],

فَقَاتِلْ فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ لَا تُكَلِّفُ إِلَّا نَفْسَكَ

'Then fight in Allah's cause, you are held responsible only for yourself' [TMQ An-Nisa: 84],

يَا أَيُّهَا النَّبِيُّ حَرِّضِ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ عَلَى الْقِتَالِ

'Rouse the believers to the fight' [TMQ: Al-Anfal: 65]

فَانكِحُوا مَا طَابَ لَكُمْ مِنَ النِّسَاءِ مَثْنَى وَثُلَاثَ وَرُبَاعَ

'Marry women of your choice, two or three or four' [TMQ An-Nisa: 3],

فَإِنْ أَرْضَعْنَ لَكُمْ فَآتُوهُنَّ أُجُورَهُنَّ

'And if they suckle to you (your offspring) give them their recompense' [TMQ At-Talaq: 6], together with other verses. All of these verses give tangible rules for tangible events. The understanding of these verses, whether related to the rule (judgment) or the incident related to it, is achieved by the rational method, i.e. thinking of them and their application is by the rational method, and by the direct style rather than the logical style. What is doubted to have come by the logical style such as Allah's ﷻ saying

لَوْ كَانَ فِيهِمَا آلِهَةٌ إِلَّا اللَّهُ لَفَسَدَتَا فَسُبْحَانَ اللَّهِ رَبِّ الْعَرْشِ
عَمَّا يَصِفُونَ

'If there were, in the heavens and the earth, other gods beside Allah, there would have been ruin in both' [TMQ Al-Anbiya: 22], it also came by the direct style. It did not come through premises, rather through the command of thinking, by transferring the sensation directly to the brain, not through the way of premises linked to each other.

Therefore, only the rational method is the one that people should adopt, and the direct style is safer to follow. This is in order that the thinking is sound, and that the result of thinking is closer to correctness in the speculative issues, and definite and decisive in what is definite.

This is because the whole subject is related to thinking, which is the most valuable thing in man and in life, and the manner of conducting life depends on it. Therefore, care should be given to it through caring about the method of thinking.

Thinking, whether in understanding the facts, understanding the incidents or understanding the texts - i.e. whether in comprehension or understanding - is, due to the continuous renewal and the various different types, exposed to slipping and exposed to deviation. Therefore, it is not enough to study the thinking method, but to study the thinking itself openly, in various conditions, incidents and things. Thus, it is necessary to study the thinking in what it is valid to think of and in what is invalid to think of. It is necessary to study the thinking regarding the universe man and life; the thinking regarding the means, the objectives and the aims, beside other matters related to thinking. Moreover, it is necessary to study the thinking that is related to the understanding of speech which is received by hearing, and the speech which is received by reading, i.e. to study the thinking in understanding the texts.

In regards to the study of what it is valid and invalid to think of (despite this being self evident) this is the great problem, and the mistake of many people even the thinkers. As for being self evident, this is because the definition of the mind ('*aqil*') (or the understanding of the meaning of the mind) in a decisive way, assumes intuitively that thinking functions only in that which is reality or has a reality. It is invalid for it to take place in other than the perceived reality. This is because the thinking process is the transferring of the reality, by means of the senses, to the brain. If there were no sensed reality, then the thinking process couldn't occur. The absence of the sensation of the reality negates the presence of thinking and negates the possibility of thinking. The study of this matter is the great problem because many of the thinkers discussed in other than the reality. All the Greek philosophy is nothing but study in that which has no reality. Similarly, the studies of the education scientists in dividing the brain are also study in other than the sensed matter. Likewise, the study of many Muslim 'ulema in the attributes of Allah and the characters of the paradise, hell and the angels, is study in what is not sensed. The thinking in other than the reality or in that which cannot be sensed, generally, dominates the peoples' adoption of many of the thoughts, and their thinking in many matters.

Accordingly, the study of what it is valid and invalid to think of is the great problem (the puzzle).

Despite that, and despite the presence of many matters, which are venerated and definitely believed in as an *'Aqeedah* (creed), and in which it is not valid to have thinking, the definition of the mind, and the adoption of the rational method as a basis for thinking, require that that which is not a reality (and which sensation can't fall on) is not a valid matter in which to have thinking, neither to consider the process which occurs regarding them as a rational process. So for example the opinion of, "the first mind", and, "the second mind", are only fantasies and assumptions, they are not a reality on which sensation falls, or that which sensation can fall upon. It is the imagination that assumed them, put theoretical assumptions and concluded results. So it is not a rational process, and imagination is not thinking. Neither even all the assumptions, including the assumptions in mathematics, are thinking or a rational process. Accordingly, it can be said that all the Greek philosophies are not thoughts; and that a rational process did not occur in them. So they are invalid to be considered as the result of thinking, because no thinking occurred in them, neither did a rational process take place in them. They are only fantasies and assumptions.

They also say the brain is divided into sections, and every section is pertaining to one type of the knowledge. This is also nothing more than fantasy and assumption, since they are not reality, because the reality of the perceived brain is that it is not divided; neither does the sensation fall on that. This is because when the brain functions (i.e. carries out the rational process) it is not possible for the sensation to fall on it. Thus, the view that it is divided, besides being contradictory to the reality, was not the outcome of an intellectual process; it is only fantasy and assumption.

The view that Allah has the attributes of *Qudrah* (power), and the attribute of being *Qadir* (powerful); and that the *Qudrah* has a pre-existent relationship and an incidentally optional relationship; and establishing rational proofs about the attributes of Allah, all of these are not thought. This is even if the shade of rational study and rational proof was placed on them. They are also not the results of thinking, because no rational process occurred regarding them, since the sensation of man does not fall on them.

The rational process, i.e. the thinking, cannot occur except with (the existence of) a reality on which the senses of man fall. However, there are matters and things that have a reality, but man cannot sense this reality, not it can be transferred by senses, but its effect falls under the sensation of man, and can be transferred to the brain by sensation. In these types of matters, the rational process can take place, i.e. thinking can take place regarding it, but it is thinking in its existence and not in its nature. This is because what was transferred to the brain by the means of the senses is its effect, and its effect indicates its existence only, and does not indicate its nature. For example, if an aeroplane was (flying) very high to the extent that the naked eye cannot see it, but the ear hears its sound, then man can sense this aeroplane by its sound. This sound is an evidence for the existence of a thing, i.e. on the existence of the aeroplane, but cannot indicate the nature of this aeroplane. The sound that is heard coming from above is a sound to an existing thing, and from the identification of its sensation, it is deduced that it is a sound and an aeroplane. The rational process took place here in the existence of the aeroplane, i.e. thinking took place in the existence of the aeroplane, and a judgment was issued about its existence, though the senses did not fall on it, rather on its effect. In other words the senses fell on a thing that indicates the aeroplane, so the mind judged its existence from the existence of its effect. It is true that the sound of the Mirage can be distinguished from the sound of the Phantom, and judgment can be given about its type like the judgment that it is an aeroplane, from identifying the type of sound. However, the discovery that it is Mirage or Phantom came only from identifying the sound. Similarly the judgment that it is an aeroplane or not, came from identifying the sound. However this judgment is not on its nature, rather on the type of this existent (aeroplane) through the identification of its effect. However, this is a thought, regardless of anything, because the process (of thinking) actually took place in it, i.e. thinking occurred in it because the senses transferred its effect. It is incorrect to say that this judgment on the existence of the aeroplane is probable. This is because the issue is the possibility of the existence of the thinking in what man senses of its effect but not its essence. However, if the judgment on the sound as being a sound of an aeroplane is probably speculative, the judgment on the existence of something, from which sound came, is a definite judgment. The results of the rational method, may be speculative

and may be definite, in accordance with the sensation carried to the brain, and the information by which this reality is explained.

Thinking about what the senses do not fall upon is only pertaining to what senses fall on its effect, because the effect of a thing is part of its existence. Thus, the thing whose effect is sensed also has its existence sensed. Therefore, thinking in it is valid, and it is valid to think in its existence definitely, and to think in everything the senses indicate of it and distinguish of it from its type. Other than that, thinking cannot function in it, and it is not thought. For example, the senses fall on matters that are characteristics of the thing and not an effect to it, so these characteristics are used as a means to judge on the matter and on the thing. For example, America adopts the concept of freedom, which means it is not a colonialist state, because colonialism is the subjugation of the people, a matter that contradicts the concept of freedom. This premise - America's adoption of the concept of freedom - is not one of the effects of America outside its borders, but it is one of its characteristics. The fact that the thing described with so and so characteristic does not mean this characteristic is its effect, therefore thinking cannot occur in it, for it is not a characteristic that the senses carry to the brain to judge on all the actions (of the thing). It is rather a characteristic of the matter and not one of its effects; therefore it is not possible to make a judgement by using it as a premise to the actions. This is because actions do not occur from man due to being described by a particular characteristic, rather actions occur due to different considerations and many various characteristics. Another example: the fact that Islam is the deen of might (*'izzah*) does not mean that man is mighty (*azeez*), because the might (*'izzah*) is itself not the deen, but it is one of its thoughts. Furthermore, when man embraces a deen this does not mean that he committed himself to it. Thus the might (*'izzah*) is not one of the effects of the deen, rather it is one of its characteristics. The commitment to the deen is also not one of its effects, rather it is one of its qualities. So thinking cannot take place in it. It is rather a sort of assumption only, and not thinking. Thus, what the thinking can take place in is the effect of the thing and not its quality. This is because the effect can be transferred (to the brain) by the sense. However, the quality of the thing, which is not sensed (tangible), cannot be transferred by the senses. In regards to the thing that can be sensed, though the quality can be transferred, the thinking takes place in it and not in the effect of

the thing. Therefore, using the qualities of the thing, as a means to judge on its effect or to judge on it, does not represent a rational process, so thinking cannot occur in it. In other words, assumptions are not valid as a means to judgment, because the senses did not fall on them. It is true that the senses fall on some assumptions, used as premises for logic; but in that case, they are not assumptions, rather they are facts. Assumption is only a supposition and not sensation; neither a supposition resulting from sensation. That is why error occurs when considering the assumptions and fantasies as thoughts.

It might be claimed that limiting thinking to whatever the senses fall on (either it or its effect) would mean restricting thinking to the tangible things. This would, accordingly, mean the scientific method is the basis of thinking, because it does not believe in other than the tangible things. So where has the rational method gone? The answer to this is that the scientific method necessitates the subjugation of the tangible things to experiments and observation and it is not satisfied with sensation only. Therefore, the fact that the thinking does not function except in the tangible things, includes the tangible things that submit to the experiment and observation, and the tangible things where it is enough for the senses to fall on them, i.e. perceive them. This does not make the scientific method a basis for thinking, rather a correct process for thinking, because it stipulates that the thing be sensed, and also stipulates subjecting it to experiment and observation. While the rational method stipulates only that be restricted to the tangible. The basis in the definition of the mind is not the presence of previous information. It is rather the perceived reality, while the previous information is a condition to have thinking about the perceived thing, otherwise it will remain sensation only. Thus the basis in thinking is that it occurs regarding a perceived reality, and not in a thing which is assumed, or where its existence was imagined. Therefore, when it is stated that the first human being has thought in such and such form, this is not considered thinking, because the first human being is not a sensed reality. Rather the current man is the sensed reality. So the current man is adopted and studied in order to know how his thinking functions. Then what is concluded as a result of the study is applied to the human race. This is because it is the same race that does not vary, or the same type that does not vary, everything that is established to any one of its individuals applies to its race and its type, because it is the same race and the same type. This is

like the particle of soil or a particular soil. Everything concluded in regards to this particle of soil through sensation applies to all of its kind and all of its type, whether it was present (witnessed) or absent (not witnessed), and whether thinking was carried in it or not. What is important is that the thing in which thinking occurred is a sensed reality by itself or its effect is sensed. There is no thinking in anything where it or its effect is not sensed.

Thus, it must be clear that what is issued of judgments, and what is adopted of information, from other than the reality, or from a reality whose existence is assumed or imagined, is not a thought in any way, i.e. the mind is not considered to have produced it. This is because the mind does not function without the reality or its effect being sensed. Accordingly thinking does not occur except on the reality or on the effect of the reality, and it absolutely does not work in other than that. Therefore, many of the so-called thoughts, whether recorded in books or verbally discussed, are not considered as the output of the mind, nor did thinking occur in them, so accordingly they are not thoughts.

At this point *al-mughayyabat* (from *al-ghayb*, that is secret and unseen), could be discussed, and whether those are *mughayyabat* (unseen) from the thinker or from the senses. Is the activity of the brain in the *mughayyabat* (unseen) considered thinking, and accordingly is that which is said about the *mughayyabat* considered as thought? The answer to that is that the *mughayyabat* from the thinker are not considered unseen, rather considered present (witnessed). This is because transferring the sensation means the transferring by any human being, and not transferring of the thinker himself only. So Makkah and the Sacred Mosque; when a person thinks of them, or of anyone of them, when he did not see them or sense them, does not indicate that he thinks of the thing that is not sensed, rather he thinks of the sensed (thing). This is because the sensed thing is not that which he senses, rather it is the thing whose nature is that it is sensible. What is concealed from the thinker of sensed things, thinking in them is considered thinking, and the activity of the brain with them is also thinking. Therefore, history is considered thoughts, even if it is recorded or talked about after thousands of years. All the old information is also thoughts, and the activity of the brain regarding them is thinking, even if this happened after thousands of years. The news transmitted by the telegrams are thoughts, and the activity of the

brain regarding them is thinking, even if they came from remote places. So what is concealed/absent from the thinker is not from the *mughayyabat*, rather it is from the sensed things, because it is not stipulated that sensation be by the thinker, but that it would be carried to him, where he might hear of it, read it, or have it read to him. The issue is that knowledge would not be thought unless it resulted from a sensed reality. Thus the sensed reality or the reality whose effect is sensed, are the only two that knowledge of which is thought, and the engagement of the brain regarding them is thinking. Anything other than them is not thought, neither is the engagement of the brain regarding them considered thinking.

The *mughayyabat* (unseen) from sensation are the ones that are genuinely called *mughayyabat*, and they are the subject of the question. The answer about the *mughayyabat* requires their examination. If they were transferred or reported from a source definitely trusted, and which itself was proved to exist by the definite evidences then they are considered to be thoughts, and the engagement of the brain in them is a rational process, i.e. it is thinking. This is because the certainty in the existence of the one who transferred from the narrator has been proved through the sensation and through the definite thought. The truthfulness of his speech was also proved by the sensation and by the definite thought. Therefore, they are considered, in origin, to be coming from a source which it is sensed or which has had its effect sensed. Moreover, the existence of the source itself has been proved, together with its truthfulness, by the definite thought. Thus it is considered thought, and the engagement of the brain regarding it is considered thinking, whether the reporting was proved with the definite evidence or the probable evidence. This is because certainty is only stipulated in its existence and in its truthfulness, in order to be considered a thought. Certainty is not, however, stipulated in proving the speech, rather the correctness of the speech is stipulated, even if it was most likely (*ghalabat uDHann*). Accordingly, the *mughayyabat* which originated from the one whose existence and whose truthfulness were proven by the definite evidence, are considered thought, and the brain engagement regarding them is considered thinking, that is if they were proved authentically to have originated from him, whether this origination was authenticated through certainty or through what is most likely (*ghalabat uDHann*).

However, if what originated (from the one whose existence and whose trustworthiness were proven definitely) was definitely proven, and thus was definitely established and its meaning was definite as well, then it must be believed in decisively, and even doubt in it is invalid. However, if its origin was not definitely proven; rather it was proven through what was most likely (*ghalabat uDHann*), and then it is allowed to be trusted, in an indecisive way. However, both of them are considered thought, and the engagement of the brain regarding them is considered thinking. Thereupon, what was reported of *mughayyabat* in the view of the Muslims, whether they came in the solitary *ahadeeth (ahadeeth al-aahad)* accepted for deduction, or they came in the Glorious Quran, all of them are considered thought, and the engagement of the brain regarding them is considered thinking.

As regards that which came from that whose existence is not definitely proven, nor its trustworthiness definitely proven; it is not thought, nor is the engagement of the brain regarding them considered thinking. They are rather a sort of fantasy and assumption, thus they are foolish talk.

Thus, the *mughayyabat* are not considered thought, nor is the engagement of the brain regarding them considered thinking, unless they were both proved definitely. This is the only case where the *mughayyabat* are considered thought, and the engagement of the brain regarding them considered thinking. This is because, in terms of their origin, they are dependent on that which is sensed. They are considered to originate from the one who sensed them, or reported from him from the One whose existence and whose trustworthiness were both proven definitely. In other than this case, the *mughayyabat* are not considered thought, nor is the brain's engagement regarding them considered thinking, because they are not from the things that are sensed (*maHsoosat*). This is because thinking is the brain's engagement regarding the sensed things (*maHsoosat*) or those whose effect is sensed. The thought is the result of this (brain) engagement, and it is not viable except in the sensed things (*maHsoosat*) or those whose effect is sensed.

As regards the study of the universe, man and life, it is not a study of nature (*Tabee'ah*). This is because nature is wider than the universe, man and life. It is also not a study of the world, because the world (*'aalam*) is every thing other than Allah, thus it includes the angels, *shayateen* and

nature. Therefore when we say that we study the universe, man and life, we do not mean nature, or the world, but we mean these three only. This is because man lives in the universe, so he must know the man, the universe and the life. Thus he is not concerned with the study of nature, for its study would not be enough for him from the study of his race, his life and the universe in which he lives. He is also not concerned with the study of other than that, such as the angels and the shayateen, for their study does not represent a problem to him. For man feels by himself that he exists, and he feels the life in him and he senses the universe in which he lives. So from the moment he started to distinguish matters and things, he starts to ask about whether a thing exists before his existence, the existence of his mother and father, and those before them until the highest grandfather. He also asks about his life that exists in him and in other human beings, and if anything exists before it or not. He also asks about this universe which he sees in terms of the earth and sun, and what he hears of in terms of planets; does anything exist before them or not. In other words, are these eternal (*azali*), where they existed like this for eternity? Or does something eternal exist before them? Then he asks, does anything exist after these three or not? In other words, are they permanent (*abadi*), and do they continue like that without vanishing or not? These questions or enquiries came to his mind frequently. The more he grows, the more these questions increase, thus forming for him a great problem which he endeavours to solve. These enquiries or questions are study of reality, i.e. transfer of a reality to the brain by the means of the senses, so he continues to sense this reality. However, the information he has is not enough to solve this great problem. However, he grows, and the information he has increases, so he attempts frequently to understand this reality by the means of the information he has. If he managed to explain this reality in a definite way, he would not repeat such questions, for he would have then solved the great problem. Though if he could not explain this reality in a definite way, he will continue his enquiry. He might solve it temporarily, but the questions come back again to him, thus he would know that he had not solved it. Thus he will continue, in a natural way, the series of questions till he reaches the answer that his nature believes in, i.e. until the answer complies with the life energy he has, i.e. conforms with his feelings (*'aatifah*). At that point he feels certain that he solved the great problem, in a decisive way, and the questions stop from coming to him. If this great problem was not solved, the questions will continue to come to him

one after the other, and will continue to disturb him. The great problem will continue with him, and he will continue in a state of disturbance, and a state of worry about his future, until he obtains a solution, whether it is a correct one or not, as long as he finds tranquillity in it.

This is the thinking regarding the universe, man and life. It is a natural and inevitable thinking. It must exist in every man, because his existence requires the existence of this thinking. This is because his sensation of these three things is constant, and this sensation drives him to endeavour to reach the thought. Therefore, thinking about the universe, man and life is inseparable from the existence of man. This is because the mere sensation of these three things, which is inevitable, requires the information which he has, and which is related to this sensation; or he tries to obtain this information from others; or he tries to request the solution from others. So, through personal motivation he persists in trying to solve this problem. Thus, the solution of the great problem chases man continuously, making him seek this solution. However, despite the inevitability of the people's questioning, and the inevitability of their undertaking numerous and successive trials to reach the answer, i.e. to reach the solution to the great problem, they differ in the response to this chase. Some of them avoid these questions. Some others continue in seeking the answer to them. However, when they are young, under the age of maturity, they receive the answers to their questions from their parents. They are born free from these questions. However, when they start to distinguish things around them, these questions start to come to them so their parents take it upon themselves to answer these questions. Due to the children's trust in their parents or in those who take charge of them, they resign to the answers in a form of submission and feel content with this submission, because it is submission to whom they have trust in. When they reach the age of maturity, the overwhelming majority of them remain at the limit of the answer they received. In the minority of them, these questions come back, because of the lack of trust they have in the answers that they received when they were young. So they re-examine what they received of solutions to this great complex, and try to solve it by themselves.

Thinking in solving the great problem, i.e. thinking about the universe, man and life, is inevitable for every human being. However, some of them solve it by themselves, and some others receive the solution (from

others). Once it is solved, in any way, this solution, whether man reached it by himself or he received from others, if it agreed with the innate nature (*fiTrah*), and he felt at ease with it, then he will be pleased with it and will feel the happiness of tranquillity. However, if it did not agree with the innate nature (*fiTrah*), then he will not feel at ease with it; and the questions will continue to chase him and disturb him, even if he did not express that with any sign. Therefore, it is necessary to think of the solution to man's great problem, in a way that the solution agrees with the innate nature (*fiTrah*).

Indeed thinking in solving the great problem is natural and inevitable. However, this thinking itself could be correct or it could be futile, or it could be thinking about how to avoid thinking. Yet it is thinking according to the rational method. Those who attribute the universe, man and life to matter, and move to study matter, avoid thinking about man, the universe and life in order to think about matter. Thinking about matter as an escape from the natural and inevitable thinking, leads them to absurdness in thinking. Since the matter submits to the laboratory, while man, the universe and life do not submit to the laboratory. The questions that arise need rational thinking, and they shift to the scientific thinking. Therefore, it is impossible to get the right solution, so they come out with the wrong solution. Hence, they solve the great problem, but with a wrong solution that does not agree with the nature (*fiTrah*). Therefore, this solution remains a solution to individuals not a solution to a people or a nation. So, the people or the nation remains without the great problem being solved in a way that agrees with their nature (*fiTrah*), and the questions continue to chase many individuals who accepted this solution.

Those who view this great problem as individualistic, and think that it does not concern the people as a people, or the nation as a nation, and that it has nothing to do with the matters of livelihood (way of life), avoid solving the great problem, and pay no attention to the individuals, no attention to the people and no attention to the nation. Therefore, the great problem continues to chase the individuals and communities, and thus the people live in a state of false tranquillity with the solution of this great problem. This is because, it actually remained without a solution, and the emotional or instinctive disturbance remained dominating the individuals, people, and the nation.

Actually, the question of solving the great problem has two aspects: The first is the rational aspect, i.e. that pertaining to the mind, in other words, the thinking itself. The second is related to the life energy that exists in man, i.e. related to that which requires satisfaction. So thinking must attain the satisfaction of the life energy. The satisfaction of the life energy with thought must result from the thinking, i.e. it must result from transferring the reality by the means of senses to the brain. If the satisfaction came about as the result of fantasies or assumptions, or with other than the sensed reality, then tranquillity will not occur, and the solution will not exist. If thinking resulted in that which does not bring satisfaction, i.e. with that which does not agree with the innate nature (*fiTrah*), then it would only be assumptions or sensation only. Thus it would not lead to a solution that the soul feels at ease with, and would not cause satisfaction.

In order for the solution to the great problem be correct, it must be the result of thinking in accordance with the rational method, it should satisfy the life energy, and it should be decisive such that it gives no space for the return of questions. Hence the correct solution exists and also the permanent tranquillity from this solution exists. That is why one of the most important types of thinking is that regarding the universe, man and life. In other words, thinking about the solution of the great problem in a way that agrees with the innate nature (*fiTrah*), i.e. by which the life energy is satisfied, which is decisive such that it prevents the return of these questions.

Indeed the trial of the life energy to satisfy that which needs satisfaction, could lead to the solution of the great problem. This is because the feeling of incapability and need of a power that helps him, could lead man to solve the great problem, and dictates answers for the questions. However, this approach does not produce safe results, and would not result in concentration (of the answer) if left alone. The sanctification instinct could initiate in the brain fantasies and assumptions that do not have any link with the truth. If it satisfied the life energy, it may do that through an abnormal way, like worshipping the idols. It might satisfy it through the wrong way, like sanctifying the priests. That is why the life energy should not be left to solve the great problem and answer the questions. Rather, there must be thinking

regarding man, the universe, and life, in order to answer these questions. However, this answer (solution) must agree with the innate nature (*fiTrah*). In other words, the life energy must be satisfied, and this should be in a decisive way that has no doubt in it. If this solution was obtained through thinking, and the innate nature (*fiTrah*) agrees with it, then it would be a solution that convinces the mind and fills the heart with tranquillity.

As for thinking regarding livelihood (way of life), this is because the satisfaction of the life energy, i.e. the organic needs, such as eating, and the satisfaction of the instincts, such as ownership, requires of man to possess thinking about livelihood (*al-a'ysh*), so it is a natural and inevitable thinking. However, if the thinking about livelihood were only for livelihood, this would not be enough for man for the sake of revival, and for the sake of attaining happiness, i.e. for attaining the permanent tranquillity. So in order that man revives, and in order to attain the happiness, i.e. the continuous tranquillity, he must build his thinking about the livelihood on the basis of his thinking about his outlook towards life. He is a man who lives in the universe; his livelihood in this universe means his life in the universe. Therefore, his thinking in the livelihood must be based on his outlook towards this worldly life that he lives. Unless his thinking about the livelihood is based on his outlook towards this worldly life, his thinking will remain declined, confined and narrow. So he will not enjoy revival, nor obtain the permanent tranquillity. Therefore, thinking about the universe, man and life must be the basis of thinking about livelihood. It is true that man thinks about the livelihood in response to the demand of satisfaction, whether he has an outlook to the universe, man and life or not, but this thinking remains primitive, unstable and not proceeding in the ascending direction until it is built on the thinking about man, the universe and life, i.e. until it is built on his outlook towards life. Thus, the issue is not which of the two types of thinking comes first, for it is known evidently that thinking about the livelihood precedes any other type of thinking. Rather the issue is the height of the thinking regarding the livelihood; that in which there is permanent tranquillity. Therefore, thinking about the livelihood must be built on the outlook towards life.

It is true that thinking about the livelihood rises from (the level of) thinking about the livelihood of oneself, to thinking about the livelihood

of ones family and tribe. It also rises from (the level of) thinking about the livelihood of ones family, to thinking about the livelihood of ones people. It also rises from (the level of) thinking about the livelihood of ones people, to thinking about the livelihood of ones nation (*ummah*). It rises, as well, from thinking about the livelihood of ones nation, to thinking about the livelihood of mankind. This elevation, though it exists in man's innate nature (*fiTrah*), if it is left alone without having a basis upon which it is built, it could be confined to thinking about the livelihood of oneself, without exceeding that, unless it is connected to the livelihood of oneself. Thus it would exceed that in order to think of the livelihood of his family and his tribe. Or it may exceed that and go on to thinking about the livelihood of his people and his nation. Yet it remains thinking about the livelihood of oneself, so the egoism remains dominating him, and decline remains evident in his behaviour, or one of the aspects of his life. It does not go beyond that to the revival nor to the permanent tranquillity. Therefore, if thinking about the livelihood remains as such, in its natural state, without being built upon an outlook towards life, it is not appropriate to continue or to remain, because it does not lead to the revival, nor to the permanent tranquillity, it rather comes as a barrier between man and the continuous tranquillity. The primitive living, or the life of the declined peoples, is the best evidence for that.

Thinking about the livelihood does not mean thinking about the satisfaction of the life energy instantly or however it may turn out, nor the satisfaction of oneself or the family alone, or the people and nation alone. For he is a man who lives in the universe, therefore thinking about the livelihood must be continuous, and at the highest possible level, and it should be for the livelihood of man as a man, with what the instinct of the survival of the human race requires. This is not possible by other than making thinking about the livelihood based on a specific outlook towards life. For if it remained like that, it would continue to be primitive and it would continue to be characterized with decline.

However, whether thinking in livelihood was based on the outlook towards life or not, the most important thing that it should have, is that it should be a responsible thinking, where the objective of it and the objective from livelihood are aimed at. The most important thing that should be observed in the thinking is the responsibility towards others,

meaning the responsibility for those, whom the sound innate nature (*fiTrah*) necessitates responsibility for, and for those whom protection demands responsibility for. So the head of the family like the father is like the wife and the children, and the head of the tribe like the chief is like any member in the tribe. Each one of them, the father, the wife, the children, the chief and every member in the tribe, has to aim at the objective of thinking about the livelihood and also the objective itself of the livelihood, and has to observe the responsibility for others. Thus the responsible thinking about livelihood must be the mark of thinking about livelihood, so as to become (truly) thinking about livelihood. This is because irresponsible thinking, in the matter of livelihood, is not more than the instinctive discretion that exists in the animal regarding the satisfaction of the life energy. This is not appropriate for man, neither is it valid to remain the thinking of man.

To stipulate that thinking about livelihood should be a responsible thinking is the least of the conditions you would fulfil. This is because, despite that, it is not enough to generate revival, neither is it enough to achieve permanent tranquillity, but it is the least that must be done in order to raise the status of man over the status of animals, and in order to make it the thinking of a man who has a brain distinguished with the ability to connect information (*rabT*), not only an animal that does not require anything other than the satisfaction of the life energy.

Thinking about livelihood is what moulds life for the individual, and moulds life for the family and the tribe. It is what moulds life for the people, and moulds life for the nation. More than that, it moulds life for humanity, in a particular way. In other words, it puts it in the form of a monkey or a pig, and makes it of either gold or tin, i.e. it makes it a life of honour, prosperity and permanent tranquillity, or makes it a life of suffering, distress and chasing after pieces of bread. A quick look to the capitalist thinking regarding livelihood, and the specific way in which it moulded life for the whole of humanity, shows how this fashioning of life for the whole of humanity resulted in suffering, distress and making man spend all his life running after pieces of bread. It shows how it made the relationships between the people, relationships of permanent dispute, which is the relationship of the bread between me and you; either I eat it or you. So the struggle will continue between us until one of us gains the bread and prevents the other. Or one of us is given what

hardly makes him survive in order to save what remains of the bread for the other and to increase his amount. One look at this moulding which the capitalists performed, shows how the worldly life became an abode of suffering and distress, and an abode of permanent dispute between the people; despite the fact that the capitalist thinking regarding livelihood was built on a complete idea about the universe, man and life, i.e. on a specific outlook toward life. In spite all of this, it achieved revival for the peoples and nations that proceeded on this thinking regarding livelihood. Yet it caused misery to these peoples and nations, and distressed the whole of humanity. It is that type of thinking regarding livelihood, which created the idea of colonialism and exploitation. It is the thinking which offered some individuals the right to live at a level that made it possible for them to obtain sustenance which came to them on a tray of gold, presented by servants, i.e. slaves. While at the same time, other individuals were deprived from even being servants or slaves to the sons of their own families, or tribes or nation, where they can enjoy the leftovers. In the wealthy America; and England - which dreams of the empire; and France - which dreams of the might and glory, there are many examples of this life. This is in addition to what the idea of colonialism and exploitation has caused in other than Europe and America of enslavement and manipulation. All of this was because the thinking regarding livelihood was not responsible, i.e. it was a thinking that shows no responsibility for others. It was rather lacking the true responsibility. Though the responsibility about the family, the tribe, the people or the nation appeared in it, but, in truth it is devoid of responsibility, because it does not have anything except that which secures the satisfaction.

Though the socialist idea came to create responsibility regarding livelihood, a responsibility about the poor and labourers; it failed to stand up for life and it deviated with time, until it became just a name or a shadow. It started gradually to forsake the responsibility for others, until it started, in effect, thinking about livelihood in a way that is not any different from the capitalist thinking, in its absence of responsibility for others. It became, in its reality, a national more than a human idea.

Therefore, though the thinking about livelihood in the world, is built on an outlook towards life, in America, Europe and Russia, which are the states that mould the life in the world, the thinking regarding livelihood

that is present in the world, is actually considered devoid of responsibility for others. The person may understand that the lack of responsibility for others in thinking about livelihood may exist naturally in the declined person, but the person cannot understand how the enslavement of the others and their exploitation in order to satisfy the needs of oneself can replace the responsibility for them. Therefore, despite the manifestations of revival and progress present in the world today, the absence of thinking regarding the livelihood of the people (particularly in the strong who are capable of obtaining a livelihood) which shows responsibility for others, makes the aware sensible person realise that the world is declined and not advanced in its thinking regarding livelihood, and it is also unstable rather than stable. The continuity of this type of thinking regarding livelihood, which is devoid of responsibility for others, is considered harmful to life and a source of distress to man. Therefore, it is necessary to destroy this thinking and to work for replacing it by a thinking regarding livelihood in which the responsibility for others is an indivisible part of it.

Indeed the loaf (bread) is the relationship between a man and another man. It is also true that the thinking in livelihood is thinking in obtaining this loaf to satisfy the life energy that drives man to find satisfaction. However, instead of the relationship of the loaf between a man and another man being either I eat it or you eat it, let this relationship with the loaf be, you eat it and not I. Thus I obtain the loaf to feed it to you, and you obtain the loaf to feed it to me, and not to quarrel with you so as to take it and you quarrel with me so as to take it. In other words, let this relationship be that of altruism and not egoism. So you get delighted by giving and not by exploiting, and I will also be delighted by giving and not by exploiting. How excellent is the Arab poet when he says:

Taraahu idha ma ataitahu mutahallilan

Kaa'nnaka tu'teeth illadhi anta saai'luh

When you come to him, you see him rejoicing,

As if you give him that which you request (from him).

This means, that though man is delighted to take (from others), in response to the instinct of survival, when he revives he comes to be delighted to give, as he is delighted to take. This is also in response to the instinct of survival, which is the manifestation (*maDHaar*) of generosity

and donation, which is similar to the other manifestation (*madhar*) of ownership and taking. This is because each of these two is from the manifestation of the survival instinct.

Thus the issue is not to make the thinking about the livelihood; rather it is to make it thinking about others. This is because thinking about livelihood is thinking about satisfying the life energy of the man who thinks, so it should be in harmony with the satisfaction so as to be a correct thinking. Rather, the issue is that there should be responsibility for others in this thinking, and not to be thinking about satisfying others. So he does not think about livelihood to satisfy the life energy in others, rather when he thinks in a responsible way, i.e. when his thinking is characterised with the responsibility for others he satisfies the manifestation of generosity; instead of satisfying the manifestation (*maDHar*) of ownership and he satisfies the manifestation of praise, instead of satisfying the manifestation of the fear. In both cases he satisfies the life energy in him through the satisfaction of the instinct of survival. However, he chose to satisfy the elevated manifestation over the declined manifestation. This is the subject in making thinking about livelihood a responsible thinking. Thus, the responsibility for others in thinking about livelihood is what makes the thinking regarding livelihood produce the elevated livelihood and the enjoyable livelihood.

In regards to thinking about truths (*Haqai'q*) (pl. of *Haqeeqah*) it is not different to thinking about anything else, because the truth (*Haqeeqah*) is the agreement of the thought (*al-fikr*) with the reality (*al-waqi*). However, since truths have great importance, particularly the non-material truths, then it is necessary to present this type of thinking, as being different from thinking about anything other than that. Thinking about truths is making the judgement that is issued completely applicable on the reality that has been transferred to the brain by means of sensation. This application is what makes that which is indicated by the thought a truth. It is the case if the truth conforms to the innate nature (*fiTrah*) in a natural way. As an example: Society consists of relationships and people. This is its reality. So when judgement is made on the society, in order to know what it is, all the judgments on society were made according to the rational method, and each of them is a thought. However, the fact that this thought is true or not results from whether this thought is truly compatible with the reality or not. Thus, those who say that society is a

collection of individuals, they saw the group made of individuals, and society cannot come about unless there was a group of individuals. This reality was transferred to their brain with means of the senses, and they explained it by the previous information, and thus issued their judgment that society is a collection of individuals. This judgment is a thought. However, its agreement or non-agreement with the reality is what indicates whether it is a truth or not. When applying it on the reality, it is noticed that the group in a ship, regardless of their number, would not make a society, rather they would be a group, though they are a collection of individuals. While the group which lives in a village, regardless of their number, makes a society. What made the village a society and what prevented the ship from being a society is only the presence of the continuous relationships between the population of the village, and the absence of the permanent relationships between the passengers in the ship. Hence what make the society are the relationships between the people and not the gathering of the people. Thus, it becomes evident that this definition of society, though it is a thought, is not a truth. This means that not every thought is a truth. Rather this thought must agree with the reality on which the judgement was issued.

Another example is that Christian religion is a thought. This is correct. For the sense transferred that the father, the son and the Holy Spirit are one. So the three are one and the one is three. The sun has the light, heat and the body of the sun; all of these are one and they are three. Similarly the god is the father, the son and the Holy Spirit. The conviction in the god has agreed with the innate (*fiTrah*), i.e. with the instinct of sanctification, so it is a thought. However its agreement with the reality or not is what indicates if it is a truth or not. When applying it on the reality, it is noticed that the three are not one, nor that the one is three. For the three are three and the one is one. Regarding the sun, the fact that it has light and has heat, does not indicate that it is three. It is rather one, which is the sun, while the light is one of its characteristics and not another thing. Also the heat is one of its characteristics and not a third thing. The fact that this thought agreed with the innate nature (*fiTrah*) is of no value. This is because the instinct of sanctification requires satisfaction, and this satisfaction could take place wrongly or abnormally or correctly. The proof of the fact that god is one not three, comes through the mind and not through the innate nature, though it is stipulated that this rational thinking should agree with the innate nature.

Accordingly, this thought does not apply with the reality of god, so it is not a truth. Therefore, the Christian religion is not truth.

Another example is the fact that the matter develops by itself, and through this, creation and initiation take place. That this is a thought is correct. For the reality was transferred that the matter transforms from one state to another through fixed laws. By this transformation initiation of new things that did not exist before takes place, thus this would be creation and initiation. However, the agreement of this with the reality is what indicates if it is a truth or not. When applying this on the reality it is noticed that this matter did not initiate things from nothing, rather from an existing thing. Also, the laws are imposed on the matter, so it cannot depart from these laws. So its action is not creating, nor is it a creator. Thus this thought does not apply on the reality of the creator, nor on the reality of creation, so it is not a truth.

Thus all the thoughts that exist in the world, and that will exist; the fact that they are thoughts does not mean they are truths. Rather the thought must apply to the reality so as to be a truth. In order to know if a thought is a truth or not, it is necessary to apply this thought on the reality which it indicates. If it applied to it, then it is a truth, and if not, it is not a truth. Thus thinking about truths does not mean to undertake the rational process only; it rather means to undertake the rational process and also the application of the thought that resulted from the rational process on the reality that it indicates. If it applied to it, then it is a truth, and if not, then it is not a truth. It is incorrect to say that there are things where it is impossible to know the agreement of the reality with them, because they are not perceived. This is because the condition of thinking is the sensation of the reality. So whatever is not a reality that can be sensed is not a thought, and accordingly cannot be a truth. Allah, for example is not a thought, rather He is a truth. For sensation has transferred His effect, which are the things created from nothing, to the brain by the means of the senses. This made us judge on His existence. So the existence of Allah is a truth. As for the essence of Allah, it does not fall under the senses, therefore we cannot judge on it. Thus any of the truths that are concluded, or could be concluded by the mind would have the senses fall on them. Therefore, the senses must fall on the truth, and thinking about it must take place by the mind.

So thinking about the truth is the application of the thought on the reality that it indicates. If it applied on it, then it is a truth, and if not, it is not a truth. Thinking about the truth is necessary for people, whether individuals, peoples or nations, particularly for those who assume responsibilities, however small they may be. This is because thoughts are often a reason for error, or cause for misguidance. Thus, it is wrong to adopt just any thought as a truth; rather it is taken as a thought only. Then it is applied on the reality that it indicates. If it applied to it, it would be a truth; otherwise it would not be a truth, though it is still a thought. So thinking about the truth - whether it was right from the beginning - such as undertaking the rational process to arrive at the thought, then applying this thought on the reality until it applies to it, (and if it applied to it, it would be truth, otherwise a search should be made for the truth, meaning for the thought that does apply to the reality which it indicates) or thinking about the truth - not from the beginning but rather through the adoption of the present thoughts - and the search for the truths; such as carrying out the application of the present thoughts on the reality, in order to reach the truth.

At this point, it is necessary to draw the attention to two issues. One of them is the distortion that occurs in the truths. The second is the distortion that diverts one from reaching to the truths. As for the distortions that occur in the truths, they occur due to the similarity that exists between the truths and thoughts. This similarity is used as a means to obliterate the truths. It may also occur by using a fact to obliterate another fact, or by raising doubt in one of the facts, claiming that it is not a fact, or it was a fact in certain circumstance, but the circumstance changed beside other styles. For example, the fact that the Jews are the enemies of Muslims is a truth, and the fact that the Jews are the enemies of the people of what is so-called Palestine is a truth. These are similar or integrated facts. However, the distortion made the truth of the enmity between the Jews and people of Palestine the prominent one; the one that is noticed. Thus this similarity was used as a means to obliterate the truth of the enmity between the Jews and Muslims. Also, the fact that freedom is present in America is a truth, and the thought that the Capitalists (big business people) select the presidents of America is a truth. These are two similar thoughts, in terms that each one of them indicates the reality of America. However, the truth of the freedom was used as a means to obliterate the fact that the capitalists are the ones who

select the presidents of America. So this truth was obliterated, and it became known that the one who wins as a president in America is the one who has more popularity. Another example is the fact that England is opposing the European unity, and this is a truth, and that England wants to strengthen itself with the unified Europe is a truth. So the second truth was used as a means to obliterate the first truth. Thus England entered the Common Market. A Further example is the fact that Islam is an undetectable power is a truth, but doubt was raised in this truth until an opinion came that this is not a truth, or that it was a truth at the beginning of Islam, then time changed so it was no longer a truth. In this way the truths are distorted, so either they are obliterated by other truths or doubt is raised in these truths. This is what the West was proficient in doing, regarding the truths that were present with the Muslims.

As regards the distortions that turn people away from the truths, these are realised by generating actions that turn people away from the truths, or creating thoughts that turn them away from the truths. The fact that the *ummah* does not revive except by thought is a truth. However, to turn the Muslims away from thought, the physical activities such as demonstrations, strikes, disturbances and revolutions were encouraged to turn the people away from thought, and to keep them preoccupied with actions. So the fact that the *ummah* does not revive except by the thought has disappeared and replaced by the concept that the *ummah* revives only by revolution. Likewise, to turn the Muslims away from the truth of revival, other thoughts were generated, such as the revival can be by morals, or that the revival can be by worships and that revival can be by the economy, beside other similar thoughts. In this way distortions occur in order to turn the people away from reaching the truths.

Therefore, it is necessary to be careful regarding the distortions. It is also necessary to hold fast to the truths, and hold on to them strongly. It is necessary to be deep in thought and sincere in thinking so as to reach the truths. The most dangerous thing that causes a lack of utilisation of the truths is neglecting the truths of history, particularly the basic truths in it. This is because history has fixed facts that do not change. It also has opinions that come out due to circumstances. The opinions that result from circumstances are not truths, they are rather incidents, so they should not be utilised, nor they should be applied to

other than their circumstances. However, in reality the history was viewed altogether, the truths of history were neglected and no distinction was made between the truths and incidents, therefore the truths were not cared for. As an example, the fact that the West took the eastern coast, particularly the coasts of Egypt and ash-Sham to invade the Islamic State is a truth. However the victory of the West over the Muslims is a historical incident and not a truth. So the incidents were mixed with the truths and the truths were neglected, until the fact, that the eastern coast of the Mediterranean Sea is a gap from which the enemy penetrates inside the Islamic countries, was forgotten. Another example is the fact that Arab nationalism is the one which weakened the entity of the Othmani State, and the fact that the Muslims fought against the West as Othmani Muslims, not only as Muslims, is a truth. However, the defeat of the Ottomans in Europe, then their defeat in the first world war is one of the incidents of the history, but the view of the history of wars between the Ottomans and Europeans, and the history of the first world war was made as one. Also the truths in these wars were neglected, i.e. the truths of the history were neglected. Thus the truths were mixed with the incidents and the truths were neglected, until it was forgotten that Arab nationalism was the reason of the defeat of the Ottomans in Europe and in the First World War. Thus in all the incidents of history, the truths were neglected, so they were not utilized, though they are the most valuable thing for man and the highest types of thoughts.

Thus thinking about the truths, whether by concluding them, or by distinguishing them from those which are not truths or by holding fast to them and utilizing them (taking advantage of them) is the fruitful thinking, and the thinking which has enormous effects in the life of the individuals, peoples and nations. What would be the value of thinking if it is not taken for action, if the truths are not held onto and adhered to and if no distinction is made between the truth and other than the truth?

However, truths are a definite (*qata'ī*) matter, they are fixed and do not change and they are definite and decisive. They are not affected by the difference of circumstances and the change of conditions. It is true that the thought should not be detached from its circumstances and the conditions that surround it, and no general comparison can be made with it. However, this is if the thought was not a truth/fact. If it was truth, then it is not correct to consider in it the circumstances and

conditions no matter how much they changed and differed. Rather it should be taken as it is, irrespective of the circumstances and conditions. This is particularly why the truths are not derived by the scientific method that is a probable method. They are rather taken by the rational method and by the definite side of it. This is because the truths pertain to the existence and not to the nature nor to the characteristics. Since the agreement of the thought with the reality which it indicates must be definite, in order to be a truth. Therefore, there should be thinking about the truths and they should be held onto strongly.

As for thinking about the styles, it is thinking regarding the non-permanent aspect of the way in which the action is undertaken. The type of the action decides the style. Therefore, the style changes according to the change of the type of action. It is true that styles may look similar, and that the style could be used for many actions. However, when thinking about the style, it is necessary to think about the type of action that the style is aimed at undertaking, even if the styles look similar, and even if the well-known style is good to use in this new action. There must be thinking about the type of action when thinking about the style that is required for it, regardless of the similarity of the styles and regardless whether there are (already) styles that are good for this action. This is because similarity might lead away from the effective style, and since there is (already) a style that can benefit the action it might obstruct the undertaking of the action. As an example, the style of propaganda for a thought is similar to the style of calling for it. Both styles depend on presenting the thought to the people. However, this similarity might mislead the da'wah carriers, and mislead the one that advocates advertising ideas. For the style of advertising if used in the style of the da'wah would fail in the long run. Similarly the style of da'wah if used in the advertisement makes the advertisement fail. The style of da'wah depends on explaining the truths as they are, while the style of advertising depends on conjuring up and glamorising the idea. Though in both of them, good presentation is necessary. Another example is the style of appointing a ruler in a democratic system, which is letting the people elect the ruler. This style serves to appoint the ruler in the Islamic systems by making the people elect the ruler. However, when it is intended to adopt a style to appoint a Khaleefah to the Muslims, the reality of ruling in the system of Islam should be thought about, which is that the appointment is for a permanent ruler and not a

ruler for a certain period of time. Therefore, it is necessary to think about the type of ruling in Islam when thinking of drawing a style for appointing the Khaleefah. Thus, for example, the representatives of the ummah, excluding anyone else from nomination, choose the nominees suitable for Khaleefah. This makes the people elect whom they wish from amongst these nominees only. Later on, the whole people are requested to give baia'h to the one whom the majority of Muslims accepted, as a Khaleefah to the Muslims. It is true that the baia'h is a method rather than a style to appoint the Khaleefah. However the manner of giving the baia'h is a style. Therefore, it is not enough that the style is useful in the new action as it was useful in the previous actions. Rather, in order to decide on taking this style in this action, it is necessary to think about the action at the same time when thinking about the style. For it is necessary to think about the type of action when thinking about adopting a style for undertaking it.

The style (*usloob*) is a specific way for undertaking the action. It is not a permanent manner. This is different to the method (*Tareeqah*), which is a permanent aspect of undertaking the action. The method does not ever change nor differ, and it does not need a creative (*mubdi'ah*) mentality to undertake it. This is because it is definite (*yaqeeni*) or its origin is definite (*yaqeeni*). While the style, could fail when used in undertaking the action, it could change and it needs a creative (*mubdi'ah*) mentality to undertake it. That is why thinking in the styles is of higher level than thinking in the methods. The method could be concluded by the creative mind, as well as by an ordinary mind. While to find out the style, a creative mind or a genius mind is needed, yet its application can be by the ordinary mind.

It is not necessary for the method to be derived by the creative mind, but it is necessary for the style to be produced by the creative mind or the genius mind, whether he is educated or not. This is because deriving the style is not related to knowledge or information, rather it is related to the intellectual process carried out to attain it. That is why there is disparity between people in solving problems, for they solve them with styles. Somebody may try to solve a problem, but he finds it difficult to solve it, so he deserts it, or declares he is incapable of solving it, whilst if the one who has the problem solving mentality tries to solve a problem, and it became difficult for him, he changes the style that he

uses, or he tries many styles. If, despite using many styles, it were still difficult to solve, he would not desert it; he does not declare his incapability of solving it nor despair about solving it. Rather, he is patient with it, and leaves it for a period of time, i.e. leave it for a time (to solve it) as they say; then repeats thinking about the solution, time and time again until he solves it. Therefore, the one who has the problem solving mentality has no problem that is without a solution. Rather, every problem has a solution. The reason behind this is that he depends on his ability to find styles that solve the difficult problem. Thus, thinking about the styles is from the characteristics of the creative or genius minds; for solving the problem depends on thinking about the styles.

As regards thinking in the means (*wasa'il*) it is the partner of thinking about the styles and it is comparable to it. It is thinking about the physical tools that are used to undertake the actions. If the thinking about the styles is that which solves the problems, these styles will be of no value if the means (*wasa'il*) that are used can't achieve the solution. Though comprehending the means was the result of thinking, trying the means is an important element in their understanding. Therefore, the one who thinks about the styles must also think about the means, otherwise all the styles can't produce a solution if the means used are not good enough to exploit the styles; in particular the means are a fundamental part in the production of the styles. As an example, drawing up of a plan for fighting an enemy is the drawing up of a style, though it is a plan, because the plan itself is a style. If somebody draw the plan perfectly, but he used arms that are not capable of facing the arms of the enemy, then the plan will fail definitely, even if the people who fight are stronger than the people of the enemy, and even if he fought with men capable to fight the enemy who are double his power, the plan will definitely fail. The plan drawn for war is a style. If there was no thinking about the means when thinking about the style, or the means were not of the type by which the style is executed, then there is no value in the thinking about the styles, nor is there a value in the styles that are thought of. This is because means will not give results unless there was thinking about them when thinking about the style, and they were of the type used in this style. Accordingly it is not right to think of the means detached from thinking about the styles. Thinking of the means is not right unless this was in light of the style that was thought of.

Though the styles may be concealed from the thinker, the means are more hidden from the thinker. This is because it is enough to think of the style, in order to take a decision about it. While the means have to be thought of and they have to be tried, so the trial will show whether it is appropriate or not, and if it is suitable for that type of style or not. For example the non-industrial countries buy arms from the industrial countries, and they train their armies using these arms by the experience of the experts of the industrial countries. However, these non-industrial countries did not try out these arms, neither did they test the training of the soldiers. Therefore, whatever plans they draw, they would have not chosen the means that are of the (correct) type for these plans. It is true they receive military training from the industrial countries and from the military countries. However, the military training, drawing plans and the military sciences are only a style, and thinking of them is enough. However, only thinking about the means is not enough, so trials besides the thinking are necessary so as to carry out thinking about the means.

Another example is the formation of a block or a party upon an idea for the sake of spreading this idea in the people or the nation and adopting the seizure of power as a method to execute this idea. In this idea, if this block or party targeted the 'ulema so as to be members in the party, and targeted the influential people amongst them or in the society in order to win them as members in the party, then this block or party will fail in achieving its objective. If the party succeeded, by using the 'ulema in spreading the idea, then it will fail in seizing the power. If the party succeeded, by using the influential people, in seizing the power, then the power will not be based on the idea, and the idea will not be spread. Forming the majority of the party from one section of them or from both sections together, will shorten the life of the party and it will fail in realising its objective, and will continue on the course of decreasing action till it ceases. These means, which are this particular type of people, resulted from thinking of them through the experiment beside the mind. However, if the truths from history were taken regarding the formation of this type of party, then the thinking regarding the means would be through the mind and through trials. Adoption of the truths from history in this subject, and the use of the means in accordance with these historical facts would result in productive thinking about the means, and their trial would be of the type of the styles. The

truths from history oblige the block (that is established on an idea in order to spread the idea and to make the ruling a method for its execution) to aim at the people or the nation, regardless of the (type of) individuals. So it accepts any person who accepts the idea and accepts to join the block, in his capacity as an individual from the people or an individual from the ummah, regardless of the degree of his education, and regardless of his status (in the society). This alone is what guarantees the success of the party or the block, and the realisation of its goal that it aims at.

Therefore, the means could be hidden and one could be misled from them, if thinking about them was detached from thinking about the style that they execute. They could also be concealed and one would be misled from them, if they were not tried. Therefore, it is necessary to think about the means; and this thinking about the means should be when thinking about the styles. It is also necessary to try these means besides thinking about them, so as to guarantee the success of the means and the realisation of the goals by them. In other words, this is in order that the styles (which use those means) become fruitful.

As for thinking in the objectives (ghayat) and aims (ahdaf), it is first to determine what does he want, i.e. to decide his aim. This determination is necessary to attain fruitful thinking. Determining what he wants is not an easy matter, since the declined nations and people do not know what they want, and rarely do they know what they want. The individuals, who are of declined thinking, even many of those who are of high thinking, do not determine what they want. Some of them cannot determine what they want. As for the people and nations, due to the manifestation of flocking together (*qaTee*), or as they call it the instinct to flock together (*ghareezat ul-qaTee*), in a prominent way and in a way that calls for gathering, imitation (taqleed) and a lack of scrutiny of thoughts dominate them. Therefore, wrong thoughts are formed amongst them, so unreliable information exists with them. They rush forth without determining an objective or without wishing to determine an objective. Therefore the absence of determining objectives prevails amongst them. As for the individuals, due to the absence of the aim amongst them, they do not concern themselves with the objectives and aims. Therefore they proceed in their thinking without an objective, so there would be no fruit for their thinking; neither would they proceed

towards a defined objective. This is despite the fact that the determination of the objectives and aims in thinking is necessary to make the thinking fruitful. For thinking or action only exists for the sake of a particular matter, i.e. for the sake of a particular objective. That is why you see every human being think, but not every human being is capable to realise the aims.

The objectives and aims differ in accordance with the difference of people. The objective of the declined nation is to revive, while the objective of the progressed nation, is to realise all the types of satisfaction. The objective of a primitive people is to maintain the situation they live in, while the objective of the progressed people, is to improve their situation and cause change. The objective of the individual with declined thinking is to satisfy his life energy, while the individual of elevated thinking, has the objective is of improving the type of satisfaction he has. Thus, the objectives and aims differ according to the different people and their level of thinking. However, whatever the objectives and aims of the people and individuals are, perseverance over realising the aims and the endeavour in pursuing them, are only in the immediate objectives and the easy aims. The satisfaction of the needs as satisfaction is an easy objective; even it was not in the immediate future. Therefore, the capability to be perseverant almost exists with every human being, though there is disparity in it between the people. To strive to eat, to strive to feed your family, to strive for ownership or to strive to seek security, and the like; the realisation of such objectives exist in the majority of the people. However, to strive to revive your people; to improve your status or to improve the status of your people or your nation, all of these are objectives whose realisation requires perseverance and serious pursuance; a matter that is not within the capacity of every human being. For you may start the path, but you might fail to realise the objective because of what you endure of hardship or because of losing patience. You might also start the struggle, but without seriousness. Thus you continue in the march, but you will not realise any objective, though you did not get tired nor did you lose patience, but only that you are not serious in the march. The realisation of the long-term objectives needs - first and foremost - seriousness, then patience and pursuance.

Individuals are more patient than groups, i.e. people and nations. This

is because their vision is more clear and stronger than in the groups. Since gathering of people weakens their (collective) thinking and weakens their vision. Therefore the vision of one person is stronger than the vision of the two persons. The greater the number is, the weaker the vision is. Therefore, it is not correct to lay down remote objectives for the people, for they will not proceed to realise them; and if they proceeded, they will not do so seriously nor they will reach the objective. Thus, it is necessary that the objective laid down to the people be immediate and possible to achieve, even if this lead to laying down immediate objectives as an early stage. Then once it was realised, they set to another objective and so on. This is because the groups closer than the individual in seeing what is possible, but of less capacity to endure great difficulties. So that which is rationally possible, the people can't make an objective, but that which is practically possible is what the people see and strive to achieve. As for the individuals, they are generally capable of seeing that what is rationally possible can practically be achieved. They are also capable of having far reaching vision and are more capable to endure the hardships and difficulties, and more capable to proceed to the remote stage.

However, whether the objectives and aims were set for the nations, people or individuals, it is not correct that their realisation be in need of generations, nor in need of an effort that is beyond human capacity, neither are they in need of means that are not available or not possible to obtain. It is rather necessary, that the objective that the generation works to achieve can be achieved, the human being can achieve it by the ordinary effort and its means should be available or possible to obtain. This is because the objective is an aim to which the striving person strives; and he does not strive to (achieve) it if it was indisputable that he will never achieve it. Since he wants to strive for it, then he needs the means by which he achieves it. If he did not have the means by which he achieves it, and if he did not have the means by which he strives then he will not strive, even if he pretended to do so, or deceived himself that he strives. He strives by using his human capacity, so if his human capacity was not enough to strive, then he will never strive. This is because man can't be charged with more than his capacity. He even cannot work more than his capacity. Therefore, the objectives, however remote they may be, must be possible to be realised by the one who strives, using his ordinary effort and by the means available to him.

Thus the objective of the thinking should be determined, and the objective of the work should also be determined. The objective should be envisioned by the sight or envisioned by the mind, and its realisation must be feasible rationally and practically, otherwise it would lose its description as an objective. If the individuals, their thinking and their work should have an objective, the people and nations should also have an objective or objectives. However the objective of the people and nations is not correct to be remote, rather it should be near. The closer the objective is (in time) and the more achievable it is, the better it would be, and it would be closer to fruitfulness and also more possible to think about it and work for it. It is true that it is inconceivable that the people and nations set down objectives for themselves, neither is it possible that for themselves all together they can draw aims, but amongst these people and nations, thoughts become public, and they adopt opinions and embrace creeds. Such thoughts become their own, and the opinions and convictions become theirs as well. Objectives also dominate such people and nations, either as a result of thoughts, opinions and convictions, or due to the trials in life. They may also be due to what they have of deprivation or satisfaction, so objectives are formed, either to eliminate the deprivation or to improve the satisfaction. Thus the people and nations have objectives, but they cannot draw objectives. Their objectives are of the type that can be realised practically, and cannot be of that type which are possible to realise rationally, and it is not actually noticed that it can be realised practically.

It is necessary to draw attention to the differentiation between the objective (*al-ghayah*) and the ideal (*al-mathal ul-a'la*). The ideal is the objective of all objectives or the final objective. It is only stipulated to strive to gain it and achieve it, but it is not stipulated that it is practically possible to realise, though it is stipulated that rationally it can be realised. Thus the ideal is other than the objective, though it is itself an objective. However, the difference between it and the objective is that the objective must be known before undertaking the actions; it must continue to be known during the undertaking of the action; the prompt effort for realising it, and the perseverance so it is actually realised. While the ideal, is only noticed during the thinking and during the action, and the whole thoughts and actions are for the sake of its realisation. For example the (attaining of the) pleasure of Allah is the ideal for Muslims

and for every Muslim. Some of them may for example take entering paradise as the ideal. Others they take the protection from entering the Hell as the ideal. Despite the fact that the last two and their like may be rightly taken as an end objective, they are not called the ideal. For they are an objective for objectives before, but there is still an objective after them. While the ideal is the end objective, where there is no objective after it; that is the pleasure of Allah. Therefore the ideal for every Muslim is attaining the pleasure of Allah. That is why it was said about some of the righteous and pious people "Suhaib is a wonderful slave (to Allah), if he did not fear Allah he would not disobey Him." This is because his objective from the absence of disobedience is not the fear that Allah might punish him for the disobedience, but his objective to gain the pleasure of Allah. So, if there is not fear in him from Allah he would not commit disobedience. This is because his not committing of disobedience was his quest for the pleasure of Allah and not the fear from His punishment. Thus the ideal of Muslims is the pleasure of Allah, and not the admittance to the Jannah or the protection from entering the Naar.

Though the ideal is an objective in itself, it is different to the objective and the aim. What is said, in regards to the thinking or the action, of the necessity of determining the objective of it, does not relate to the ideal, rather it relates to the objective that is actually achieved, though it has beyond it another objective or objectives. So the objective should be defined and should be possibly achieved at the hands of those who strive for it, and not on the hands of the coming generations. Its means also that it should be, available or could be really and practically, achieved. It is not the ideal, rather the aim that is intended to be realised. Therefore, thinking about the objective should be real and practical. In other words, it should be feasible that it be realised at the hands of those who strive for it.

In this context, a question may arise. That is the age of the nations is not measured by one generation, rather by generations; the planning for the future of the *ummah* must also be on the long time, such that the coming generations realise it. Then how is it said that the objective must be realised by the same generation who strive for it?

The answer to this is that the age of the nations is not measured by

generations nor by hundreds of years as it is suspected. It is rather measured by decades. Within one decade the nation changes and transfers from one state to another. The practical idea can be given to the nation and attached to her within one generation, regardless of what there was of resistance, on condition that there is seriousness in thinking and seriousness in action. So the nation does not need generations nor hundreds of years; rather every idea and every action needs, in order to bring fruits in the nation, not less than one decade. For within one decade the nation can be changed. If she was subject to her enemy, she needs more than one decade, but she does not need for more than three decades under resistance. Therefore, the movement, or the action or the idea must give fruit in the nation at the hands of the people who strive to realise this idea or this action, and not on the hands of the generations who come after them. Thus the objective should be of the type that is realised at the hands of those who strive for it. This is the condition of the thinking in the objective. It would not be an objective if those who strive for it do not realise it themselves.

As regards to what is said about the planning for the nation, and letting the coming generations work to realise these plans, as the living peoples and nations do. This type of planning is not an objective, even not defined thought; rather they are broad guidelines and general thoughts, drawn out as a supposition and not as an objective. Therefore this type of planning is not an objective; it is rather general thoughts, assuming they exist, while the objective is only the matter that is achieved by those who strive for it. This is the objective, and this is the thinking about the objective. Anything other than that, is only assumptions and theories and not thinking about objectives.

Thinking may be shallow, deep or enlightened. The shallow thinking is the thinking of the common people. The deep thinking is that of the scholars. As for the enlightened thinking, is most often the thinking of the leaders, and the enlightened among the scholars and the common people. The shallow thinking is the transferring of the reality only to the brain, without discussing anything else, and without trying to sense what is related to the reality; then linking this sensation with the information related to the reality, without attempting to search for other information that is connected to it, then coming out with a shallow judgment. This is what prevails in the groups, and what prevails in those

of low thought, and what prevails in the uneducated people and in the intelligent people who are not cultured.

The shallow thinking is the curse of the people and nations, for it does not help them to revive, and even not to enjoy a pleasant livelihood. Though it might help them to have an agreeable life. The cause of the shallow thinking is weak sensation or poor information, or the weak linking ability present in the man's brain. It is not the natural thinking of men, though it is the primitive thinking. Human beings differ in the power of sensation and in their level of weakness. They also differ in the power and weakness of their linking ability and in the amount and type of information they have, wherever this information was obtained whether by learning or by reading or gained from the experiences of life. Thus thinking is in accordance with the difference of these matters. In origin, the majority of the people are strong in their brain and linking ability, except a few who were created weak, or they became weak later on. In origin, the information of the majority of the people changes daily, even if they were illiterate, except the abnormal people, whose attention is drawn by nothing, nor do they take any account of anything they learn or read of information. Therefore, shallow thinking is not natural, rather abnormal. However, the individuals being accustomed to the shallow thinking, their content of its results, and the absence of ambition amongst them for better than they have, make the shallow thinking a habit, so they continue with this mode of thinking and enjoy it, and their taste becomes reshaped on that. As for the groups, due to their deficiency in thinking because they are a group, the shallow thinking prevails in them, even if they were a group of creative thinkers. As a result, the shallow thinking prevails in life. Had there not been some individuals in the people or the nation, who are granted an exceptional capacity for sensation and linkage (relating), and then it is inconceivable to have revival, or a material progress in life.

There is no cure to the shallow thinking in the groups. However, it is possible to raise the level of the reality and the events, and to provide the level of the reality and the events, and to provide the groups with sublime thoughts, and rich information; thus it becomes possible to raise the level of their thinking. Yet it remains, anyhow, shallow thought, but of a high level. In other words, the people and the nation can act the in the way dictated by the enlightened thinking, but their thinking remains,

anyhow, shallow. The groups of people would not be able to think deeply or enlightened, whatever level they reached of elevation and progress. This is because, as a group, they are not able to go deep in study or to have enlightened thought. So, to raise the level of their thinking, no attempt should be made to treat the thinking of the group, rather the attempt should be made to treat the reality and the events on which the sensation of the group falls. It is also possible to treat the thoughts and information which are placed in it. Thus shallowness is raised up, but not removed, and accordingly the level of its conduct is improved.

As for the individuals, it is possible to remove the shallowness, reduce it or make it rare in them. This is firstly by removing the habit that they have in thinking. Teaching them or educating them and drawing their attention to the triviality of their thinking and the shallowness of their thoughts achieve this. Secondly, by increasing the trials, whether those they do or see, and make them live in many incidents and sense a reality that varies, renews and changes. Thirdly, by making them live in life, and proceed with it, and thus they abandon shallowness or shallowness abandons them, and thus they become not shallow. When such individuals increase in the ummah, then helping the *ummah* to revive would become easier and more achievable. Though these individuals live in the ummah, receive the existing information and sense the existing reality and events, and they cannot precede their time; and they are not a type different than that of their ummah.

Yet they can precede their *ummah* and they can transfer her from one situation to another. This is because they can perceive the elevated events of life in a practical way. This occurs through the acceptance of the sound thoughts and the correct opinions and the conviction in the definite thoughts, and the differentiation between the different opinion and discerning the reality of the opinions. Through this the intellectual sensation originates in them, i.e. the sensation that results from the knowledge and comprehension; and the *manTiq al-ihsas* (logic of sensation) also originates in them, i.e. the understanding that results from the sensation, as such. Though they have senses like the rest of the people, and have brain like the others, but the strength of the characteristic of linkage (relating) that exists in their brain makes them excel over other people. Since they also concern themselves with linking the sensation with the previous information correctly, they become more

aware of the matters, i.e. their thinking becomes more distinct than the thinking of others. As a result of that, the intellectual sensation originates in them, and with it the logic of sensation (*manTiq ul-ihsas*) excels. Therefore the individuals are more capable than the groups in abandoning the shallowness, though their capability is of no value unless it was taken and adopted by the groups.

This is the cure for shallowness; which is the treatment of the individuals, and making the *ummah* take and adopt what they reached of thought, beside renewing the events in the *ummah* and placing the elevated thoughts amongst her and within her reach. All of this should be done at the same time. For action to remove the shallowness from the *ummah* is of no value if not accompanied by the treatment of the individuals. Also, the treatment of the individuals is of no value if it did not proceed together with the work in the *ummah* so as to remove the shallowness present in her. This is because the individuals are an indivisible and inseparable part of the *ummah*. The *ummah* is a group of peoples who are bound by a specific way of life. While the people are a group of individuals who are of the same race and they live together. So the individuals are members of this people, whether a people (sha'b) or a nation (*ummah*). So they cannot be separated from them or isolated from them. Therefore, the process of abandoning shallowness, and the work amongst the individuals and the *ummah*, must proceed at the same time, so as both individuals and the *ummah* can abandon shallowness.

As for deep thinking it is trying to be deep in thinking, i.e. to be deep in the sensation of the reality, and in the information that is linked with this sensation to understand the reality. The deep thinker will not be content with the mere sensation and the initial information to link with the sensation, as is the case in shallow thinking. He rather repeats the sensation of the reality, and tries to increase his sensation of it, whether through experimentation or through the repetition of sensation. He also repeats the search for other information beside the initial information. He also repeats the linkage of the information with the reality more than he did before, whether through the repeated observation or through repeating the linkage again: so he comes out from this type of sensation and this type of linkage and this type of information, with deep thoughts, whether they are truths or not. Through the repetition of this approach and becoming used to it, the deep thinking originates. So the

deep thinking is not content with the initial sensation, not content with the initial information and the not content with the initial linkage. It is the second stage after the shallow thinking. This is the thinking of the scholars and thinkers, though it is not necessary to be the thinking of the educated people. Thus deep thinking is to be deep in the sensation, information and linkage.

As regards the enlightened thought, it is the deep thinking in addition to thinking about what surrounds the reality and what relates to it, so as to come out with the true results. In other words, the deep thinking is to be deep in thinking itself, while the enlightened thinking is to add to the thinking in depth and the thinking in what surrounds it and relates to it, for the sake of an aimed objective, that is to reach to the true results. Therefore every enlightened thought is deep thinking. It is not possible for the enlightened thinking to result from the shallow thinking. However, every deep thinking is not an enlightened thinking. For example, the scientist with the atom; when he researches into the splitting of the atom; and the scientist in chemistry when he researches the formation of things; and the jurist when he researches the deduction of rules and laying out the laws. These scientists and their like, when they discuss such matters, they do that depth, which without they would have not been able to come out with those magnificent results. However, they did not think with enlightenment, neither was their thinking considered an enlightened thinking.

Therefore, you should not be surprised when you find a scientist that researches into the atom, praying to a piece of wood, i.e. the cross. Though the least enlightenment shows that this piece of wood neither benefits nor harms, and it is not something that could be worshipped. Don't be surprised also to find the skilled legist believing in the presence of priests; and he submits himself to somebody like him in order to forgive him of his sins. This is because the scientist and the legist and their like, think deeply but not with enlightenment. Had they thought with enlightenment, they would not have prayed to a piece of wood, neither would they have believed in the existence of priests, or sought forgiveness from people like them. It is true that the one who thinks deeply is deep in what he thought of and not in other than it. So he might be deep when thinking about splitting the atom or putting a law, but he is stupid in other matters when he thinks about them. However,

the thinker, being accustomed to deep thinking goes deep in most of what he thinks of, particularly the matters which relate to the great complex, or the outlook in life. However, the absence of enlightenment in his thinking makes him accustomed to deep thinking and to shallow thinking and even the stupid thinking. Therefore, deep thinking is not alone enough to revive man and to raise his intellectual level. It is rather necessary to have enlightenment in thought so as elevation in thought occurs and so that man revives.

Though enlightenment is not necessary to reach to correct results in thought such as the empirical science, laws, medicine and the like, it is necessary to raise the level of thought and to make thinking result in thinkers. Therefore, the *ummah* will not revive by the presence of jurists and legists, of the presence of doctors and engineers, and their like. She only revives if she has enlightenment in thinking, i.e. if she has enlightened thinkers.

Enlightenment in thinking does not require the presence of education. In other words, it is not necessary that the enlightened thinkers be educated. The Bedouin for example, who said: The camel dropping indicates of (the presence of the) camel, and the mark (footprint) indicates of (the existence of) the travel, he is an enlightened thinker. The speaker who said: Precaution cannot protect from the *qadar* (destiny), and the patience (*sabr*) is one of the causes of success, he is an enlightened thinker, but the poet who said:

Maata al-Khaleefatu ayyuhath thaqalane
Faka'nnani aftartu fee Ramadane
 The Khaleefa has died, O Ins and Jinn
 As if I broke the fast in Ramadan,

he is not an enlightened thinker, though he is an educated *faqeeh* (jurist). Also the wise man (*Hakeem*) who said: The head of wisdom is the fear of Allah; he is not an enlightened thinker, because the head of wisdom is the realisation of the existence of Allah and not the fear of Allah. Thus, the enlightened thinking does not need knowledge, or wisdom. It rather needs to think deeply, and to look around a thing and what relates to it for the sake of arriving at correct results. Therefore, the enlightened thinker could be illiterate or educated or even a scholar. The enlightened

thinker would not produce an enlightened thought, unless he had enlightenment while thinking. Thus the politician is an enlightened thinker. However, each of them needs to have enlightenment when thinking in everything so that thinking can be enlightened. Therefore, he would not be surprised if we saw great leaders and great politicians pray to a piece of wood, and seek forgiveness from people who are less enlightened than them. This is because their thinking has no depth or enlightenment; it is rather following habits or imitation, or a sort of deception and hypocrisy. All of this is neither depth nor enlightenment. This is because the enlightened thinker, has nothing to do with deception or hypocrisy, neither is he dominated by customs and traditions.

The thinker, whether he is shallow, deep or enlightened, must be serious in his thinking. It is true that with the shallow thinker, his shallow thinking does not help him in being serious. However, by avoiding amusement and his habits he can be serious. Seriousness does not need depth, though depth encourages it. Neither does it need enlightenment, though enlightenment requires it. This is because seriousness is the presence of the purpose, and the struggle to achieve this purpose, besides the good conception of the reality that is thought of. So thinking about danger is not actually thinking about it, rather it is thinking to avoid it. Thinking about eating is not thinking about it, rather it is thinking about obtaining it. Thinking about playing is not thinking about playing; rather it is for the sake of playing. Thinking about a picnic is not discussion of the picnic; it is rather for the sake of enjoying the picnic. Thinking about walking aimlessly is not thinking about this walking, it is rather for the sake of driving away boredom. Thinking about enacting a law is not thinking about the law itself, it is rather for the sake of enacting the law itself. Thus, thinking, whatever type it is, is thinking about the matter itself or thinking about acting on that thing. Thinking about the thing must be for the sake of knowing it, while thinking about acting on this thing is for the sake of acting on it. In both case, amusement should not be involved in any one of them. The habit of thinking about the thing or about the action with the thing, should also not dominate the thinking. So if amusement and habits were removed from thinking, then the serious thinking will exist. This is because it would be easy, if not inevitable, for the purpose to exist, and also the struggle for achieving that purpose to exist. It would then also be easy, if not inevitable, for the conception of the reality of what is aimed at,

to exist, i.e. the reality of what is thought of.

Accordingly, seriousness is possible to exist in shallow thinking, as it also exists in the deep thinking and the enlightened thinking, though in origin, seriousness only exists in the deep thinking and in the enlightened thinking. Yet seriousness is not intrinsic in thinking, indeed most of the thinking of the people is devoid of seriousness. The people carry out their works through habit and in virtue of continuity. Amusement in their thinking exists distinctly. Therefore, it is necessary that seriousness is exercised even by pretence, where the purpose is the basis of this seriousness. So the pretence of seriousness is the purpose itself. Hence, it must be said that seriousness is not natural, even if it was noticed in some people that they are naturally serious.

However, the seriousness which we mean is not the absolute one, rather that which is at the level of what is thought of, so if it was below its level, then it would not be considered seriousness. Thus, the person who thinks about marriage but he is not concerned with what achieves marriage, would not be serious in his thinking about the marriage. The person who thinks about trade, then he spends all of what he gains from the trade; he is not serious in his thinking about trade. The person who thinks about becoming a judge but does not do anything except endeavour to be employed in a judicial post; he is not serious about becoming a judge, rather he is only serious about becoming an employee. The person who thinks about feeding his family, but then he passes the time in playing and going around in the markets is not serious about feeding his family, and so on.

Seriousness requires of him to work to achieve what he aims at, and that his work be at the level of what he aims at. If he did not work to achieve what he aims at, even arriving at a particular thought, or he does actions below the level of what he aims at, then he is not serious in his thinking. That somebody says he is serious in his thinking is not enough for him to be serious. His pretence of circumstances, appearances, or motions, whether intellectual or physical, is not enough to be serious or to indicate seriousness. It is rather necessary that he undertakes physical actions that are at the level of what he thinks of so as to be serious, or to indicate that he is serious in his thinking. Thus the physical actions, which are at the level of what he thinks about, are necessary for seriousness to exist, in thinking, or so that it is indicated that seriousness

exists in thinking.

The declined people and nations and the indolent individuals or those who avoid new ventures, or those who are possessed with shyness, fear or dependence on others, all of these are not serious in what they think about. This is because decline makes the person like the easy (thing), so he is not concerned with the difficult and hard (thing). Hence, indolence contradicts seriousness. Protection of oneself against new ventures turns away from seriousness. Shyness, fear and dependence on others deviate from seriousness. Therefore, it is necessary to elevate the thought, get rid of indolence, and love to be immersed in new ventures. Shyness must be differentiated from that which one must be ashamed of and from courage. One must make dependence on oneself one of the characteristics. All this should be done until the seriousness exists in the individuals, people and nations. This is because seriousness cannot exist spontaneously, but rather it is necessary to stimulate its existence.

As regards the necessity of the existence of seriousness in thinking, this is because the purpose of the thinking is not only initiating the thought, but rather thinking must be for the sake of using this thought. Therefore, it is necessary that thinking be for the sake of an action. Thoughts produced by the scholars and thinkers, and the information that is obtained is not only for delight, nor for the enjoyment of these thoughts. They are rather for the sake of life and for the sake of acting upon them in life. Therefore it is wrong to say that knowledge is sought for the sake of knowledge itself. Thus there is no value in Greek philosophy because it is only thoughts for enjoyment. Any knowledge that can't be used is of no value, because knowledge is not sought for enjoyment, rather information is sought to act upon it in this life. Therefore we cannot say that the Greek philosophers and whoever imitated them were serious in their thinking. Also, we cannot say that the late scholars of the Muslims, who made the subjects of *balaghah* (rhetoric), like the subject of philosophy, such as 'Hawashi ibn Sa'd (footnotes of ibn Sa'd) in the subject of rhetoric, were serious in their thinking. This is because this thinking does not have any use in life; it only includes enjoyment in study and research. It is true about the poets and men of letters, that their thinking is not used in life. However, it is not used in terms of undertaking actions, but it might be benefited from. Yet their production is itself a benefit. For reading a poem, or reading texts of literature such as the prose, in all of its types, generates a

pleasure and creates stimulation. They have composed these texts, which themselves were the result of thinking. Therefore, it is not correct to say they are not serious. Rather there are amongst them who are serious and conversant, though there are others who are not serious and not conversant. This is different to philosophy; thinking about it was only to arrive at truths, and what it came out with were not facts neither do they have any relation to facts. This is also different to the scholars of *balaghah* (rhetoric), who composed it in the mode of philosophy. Their thinking was only to understand the rhetoric in speech in order that people become eloquent in speech. Though what was mentioned in it does not generate rhetoric, neither is it related to rhetoric. So their production was not more than a cause for discussion and the enjoyment of research, without reaching the objective for whose sake they made it. This is because they did not produce it for the sake of enjoyment of research rather for another reason. Therefore, they were not serious in thinking. This is not because they did not achieve what they wanted, rather the nature of what they produced makes it impossible to achieve what they wanted. Had they been serious, they would not have produced this philosophy nor this type of science of rhetoric. This is because seriousness needs to have a purpose, which is supposed to lead to an objective. However, they did not intend anything except research only, so certainly they were not serious in thinking.

Seriousness in thinking does not require a time, either short or long, between the thought and action. This is because action is a result of the thought. So a person might think about travelling to the moon, and the time might be long between this thinking and reaching to the moon. He might also think about eating, and the time between thinking and undertaking eating might be long. He might think of reviving his *ummah* and the time between his thinking and the existence of the revival might be short. So the question is not the length or shortness of the time, because the time between the thinking and the action is not necessary to be short or long, for it might be short or it might be long. What is important is that an action should exist as a result of the thinking, whether the thinker himself produced it or others. Thus thinking must produce action, whether it was speech like the poets and men of letters; or it was actions such as the scientists in the empirical sciences; or it was plans such as the scholar of politics and war; or it was a physical work such as the war, eating and teaching and the like.

Thus, in order that the thinking produces the results thought of, it must be serious, whether it produced the results in reality or failed to do so. So the seriousness is necessary in the thinking. Without it, thinking will be amusement or play or monotonous, in that it that proceeds in the same manner because of the habit and the imitation. The monotonous thinking gets pleasure in the life in which the thinker lives and the life in which the people live, and thus removes from the mind the concept of change and thinking about change.

Thinking about change is necessary for life, because stagnation of life and submission to the destiny is one of the greatest evils that make the people and nation extinct and disappear with the incidents and days. That is why thinking about change is one of the most important types of thinking. Thinking about change is not regarded pleasant by the languid people, neither is it accepted by the lazy people, because the price of change is high, and because those who are dominated by habits perceive the thinking about change as harmful for them and changing them from one state to another. That is why the declined people and the lazy people fight against it, and the so-called conservatives and those who dominate the people and their livelihood oppose it. Therefore, thinking about change is dangerous for the one who thinks about it, and amongst all the types of thinking, it is the most fiercely attacked.

Thinking about change, whether it is the changing of the souls of the individuals or their situation, or the changing of the societies or the changing of the situations of the people and nations or any other thing that requires change, it must start with the basis upon which man lives, and with the societies that are not established on a basis or established on a wrong basis, or with the situations that proceed aimlessly. This basis upon which life is established is that which elevates or declines it, which brings happiness or hardship to him and it is what originates the outlook towards life. According to this outlook man proceeds in the battlefield of life.

Firstly, this basis is examined. If it is a rational creed that complies with man's innate nature (*fiTrah*), then this basis does not need changing. Nobody would ever have it occur to him, or have it come to his mind, the idea of changing this basis, because it is the basis upon which life is

established. Change only occurs when the things are not correct and matters are not right, and the error is apparent to the mind or conspicuous to the feelings of the life energy of man. If the mind was decisively certain about the truthfulness of the thing and the correctness of the matter and the feelings (*mashaa'ir*) of the life energy (*at-Taqah al-Hayawiyyah*) were satisfied and pleased, then the idea of change would not exist at all, and there will be no need for thinking about change. However, if the basis upon which man lives, the society is established and in accordance to which the situations proceed, does not exist in origin, or it exists in a wrong way, then it would be useless to undertake thinking about changing anything else before changing the basis, i.e. before changing the creed which the people embrace. Therefore, Muslims, who enjoyed the rational creed that agrees with man's innate nature, should have made the change in the people who have no creeds, or have erroneous creeds, that are rejected by the mind and do not agree with man's innate nature. That is why it was obligatory upon them to carry the Islamic da'wah to all non-muslim people, even if this lead to fighting, and to being involved in battles with the *kuffar*, i.e. with those who do not have the rational creed that agrees with man's innate nature (*fiTrah*).

So changing should start with the basis. Once the basis has been changed and replaced by the basis whose truthfulness and validity has been definitely established, then thinking about changing the societies and situations follows. Changing the societies and situations is achieved by changing the criteria, concepts and convictions. For when the true and correct basis exists it becomes the principle criterion for all other criteria, and the principal concept of all the concepts and the principal conviction of all the convictions. So once this basis existed, it becomes possible then to change the criterion, concepts and convictions, and subsequently to change the societies and situations. This is because by changing the basis, all the values change, whether the values of the things or the values of the thoughts, and hence the fundamentals of life change. Thus man should think about change or he should be made to think of change. Everybody who has a rational creed that agrees with man's nature has the potential to think about change, that is latently inside him, or by changing; such as when he actually carries out thinking about change during his immersion in the battlefield of life.

Thinking about change does not mean that it exists with those who feel the necessity of changing their circumstances or their thoughts. Rather it exists as long there exists in the universe a state that requires changing. Therefore, thinking about change is not restricted to the person's changing of his situation, nor changing his society or changing his people or ummah. It rather exists to change others; changing the other people, other societies and the foreign situations. This is because it is the characteristic of humanity, which requires one to look at man wherever he was, whether in his own country or in another country, and whether in his *ummah* or in another ummah; and whether in his state or in another state. So man tries to create change in every place that needs changing.

Thinking about change originates from within oneself, and the events of life create a drive for it, it is even created by the mere feeling of life. Though the powers that feel the danger of change, oppose it, yet it exists within them. So the presence of change in man is inevitable. However, making the people think about change may either result through persuasion or by a powerful compulsion. Once the change happened in reality or the importance of change was understood, then the thinking about change becomes easy and feasible, because it restores to the people their feeling of the importance of change, and consequently thinking about change exists in them. Therefore it is necessary that every man thinks about change.

These are ten types of thinking or ten models of thinking, and they are enough to illustrate thinking. They include thinking from the beginning, personal thinking, thinking through sensation, and thinking through hearing. They also include thinking with regards to understanding the texts, i.e. thinking about what is read. However this additional type of thinking needs special study and specific attention. This is because reading alone does not originate thinking; rather it is necessary to know how thinking proceeds in the texts that man reads. This is because reading and writing are means of thinking but not the thinking itself. Many of those who read do not think, and many of those who read and think; their thinking is not right; neither do they arrive to the thoughts which the speech expresses. That is why it is wrong for somebody to think that reading and writing educate the people or revive the nations. Thus it was wrong to focus the attention on removing the illiteracy for the sake of educating the people and to direct the effort to removing the

illiteracy for the sake of reviving the people or the nation. This is because reading and writing do not provide the mind with anything, nor they arouse in the soul or the mind any motivation for thinking. For thinking is originated by the reality and the previous information. Reading (books) is not a reality in order to think on, nor is it information by which the reality is explained, so there is no value in them for thinking. They are only the expression of thoughts. Their reading alone does not originate thoughts in the mind neither does it arouse thinking. They are the expression of the thoughts, so if the reader understands properly this expression, then thoughts exist with him from his good understanding and not from the reading. If he does not properly understand, then no thoughts will be originated in him, even if he read for hours or years. Therefore, it is necessary to discuss the thinking regarding texts and how texts are understood.

There are four types of written texts: the literary text (*adabi*), the intellectual texts (*fikri*), the legislative texts (*tashree'i*) and the political texts (*siyasi*). Thinking about (understanding) each one of them differs to the other, though understanding of them all proceeds on one method, that is the rational method. The scientific texts were excluded, because they are almost specific to the scientists in the empirical sciences, and hardly used by others. While the four types of texts are submitted for all the people, and everybody can understand them if provided with the means of understanding.

As for the literature texts they are placed for the enjoyment and provoking the emotions, though they might include some information which the mind could benefit from. So they give attention to the words and phrases more than the meanings. Though the poet and the writers must intend the meanings, the first purpose is the words and phrases. It is true that the words indicate meanings and also that the phrases indicate meanings, but the poet or the writer concentrates his effort on the words and the phrases to indicate these meanings. It is also true that they say eloquence is the attractive meaning included in the attractive words and phrases. Though the poet or the writer pays attention to selecting the meanings, he does that in order to formulate them in attractive words and an attractive phrase. Thus, the form in which the meaning is presented, in that word or that phrase, represents the word, the phrase or the formulated meanings.

The formation of the meanings depends on the formation of the words and phrases. It is true that the purpose of the texts is presenting the meanings, but this is in the texts generally. As regards the literary texts, the purpose of them is not presenting the meanings only, but in origin, the purpose of them is to provoke the reader and the listener, and not only giving him the meaning. Thus, provocation is the aim in the first place. Therefore the poet or writer chooses the words and phrases, and his aim from this choice is that his expression be portrayed with magnificence (*tafkheem*) and generality; addressing the places of beauty; influencing; provoking the sentiments and producing excitement. That is why you find the literary texts characterised with the expressions in which the thoughts are formed and images are manifested. The attention is then paid to images and the choice of the thoughts. So the main purpose of the thoughts is to form them and present them as exciting and provoking images. Thus, the origin is the expression, which is the representation or producing the image, while the thoughts are only a tool or a means. So the presentation and the images are what the poet or the writer takes care of. As for the thoughts, he takes care of them in terms of their suitability for presentation and the image with which they are portrayed, and in terms of their truthfulness and validity. This is because the purpose of the text is not teaching the thoughts to the people, rather provoking their emotions. That is why the attention in these texts is concentrated on the presentation, i.e. the expression. Their attention is with what this expression proceeds, which are the words and phrases, and not in what this expression contains (of meanings or thoughts) except in terms of its suitability for presentation, i.e. to produce the exciting and magnificent image.

This is the reality of the literary texts. Therefore the previous information required to link the sensation that results from reading such type of texts must be information related to imagery (*tasweer*), i.e. literary pictures, in order to understand the meaning of the texts and to observe the picture which was presented in the form that it was portrayed with. This means that understanding the literary text requires previous information about the words and phrases, i.e. about the process of presentation and it requires of tools and means. This requires practice in observing the images and differentiation between them. In other words, it requires previous reading of literary texts in a way that nurtures the taste, differentiation and comprehension. Therefore, the one who does

not have previous knowledge of the literary texts cannot understand the literary texts, even if he displayed his influence by them and his appreciation of them. The issue is the taste, which does not result except after practice, the increase in tasting and the variation of the types he tastes. In other words, this taste results after repeating the reading of literary texts, of different types and images. Once this taste existed the understanding of the text will exist, because understanding the literary text is not the understanding of its meanings, but tasting the structure. From this tasting comes the understanding of the meaning. This is an example of a poet's saying:

Two morals I do not accept them for a youngster,
The pride of richness and the humility of poverty,
So if you became rich don't be haughty,
And if you became poor feel proud all the time.

Another example is the poet's saying:

That (lady) which claimed your heart and you became fed up of her,
She was created as your love like you were created as her love.
So what she claimed in you is in her, and both of you,
Show to their companion the whole ardent love.

These two examples are different from the poet's saying:

We were, if the guest sought hospitality with force,
The swords would reach him while bleeding with poison (death),
We do not give the horses any rest till we bring her back,
Heavy burdened with spoils from our enemies.

This is also different from the saying of the poet:

If we were vexed a Modhari wrath,
Ripped apart the veil of the sun or it dripped blood,
If we lent a chief of a tribe,
The top of a minbar he would give salah and salam to us.

This difference is not difference in meanings, rather in the image that the poet produced and the presentation that he originated. Though each

one of these poets provoked the reader and the listener, however the excitement originated by the first two poets is different from that originated by the other two poets. Another example is the saying of the writer: "O my protector (*mawla*) and my master (*sayyid*), my love is to him and my dependence is upon him, and my extent is from him. The one whom Allah kept of sharp resolve and kindling hope. If you - may Allah honour you - deprived me of the garment of your favour, and withdraw away from me your hand of protection, after (even) the blind had seen my hopes in you, and the deaf heard my praise to you, and the inanimate (being) felt of my dependence on you. Then, it is no wonder that the water could choke the one who drinks it, and the medicine could kill the one who seeks cure with it, and the cautious could be attacked from the place which he trusts, and the death of the duplicator could be in his wish, and the destruction could come before the endeavour of the greedy."

Another writer's saying: "The book is a vessel full of knowledge, and an envelope stuffed with charm, and a vessel charged with fun and seriousness. If you liked, it could be more impotent than Baaqil, or if you wished it could be more evident than Sahbah bin Waa'il. If you liked, you could laugh of its heralds, or if you wished, you could be amazed of its wonderful benefits."

This saying is different from the writer's saying: "Knowledge does not acknowledge the final word in any of its issues. Rather its truths are all supplementary and temporary. They have their values until study reveals about what removes this value or changes it."

This is also different to the writer's saying: "Thoughts are various, the opinions are numerous, and the issues of every time differ from those before. The researcher looks at them, so he thinks of them, at the first glance, not linked to those before by any bond, and nor connected with it by any relationship. So he ponders in whatever relation that might exist between them and whatever reason that might join them."

This difference between these sayings is not in the difference of meanings, rather in the manner by which these meanings were delivered and the image with which each writer tries to present these meanings. The first writer is seeking kindness, while the other describes a book.

Each one of them presented the meaning he wanted in a specific manner and gave a specific image. The other two writers; one of them speaks about knowledge while the second speaks about thoughts. Each one of them presented the meaning in a manner different than the other.

However, all of them were not looking after the meanings, they rather cared for the phrases and words. The meanings were means to present the image that he wanted to project. When a person wants to understand these texts, whether poetic or literary, it is important for him to exert himself with the meanings first. Rather, he must focus his effort to understand the words and phrases; and the understanding of the meanings would follow that. Therefore, it is necessary that his previous information be related to the words and phrases and not to the meanings. In order that he generates information in this matter, he must read a lot of literary texts, and try to examine them critically, and exert himself in understanding the secrets of their phrases, until the taste is formed in him; and from the presence of the taste the information is formed. Thus, understanding the literary texts does not require study and education; neither does it require information about the meanings contained in the texts. It rather requires the forming of a taste in the first instance. This taste is formed through the increased reading of literary texts so that the enthusiasm from reading them exists. In that case the taste in man would have been created. Understanding the literary texts does not require knowledge about grammar and morphology; neither does it require knowledge about rhetoric such as meanings and metaphor; nor knowledge of linguistics or knowledge of coinage of words (giving words certain meanings). Though it is preferable the person has information about them, but it is not preferable to delve (penetrate deeply) into them. One thing is needed most, and that is the increased reading of texts, so as a taste is generated in him.

This is the way of thinking in understanding the literary texts. Thus its understanding requires the presence of a previous taste. In other words it requires knowledge in the nature of texts, from which results the formation of the taste. So their previous information is the presence of the taste. The increased reading of the literary texts is the way to achieve that, so as the taste can be formed. If the taste did not exist, it would not be possible to understand the literary texts, i.e. thinking about them would not be productive. It is true that he might come out with

understanding the thought they contain or with viewing the aim they intend, but he will not come out with understanding of them nor become acquainted with them. This is because he did not enjoy them nor knew their taste. If he did not enjoy them and did not know their taste, then he did not understand them. The understanding of the literary text is to agitate you, provoke you and influence you. This would not happen unless there was a taste for them in the one who reads these texts. Accordingly, the presence of the taste is what is necessary to understand the texts.

As regards the intellectual texts, the rational information is the basis of constructing the text. The attention in such text is directed towards the meanings first, then to the words and phrases. The intellectual text is the language of the intellect and not the language of the sentiments. The purpose of it is to present the thoughts, particularly the truths for the sake of serving the information and provoking the minds. The words and phrases in the intellectual texts are distinguished by their accuracy, clear delineation and thorough examination. It is based on the mind irrespective of the sentiments, on spreading the intellectual truths and the information whose attainment requires effort and an increase in depth. Therefore the intellectual texts differ completely from the literary texts. This is because the literal text does not stand at the limit of the facts and information, neither is it meant to furnish the mind with thoughts, rather it tries to bring these facts to the mind, but it selects the most prominent and important of them. In other words, it selects that which creates influence and excitement; and the words and phrases that deliver these thoughts are in the manner that incites the readers and listeners, and thus provokes their emotions, and arouses in them what this excitement requires of pleasure and delight or discontent and anger. This is different to the intellectual text, where it aims at furnishing the mind with thoughts. So it stands at the limit of the facts and information, irrespective of whether or not they arouse the emotions. It aims at clarifying the thoughts and not approximating them, the good presentation of them and not beautifying them, and what produces persuasion of the mind and the accurate presentation. It does not take care at all with what this might arouse of discontent or pleasure, delight or anger. It rather takes care of presenting the thought as it is, and makes the picture of the thought clear and not the picture of the construction. Hence understanding the intellectual texts differs completely with the

understanding of the literary texts.

Thinking about the intellectual texts, i.e. understanding them is not possible without the presence of previous information about the subject of the text. If such mentioned previous information were not available, the text cannot be understood. This is because the text expresses (about) a specific reality. So if the reader did not have previous information by which he explains this reality, then, by no means, can he understand it. The previous information required in order to understand the meaning of the intellectual texts must be conceptualised. If such previous information was just known, but without the reality of its meaning being conceptualised, then it is not possible to understand the intellectual text. This is because the intellectual text expresses (about) a thought that has a reality and a meaning, and it is not just a thought. If the thought was understood in a manner that indicates its meaning, and without comprehending its reality, and conceiving its meaning, then it would not be previous information by which it is possible to explain the reality. It would rather be just information and would not benefit in thinking, i.e. they will not be of benefit in understanding the intellectual text. Thus the condition that must be present in thinking about the intellectual text is not only the presence of previous information, but also the presence of the comprehension of their reality and a true conception of their meaning. You may read an intellectual book, whether it was a study of a thought, or a study of a subject or a study of an issue. The text of this book is Arabic, its words are Arabic and its phrases are Arabic and you are knowledgeable in Arabic language. Though your knowledge of Arabic language helps you in understanding the meanings of the word and phrases, it does not help you in understanding the meaning of the thoughts by which these words and phrases were coined. In order to understand these thoughts, it is necessary to have previous information about them, and it is also necessary to understand the reality of this information, and conceive their meaning, otherwise you would have understood the speech linguistically. This understanding of yours might agree with what the thoughts indicate or might be opposite to it. Whatever is the case, it would only be a linguistic understanding and not an understanding of the thought.

When, for example, you read this text, "The politically aware person is obliged to be involved in struggle against all the viewpoints which

contradict his viewpoint, and against all the concepts which contradict his concepts, at the same time he involves himself in struggle to consolidate his concepts and implant his viewpoints." This is an intellectual text; so it is not enough to understand its meaning in Arabic in order to understand it. It is also not enough to comprehend the meanings of its words and phrases in order to understand its meaning. It is rather necessary that the reality of the political contemplation, from a specific angle, be clear to you, and its meaning conceptualised for you.

It is necessary that the reality of the viewpoints and what they indicate are comprehended and conceptualised by you. It is also necessary that the reality of the struggle against these viewpoints by your viewpoints, and the reality of implanting your viewpoints in the people are comprehended and conceptualised by you, etc. In other words, the previous information about the political awareness, struggle, viewpoints and concepts and their reality must be conceptualised, and their meaning must be comprehended, in order to understand this text. If this did not happen, and the information remained just information; or their indication is observed only as meanings and not as a reality, then it would not be possible to understand this text. If it was not understood, then no benefit will be gained from it even if it was memorised by heart. Therefore, the intellectual texts are like a building; it is not possible to remove a stone from it with the picture of the building remaining as it is. So you cannot transfer a letter in it from one place to another, nor to replace a word by another word. It is rather necessary to have complete preservation of the text as it is. This is because the reality that is indicated by it, i.e. the indication of the thought which is intended to be presented, is a particular reality and has a particular picture. If something changed in the reality and that picture, then the understanding will change, either completely or partially. Thus the understanding of the intellectual text requires comprehending its indication; and comprehending its indication requires the preservation of its words and phrases.

Indeed, the intellectual text might be moulded in the form of the literary text, so its effect on the emotions beside the examination and crystallisation of the facts has to be observed. However, it is still an intellectual rather than a literary text. The condition that must be present with the intellectual text is not its influence on the emotions, rather

reaching to the facts, whether or not they affected on the emotions. Taking notice of the influence of the intellectual text on the emotions does not exclude it from being an intellectual text. It rather remains an intellectual text as long as its attention is directed to the thought, and the thought was the main aim of it. If the influence of the intellectual texts on the emotions was noticed, then the state of their understanding does not differ from the case of not noticing it. Their understanding rather requires previous information about the thoughts, comprehending the reality of the thoughts and the conception of their meaning.

It is true that the intellectual texts might be suitable for all people, and they have the capacity to present the thoughts for all the people whatever their culture was, for despite their depth, it is possible for them to be understood by all the people. However, with these texts, though everybody might take what he can understand of them, because of their depth it is not possible for everybody to understand them. It is true that the people take from them what they can understand, but not all the people can think about them and understand them. This is because the intellectual texts, if there was no previous information about them and on their level, it is not possible to understand them. If the reality of their thoughts was not comprehended and the meanings of their thoughts were not conceptualised, then it would not be possible to benefit from them and to execute their thoughts. The fact that everybody is capable to take from them in accordance with his capacity to understand them, does not mean that all the people are capable to understand these texts. For those who do not have previous information at their level, are not possible to understand them anyway.

It might be said here that the previous information is enough to form the thought once the sensation existed. This means, to understand the intellectual text, it is enough for the person to have previous information by which he explains the reality contained in the text. The answer to this is that the previous information is needed to explain the reality contained in the text. Unless this information is on the level of the text then the reality cannot be explained with it. So if the previous information is the linguistic information, then it would not be enough except to make linguistic explanation, but it is not enough to explain the thought. If, also, the information about ruling is that it is force, this might rather deviate from understanding the meaning of ruling. If the

previous information about the society is that it is people and relations, it will not be enough to understand the society in a way that makes it possible to change it or to protect it. This is because this information is not on the level of what society means. Thus to understand the intellectual text, the previous information must be on the level of the thought contained in the text, and not just information about it.

It might also be said that, if it is stipulated that to understand the text it is necessary to have previous information on the level of the thought that is wished to be understood, then where does the stipulation that its reality should be comprehended and its indication be conceived come from, beside the stipulation that the previous information be on its level? The answer to this is that the intention from understanding the intellectual text is not to enjoy it or the acquaintance of its meaning. Rather the intellectual text is understood in order to be adopted, i.e. it is understood in order to act upon it. If it is not treated like that then there is no benefit in it, and its existence has no value. This is because the thought is understood in order to be adopted, and not only for the sake of information. Its adoption would not be possible except through the comprehension of its reality and conceptualising its meaning. Therefore, for understanding the intellectual text, three conditions are stipulated, beside the previous information; firstly, the previous information should be at the level of the thought intended to be understood. Secondly, the reality of this information should be comprehended in a way that delineates it and distinguishes it from other realities. Thirdly, this reality should be properly conceived in a way that gives the true picture about it. Without these three conditions together, the intellectual text cannot be understood, i.e. the thought cannot be understood, in other words, it cannot be adopted. This is because understanding the thought means adopting it and not understanding its meaning. The closest example for that is the thought of Islam, in terms of creeds and rules. When Islam came down to the Arabs, where it came down in parts in accordance with the incidents, they understood it and adopted it. This was not because their language was Arabic, which facilitated their understanding of it, rather because they comprehended the reality of its thoughts and conceived their meanings, so they adopted them after that comprehension and conception. That is why it influenced them and changed their views. The values of some things increased while the values of some other things decreased. The fundamentals of life have

also became different from before. However, these Arabs themselves, once their comprehension of the reality of the thoughts, and their conception of their meanings was lost; they lost the understanding of these thoughts, i.e. they lost their adoption. Therefore, these thoughts ceased to effect them. Despite the fact that there are *hadeeth* scholars who are more knowledgeable than Malik, and jurists who are of wider knowledge than Abu Hanifah, and Mufassiroon (commentators of Quran) who are of more cognisance than Ibn Abbas; yet there is not one of them who could approach those who were in Madinah at the time of Malik, nor those who were at the time of Ibn Abbas, nor those who lived at the time of Abu Hanifah. This is not because of the deficiency in knowing the thoughts, but rather due to the absence of comprehending their reality and the absence of conceiving their meaning. Therefore, to have thinking about the intellectual texts, the presence of previous information at their level is not enough; beside that it is necessary to comprehend their reality and conceptualise their meanings.

Understanding the intellectual texts does not mean to adopt them, rather also to reject them and attack them. Thus, adoption is the aim. If they were not of those that are adopted, then they are of those that are abandoned or those that have to be attacked. If there was no comprehension of their reality and conception of their meaning, then this could lead to deviation. Thus what is supposed to be abandoned and attacked would be adopted, and that which is supposed to be adopted or just to be known without adoption or rejection, is rejected and attacked. Therefore, it is necessary for understanding the intellectual texts to comprehend their reality and conceive their meaning, so as to take the necessary position towards them, whether to adopt them or to reject them and attack them. The stipulation of comprehending the reality of the thoughts in a way that delineates and distinguishes them, and the conception of their meaning in a proper way, is what guards the thought from error and deviation, and makes the person decide his position on these thoughts soundly. The harm of these thoughts does not stand at the limit of restricting to the information, it rather might avert the one who adopts them from fundamental actions in his life, and make him misjudge and deviate or even go astray. The clearest example for that is what (they study of) the Greek philosophy caused to many Muslim scholars, and what the Capitalist ideas and the Communist

ideas caused to many of the Muslims' sons. All of that was because the comprehension of the reality (of these thoughts) was not in a way that defines and distinguishes them, and because the conception of the meaning of the thoughts was not correct.

Let us examine the Greek philosophy. It was present with the Christians of ash-Sham and Iraq. The Muslims carried the da'wah for Islam to the Christians particularly after they became under the power and control of Islam. The Christians used (in their arguments) the Greek philosophy and the Greek logic. The Muslims used this philosophy and this logic to answer back these Christians, without understanding the thoughts contained in this philosophy and without observing the deception used in the premises of the logic. This study, which was for the sake of spreading Islam, led to some Muslim scholars turning their attention to it for the sake of the enjoyment that they found in its study. Some other Muslim scholars turned their attention to it for the sake of responding to the Christians and proving the validity of the thoughts of Islam. As for the first group of scholars, they proceeded in the path of the Greek philosophers and they adopted the Greek philosophy and it became their culture. They embraced its views, taking Islam into account according to the view of these philosophical thoughts. Thus the Muslim philosophers emerged. Some of them were mistaken and deviated; and some of them went far astray. Both of these parties; the deviated, and the misguided, have abandoned Islam and became *Kuffar*. Therefore all of those so-called Muslim philosophers or the philosophers of Islam are *Kuffar*, there is no difference between Ibn Seena and Farabi nor Ibn Rushd and al-Kindi.

As for the second group of Muslim scholars, who studied the Greek philosophy and the Greek logic, they were divided into two parties: One party adopts the philosophy as a basis, and they interpret the thoughts of Islam so as to agree with the thoughts of this philosophy. They apply the philosophical thoughts on the thoughts of Islam. These were the Mu'tazilah. The other party opposed and criticised these thoughts. They attempted to correct them and answer them. These were what are called ahl us-Sunnah. Thus, argument arose between these two parties, and they were distracted away by this argument from carrying the Islamic da'wah. They were turned away from the main duty that Allah obliged on them, which is the carrying of the da'wah of Islam to non-Muslims and

to attempt correcting the creeds of Muslims. This was either by using the Greek philosophical thoughts to prove the validity of the thoughts of Islam and to crystallise them, or by responding based on these thoughts. They occupied the people with that for generations and centuries. All of these, though they are Muslims, were turned away from carrying the da'wah for Islam to non-Muslims because of the Greek philosophy.

The matter was not limited to this, rather due to that other groups emerged such as the Jabriyyah, the Murji'ah, the Qadriyyah and others. This resulted in the presence of sects, thoughts and groups amongst Muslims. So there emerged great confusion, till the Muslims became tens of groups, and tens of schools of thoughts, all of this is due to the penetration of the Greek philosophy into the lands of Islam and the devotion of many Muslims to its study, without the realisation that defines and distinguishes its thoughts, and without proper conception of the meaning of these thoughts. If Islam itself was not strong, and the ahl us-Sunnah wal-jama'ah did not challenge, with sincerity and devotion, these thoughts by explaining the reality which they indicate, and portraying their meanings accurately, and unsheathing the sword against the Kafireen from amongst these divisions and sects; had this not happened Islam would have gone away and would have been lost due to the Greek philosophy and what it created of thoughts and opinions.

As regards the Capitalist and Socialist thoughts their danger is tangible and witnessed (by Muslims). The misguidance of their thoughts has included many of the Muslims sons. The error of their concepts has spread even amongst the Muslim masses. We are in no need to establish an evidence for that, nor to mention examples of the erroneous thoughts and the wrong thoughts. This is because the tangible situation in the lands of Islam, particularly by those who are aware of the (type of) life after the Second World War, shows us what these thoughts have caused of corruption to the minds of Muslims, and distraction from work for the sake of Islam.

Therefore, it is necessary that thinking in the intellectual texts is well understood, and it is not enough to have the presence of the previous information only. Rather it is rather necessary that this previous information be on the same level of the thought; their reality should be comprehended in a defined and distinguished fashion and their meaning

should be properly conceptualised in a way that gives the true picture of that meaning.

It is true that Islam did not prevent the intellectual study; rather it allowed it. It did not also forbid adopting the thoughts; rather it allowed it. However, Islam deemed the Islamic *Aqeedah* as the basis for thoughts, and as a criterion/ for their adoption or rejection. Islam does not allow the adoption of any thought that contradicts this basis (Islamic *Aqeedah*), though it is allowed to read the texts that contain such a thought, and it does not allow the adoption of any thought unless the intellectual basis allows that. As for understanding whether the thought agrees or disagrees with the intellectual basis, and taking a position towards it; this only happens after comprehending the reality of the thought in a way that defines it and distinguishes it, and also conceptualises its meaning in a proper way. Without this, the thought cannot be assessed with the intellectual basis, and accordingly it is not possible to take the true position from it. Therefore, it is required from the one who thinks about an intellectual text to have previous information on the same level of this thought, and beside that, to have a comprehension of its reality in a way that defines it and distinguishes it, and have a proper conception of its meaning such that it gives the true picture about it.

As regards the legislative (*tashree'i*) texts, in order to comprehend what they contain of thoughts and arrive at deriving the thoughts, it is not enough to understand what they have of words, phrases and their meanings. This does not require any previous information; rather it needs two matters combined together. It requires, firstly, knowledge of the meanings of words and phrases, then the import that these words and phrases indicate, and later on the use of specific information to understand or to deduce the thought. To know the meanings of the words and phrases, knowledge of the language is required, as words and phrases and also knowledge of certain technical usages. After that, comprehension of the thoughts and rules follows. This can apply to any thinking in legislation, but when we discuss here, we mean the Islamic legislation alone. This is because, as Muslims, we are not allowed to discuss other than the Islamic legislation, for the decisive matter which our *Aqeedah* obliges is restrict our thinking to the Islamic legislation alone. Other than the Islamic legislation, we are not allowed to study it, nor even read it. This is because when the legislation is read, it is read for

adopting what it contains and not for the amusement or pleasure. When it is studied and thought of, it is only done for adopting it. It is *haram* to adopt anything from other than Islam, and it is *haram* upon us to adopt other than the *hukm shar'i*. It is true that we are allowed to read and study other than the legislative texts, such as the literary texts, the intellectual texts and the political texts, but we are not allowed to read or study other than the Islamic legislative texts. The literary texts are only read and studied for the sake of enjoyment and amusement. The intellectual texts are studied when we had taken the intellectual basis as a criterion for what they contain of thoughts. The political texts are read to know the manner by which the foreign affairs are managed. In all of these types of texts, there is nothing to prevent reading, studying and discussing them and thinking about them. As for the legislative texts, they are read and studied to adopt from them. Since we are not allowed to adopt other than the *hukm shar'i*, then accordingly it is not allowed for us to read, study or think about other than the Islamic legislation. Since the thoughts are built on the *'Aqeedah*, then it is the criterion for the validity or invalidity of these thoughts, i.e. to decide the position towards them in terms of adoption or rejection. The *ahkam shar'iyyah* emanate from the *'Aqeedah*, i.e. they are deduced and derived from the *Aqeedah*. So only whatever emanated from this *'Aqeedah*, and was a *hukm shar'i*, is adopted. Whatever did not emanate from it is rejected totally, whether it agreed or disagreed with the *'Aqeedah*. Therefore we do not adopt that which agrees with Islam. We rather adopt only what is Islam and nothing else. This is because the *hukm shar'i* only emanates from the *'Aqeedah* and derived from it and it is not built on it. This is different from the thought that is built on it. Allah ﷻ, when He said *Iqraa'* (read)', He allowed us reading without restriction, but when He ﷻ commanded (us) adopting the solutions for life, i.e. the *ahkam shar'iyyah*, He restricted the adoption to them and linked the adoption with the *Iman*. He ﷻ made adoption from other than this as adoption from the *Taghout*. Thus the texts that pertained to the legislation specified reading; which means that reading is allowed specifically in that which is not related to legislation. As for the legislation, i.e. the rules and solutions, the allowance does not include them, due to the presence of the texts that indicate the impermissibility of adopting from other than them. That is why we do not read other than the Islamic legislation, neither do we study or think about them. Therefore, when we study thinking regarding legislation we only study the Islamic legislation.

Thinking in legislation, though it requires knowledge of the Arabic language and the Islamic thoughts, it requires, first of all, knowledge of the reality and understanding of it, then knowing the *hukm shar'i*, then the application of this *hukm shar'i* on the reality. If it applied to it, then it would be its *hukm*. If it did not apply to it, then it is not its *hukm*, and search is made for another *hukm* that applies on it. Therefore thinking about legislation is not feasible for all the people, because it requires many things which relate to the words and phrases, and relate to the legislative thoughts, i.e. specific information, which is the legislative information. It also requires understanding of the reality, i.e. the reality of the *hukm* which is adopted or deduced. For thinking about the legislative texts, it is not enough to give attention to the words and phrases, like it is with thinking about the literary texts. Neither is it enough to give attention to the meanings and the thoughts like with thinking about the intellectual texts. Neither is it enough to give attention to the incidents, events and circumstances like thinking about the political texts. The attention is rather directed to the words and phrases, the meanings and thoughts, and the incidents and events for which it was aimed to deduce the *hukm*, and all of that at one time. In other words, thinking about the legislative texts requires all that is needed for thinking in all other texts. Therefore thinking about them is more difficult than thinking about any other text. It is in need of depth and enlightenment at one time. Depth alone is not enough for it, though enlightenment is enough, because it cannot exist without depth.

Thinking about the legislative texts differs according to the objective for this thinking. This objective is either to adopt the *hukm shar'i* or to deduce the *hukm shar'i*, and there is a difference between the two. Though thinking is to recognise the *hukm shar'i*, it needs the knowledge of the meanings of the words and phrases, but it does not need knowledge of the grammar or morphology (conjugation), or the text of the language or the rhetoric. It is enough only to know how to read Arabic language and even not know how to write. Reading the text in the Arabic and understanding what is read is enough to seek knowledge of the *ahkam shar'iyyah* from the texts. Though it needs knowledge of the *shar'i* thoughts, i.e. previous information about the *shar'i*. However, the elementary information is enough for the knowledge. So it is not necessary to know the science of *usul ul-fiqh* (foundation of *fiqh*), nor the verses and *ahadeeth*. It is enough to understand the *hukm shar'i* from

others from reading only. It is also not necessary to know what the reality is. It is rather enough to know that this *hukm* is for that reality. So when he reads in order to know what the *hukm* of the canned meat is, it is enough to know that the canned meat is carrion, because it was not legally slaughtered. When he reads in order to know the *hukm* of the cologne, it is enough that he knows that the intoxicant is *haram* and that the cologne is an intoxicant. Thus for thinking, and for knowing the *hukm shar'i* from the *shar'i* texts, it is enough to have previous information sufficient to explain the reality of the *hukm* sought for.

As for thinking to deduce the *hukm shar'i*, it needs more than only the reading for its deduction. It requires knowledge in three matters; what are the words and the phrases, the *shar'i* thoughts and the reality of the thoughts, i.e. the *hukm*, in a way that this knowledge enables him to make deduction, and not just mere knowledge. So he must be knowledgeable in Arabic language in terms of grammar (*naHw*), morphology (*Sarf*) and rhetoric (*balaaghah*) etc. He must also be knowledgeable in tafseer (commentary), *hadeeth* and *usul ul-fiqh* (foundations of *fiqh*). He must also be knowledgeable regarding the reality for which he wants to deduce a *hukm*. We do not mean knowledgeable enough to be a mujtahid in these subjects; it is rather enough to be familiar in that. This is because he can enquire about the meaning of a word and refer to the dictionary to find it. He can refer to a *Mujtahid* in grammar, and morphology or refer to a book on grammar and morphology, so as to know the grammar or the conjugation of a word. He can also refer to a scholar in *hadeeth* or to a book of *hadeeth* to know the *hadeeth*. Furthermore, he can ask a person that is knowledgeable regarding the reality that he wants to understand, even if this person was not a Muslim, or refer to a book on the subject of this reality. So, to be knowledgeable does not mean to be a mujtahid or to be of deep knowledge in the subject, but rather to be familiar with it in a way that enables him to do the deduction. This is the meaning of having certain information, i.e. information that enables him to make deduction (*istinbat*). Therefore, though *istinbat* (deduction) requires information more than that required to know the *hukm shar'i*, it does not mean that he has to be a mujtahid in each of the three matters required for deduction (*istinbat*). It rather means he should be familiar enough with information about these three matters to enable him to make deduction. Once he became capable to make deduction then he would be a mujtahid. Therefore *istinbat* and *ijtihad* are possible for all

the people and are feasible for all the people, particularly after books on the Arabic language, Islamic shar' and the events of life became available to the people. Such books are adapted, so they can be referred to and used for deduction. Thus the knowledge of the *hukm shar'i* is feasible for everybody, as is the deduction of the *hukm shar'i*, though the deduction requires more knowledge, i.e. more and broader previous information.

Our ancestors straitened the issue of *ijtihad* and *istinbat* for themselves, and they contented themselves with the knowledge (information) only. So they became, in their majority, *muqqalids* (imitators). However, new incidents and events occurred, and yet they were left without having a *hukm*. So our insistence to abide by the *ahkam shar'iyyah*, and to be involved in the domain of life at the highest level and in an open and wide way, obliges us, with this availability of books of knowledge and science, to raise ourselves from the level of taqleed to *istinbat*, and to treat all the problems of life with the *ahkam shar'iyyah* alone. This requires of us only the knowledge needed for *istinbat*.

It is true that the knowledge of the *hukm shar'i* is a personal duty, and the deduction of the *hukm shar'i* is a collective duty. However, the necessity of the change of incidents and events and the prohibition upon us from taking any rule other than the *hukm shar'i* make this collective duty no less necessary than the personal duty. Therefore it is necessary for this *ummah* to have a great multitude of those who make *istinbat* and *ijtihad*.

Hence, it is clear that, though thinking in legislation is the most difficult type of thinking, it is the most indispensable for the Islamic *Ummah*, whether it was thinking in order to know the *hukm shar'i* or thinking to deduce the *hukm shar'i*. However, thinking in deducing the *hukm shar'i* should not be treated lightly nor considered with simplicity. Rather it should be considered with care and attention, and nobody should address it unless he obtained the information necessary for it. He must always observe what thinking about the legislative texts requires regarding the presence of enough information in the three matters necessary for it, which are the Arabic language, the *shar'i* matters and the understanding of the true nature of the reality, and the application of the *hukm shar'i* on that reality. Though the application of the *hukm shar'i* on the reality is not of the information required for the *istinbat*, rather it is

the result of the validity of the knowledge of the three matters.

This is the thinking regarding legislation. That is, the information that is connected with the reality, is specific information, and is enough for knowing the *hukm* of the reality or for deducing the *hukm* for it. Our enemies have succeeded in their deception and made us see the honey as the excrement of the flies (i.e. the bees), so we abhor it and turn away from it. In other words, they made the *fiqh* disgusted and disgraced in our eyes until we turned away from it. However, it is time to reveal this deception and to see our happiness and our life not being fulfilled except by the *ahkam shar'iyah*, i.e. we can't reach them except by the *fiqh*, i.e. by the knowledge and deduction of the *ahkam shar'iyah*. This becomes of more significance because any legislation other than Islam, such as the civil law and the like, is a law of the taghout, which we are forbidden from taking by the text of the Quran.

Whatever the case may be, thinking about the legislative texts, i.e. thinking about the Islamic legislation differs completely from thinking about all other texts. Thinking about the literary texts requires the knowledge of the words and phrases, and consequently needs a taste that originates from this knowledge. Thinking in the intellectual texts requires information of the same level of the thought which is intended to be comprehended. Thinking in the political texts requires knowledge about the events and incidents. However, thinking about the legislative texts requires what is needed in all these types of thinking. This is because it requires the knowledge of the words and phrases, *shar'i* knowledge of the same level of the *shar'i* reality and also knowledge of the events and incidents upon which the *hukm shar'i* applies, whether for the knowledge or the deduction of the *hukm shar'i*. Hence it is right to say the thinking in legislation is the most difficult type of thinking and most indispensable for Muslims.

As for the political thinking, it is completely different from the legislative thinking, though it is of its type. This is because legislative thinking is to solve the people's problems, and the political thinking is to look after the people's affairs. However, there is a difference between the two types of thinking. It also completely contradicts the literary thinking, because the literary thinking is for the excitement and enjoyment of the words and the phrases. It also appreciates the meanings provided in the

forms of words but presented in the literary style. As for the intellectual thinking, it requires some details. If the political thinking was thinking about the texts of political sciences and political studies, then the political thinking and the intellectual thinking would be almost of the same type, for they are similar to a great extent. However, in the intellectual thinking, the previous information must be of the same level of the thought under study, even if this information is not of its type but related to it. The political thinking, though it requires previous information of the same level of the thought, it requires that the previous information is on the same subject, and it is not enough to be related, to it, similar to it or suitable to explain the thinking. Therefore, thinking about the political texts is of the same type of thinking as the intellectual thinking.

However, if the political thinking was thinking about the news and events, and linking of the incidents, then it differs from all types of thinking, without having any rule of thinking that applies to it; even there is almost no rule that applies to it. Therefore it is the highest type of thinking because it is thinking about the things and incidents, and thinking about each type of thinking. It is true that the intellectual basis upon which thoughts are built and from which the solutions emanate is the highest type of thinking, but this basis itself is a political thought, and a political idea. Unless it is a political idea and political thinking, it would not be a correct basis, nor suitable to be a basis. Therefore, when we say the political thinking is the highest type of thinking, this includes the intellectual basis, i.e. that which is suitable to be an intellectual basis. As for the fact that it is the most difficult type of thinking, this is because of the absence of a rule related to it, upon which it is built and with which it is measured. That is why it confuses the thinker, and makes him, at the beginning, subject to many mistakes and prey to imagination and errors. Unless he passes through the political experimentation, and is vigilant and follows up all of the daily incidents, it would be difficult for him to have command of political thinking. That is why the political thinking regarding the news and events is distinguished from all types of thinking, and obviously distinguished over them.

Though thinking about the political texts includes the thinking about the texts of political sciences and political studies, the true political thinking is the thinking concerning the texts of the news and events.

Therefore, the scripting of the news is the one that is considered the true political text. If one wants to engage in political thinking he has to think about the texts of the news, particularly their wording and the manner of understanding this wording, because this is what is considered political thinking, and not thinking about the political sciences and political studies. This is because thinking about the political sciences and political studies gives information; the same as the thinking in the intellectual texts gives. It also gives deep or enlightened thought, but it does not make the thinker a politician, rather it makes him a scholar in politics, i.e. knowledgeable regarding the political sciences and studies. Such a person is fit to be an instructor but not a politician. This is because the politician is the person who understands the news and the events and their meanings and reaches to the information that enables him to act, whether he had an acquaintance or not with the political sciences and studies. Though the political sciences and studies help in understanding the news and the events, their help is limited to obtaining the type of information at the time of linkage, and they do not help beyond that. That is why they are not a condition in political thinking.

However, since the advent of the idea of separating the deen from the State, and its advocates being dominated by the issue of the compromise solution, the West (meaning Europe and America) was, sadly, alone in issuing publications and books in the political sciences and studies; on the basis of its view about life and on the basis of the compromise solution and on the basis of technicalities which produce compromise thought that existed for the sake of reconciliation and mediation. When the communist idea appeared, and Russia the communist state embraced it, it was hoped that political studies will emerge based on a fixed thought and not on the basis of the compromise solution. However, Russia unfortunately, remained attached to the West. Therefore, the political sciences and studies remained proceeding in the same course, with difference only in the form and not in the content. Thus we can say the political sciences and studies which emerged until now are political studies which the mind is not assured of, in respect of their validity, and political sciences which (like psychology) are built on guess and estimation; beside that their basis is the compromise solution. Therefore when thinking occurs about the texts of these sciences and studies, the person must be vigilant of the thoughts, and cautious of slipping with their errors, because they contain thoughts

that are different to the reality and studies that are extremely wrong. Though we prefer that they are treated like the Western legislation, so they are not read nor studied, for they contain that which is related to legislation rather than politics, such as the ruling system. However, because they are of the intellectual studies type, and they contain political studies, then due to that, there is no harm in reading them and studying them; but it should be with vigilance and caution.

Let us take some thoughts as an example for what the West has of political studies. The leadership in the West is collectively represented by the council of Ministers. The East adopted this concept and gave it another form and advocated the collective leadership. This contradicts the reality and built on the compromise solution. This is because the despotic Kings in Europe were individuals, and the people cried out against the despotism of the Kings and considered the reason for that is the individual leadership. So they advocated the leadership of the people rather than the individual and placed it in the council of Ministers (government cabinet). This is a compromise solution, because the council of the ministers is not the people, nor do the people elect it. Moreover, the Prime Minister is the one who is in charge of the leadership of the ministers. Thus the leadership is not for the people or for the individual, rather for the Prime Minister and the cabinet. So this system is a compromise solution between the leadership of the individual and the leadership of the people. This is not a settlement for the issue of the leadership, rather a conciliation of the two sides. Moreover, the actual practice is that leadership remained individualistic in all the democratic systems. This is because, in reality, the leadership is held by the head of the state such as the Republics' president, or practiced by the Prime Minister himself. So the reality of the leadership is that it is individualistic and nothing more. It cannot be collective by any means. Even if it was made or called collective, the course of the ruling itself changes the leadership into being individualistic, for it cannot be anything except individualistic.

The West made the sovereignty for the people. The people are the ones who put the laws. They are the ones that govern. It is they who have the will and the execution. This is contradicts the reality and based on the compromise solution. This is because the despotic Kings had the will and had the right of decision. So they put the laws and they ruled.

The people cried out against the despotism of these Kings and considered the reason of that the fact they had the will and had the right of decision, thus possessing the legislation and ruling. So they advocated the sovereignty to be for the people. It is they who put the laws and they are the ones who govern. They made the task of legislation a task for a council elected by the people. They made the execution (of the laws) a task for the government, (cabinet) the Prime Minister or for the head of the state, and this is a compromise solution. This is because though the people elect the parliament, the parliament does not legislate; rather the ruler is the one who legislates, while the government (cabinet) or the president of the republic is the one who governs. Though the government or the president are elected by the people or agreed upon by the people's representatives, this does not mean the people govern; it is rather only that the people elect the ruler; thus this is a compromise solution. Furthermore, they declare sovereignty belongs to the law, and consider that the good ruling is the one in which sovereignty belongs to the law. This was a compromise solution and self-deception, and added to that, the reality of ruling is other than that. The reality of good ruling is that the people select their ruler and that sovereignty belongs to the law. So there is no sovereignty to the people, and no ruling is for the people under any circumstances.

The West views ruling as one issue and the emotional and religious matters another issue. In their view the authority of the church is different from the authority of the state; and the emotional matters, like the charitable deeds and caring of the poor people; helping the wounded people and the like; the state has no relation with them. This is built on the idea of separating the deen from the state, on the compromise solution; and it is divergent to the actual reality.

This is because the despotic Kings used to control the church, and did not used to assist the people who were wounded, poor, sick and the like, therefore there was an outcry amongst the people. Accordingly the compromise solution was in separating the church from the state, and separating the charitable deeds from the state. Thus there emerged with them an authority to the church different to the authority of the state. Also the charitable organisations and the Red Cross organisations emerged with them. Since the reality of the ruling is to look after the affairs of all the people, and the deen is of these affairs, and the

charitable deeds are of these affairs, the state supervises the churches, but through a hidden style, and supervises the charity organisation and the red cross organisation, but with hidden styles. Therefore this theory is actually different to the reality, though it appears that there is separation between the ruling and other matters.

These are three thoughts given as an example for the error of the political thoughts contained in the political studies in the West. This is the case in relation to the political thoughts connected with the systems. The same applies to the political studies related to the things and events. These studies, though they have some facts which the mind cannot see deception in, they are full of matters which disagree with the truth and also full of deception. For example they say the English policy is built on three matters: The relation of England with America, the relation of England with Europe and the relation of England with her previous colonies after their independence, or what are called the Common Wealth (countries). This speech is correct, because it is a description of the reality where there is no possibility of deception occurring. However, when they speak about the English policy in terms of its conduct in alliances, its position with the friends or the enemies and its view to the people and nations, then their speech not only includes deception and mistakes, but it also disagrees with the reality and commits outrage against the incidents and events. This applies to their statement about any state, whether in the West or otherwise, and whether it is a statement about historical matters or current events. They have great skills in deception and forgery of facts, to the point of being hidden from some aware people. Therefore, thinking in the political sciences and political studies, whatever they are, cannot be correct unless done with vigilance and caution.

Political thinking in the current incidents and events is the one that deserves to be a political thinking in the full sense of the word, and it is the one that makes the thinker a politician. This type of thinking needs five main matters combined together:

Firstly; it needs to follow up all the incidents and events that occur in the world, i.e. to follow up all the news. The news reports are different in terms of importance or non-importance; in terms of (what is) deliberate or coincidental regarding the event or incident, or in the

conveying of the news about it; and in terms of their brevity or elaboration. However, with practice and with time, follow up of the news will not be for all the news, but for what is necessary to know.

Secondly; it needs information, even preliminary or brief, about the nature of the events and incidents, i.e. about the meanings of the news, whether they were geographic, historical, intellectual or political information, or others that enable the understanding of the reality of the event or incident, i.e. the nature of the designations of the news.

Thirdly, events should not be detached from their circumstances and thus generalised. The divesting (of the news) from the (related) circumstances; generalisation; and making universal analogy, are the evil of understanding the events and incidents, i.e. the evil of the news. So the event or the incident must be taken without being detached from its circumstances by any means. This is in addition to confining this incident to its whereabouts. So it is not generalised to include every incident similar to it. Neither are other incidents compared to it in a total form. It is rather taken as an individual incident, and a judgment is issued about it in its capacity as an individual incident, i.e. to this incident alone.

Fourthly, the incident or the event has to be examined, i.e. examining the news through a complete scrutiny of it. Thus the source of the news, and the place, the time and the situation in which the incident or event occurred has to be known. Furthermore, it is necessary to know the purpose for its occurrence or for conveying the news about it, and the limit of the brevity and elaboration of the news conveyed about it, in addition to its truthfulness or falsehood; together with whatever investigation uncovers. This is because scrutiny is what generates examination. This examination would exist as long as the scrutiny is comprehensive and deep. Without examination, this incident or event cannot be taken with the examination, because the person who studies it will become subject to deception and error. Therefore, examination is an important element for taking, or even listening to the news.

Fifthly; the news has to be linked with the information, particularly with other news. This linkage is what leads to the most

possible correct judgement on the news. If the news was related to the international politics, and was linked with the local politics; or if it was related to the local politics and was linked to the international politics; or if it was economic news and linked with economics though it is of the political matters even if it is economic, or if it was related to Germany and linked with the German politics though it is of the matters related to America. Thus if the news was linked to other than what should be linked to, then error will occur definitely, if not even the deception and cheating. Therefore, linking the news with what it is related to is of extreme importance. This linkage should be on its right manner, i.e. it is a linkage for the purpose of understanding and comprehension, not for the sake of knowledge only. In other words, it is a linkage for the sake of action and not for knowledge.

These five matters have to be all fulfilled for the thinking in the political texts to occur, i.e. until the political thinking results. It is not correct to say these are many and difficult, and not easy to achieve them. This is because the presence of these matters is not difficult, for what is meant by that is only the general familiarisation and not the comprehensive knowledge. This knowledge develops and grows with time and not at once, and it results from the follow up and not, however, through study and scientific research. Indeed the study with scientific research gives more backing to the capability, but it is not necessary in political thinking, nor for the politician, for it is complementary and secondary. The most important of all of this is the follow up, once the follow up exists the other four elements will exist naturally. The origin of the political thinking is the follow up, and once this existed the political thinking will exist naturally.

Accordingly, the political thinking, despite its difficulty and high level, is within man's capacity, regardless of his thinking and his mind. So whether it is the ordinary, the distinguished, or the genius, each of them is capable to think politically and become a politician. This is because he does not require a specific degree of intellect, or a particular degree of knowledge. Rather he needs to follow up the current incidents and events, i.e. to follow up the news. Once this follow up existed, the political thinking existed. However it is not proper to have an interrupted follow up, rather it must be continuous, since the current incidents and events represent a continuous chain. Once one of its rings was broken

the chain will be broken, and the person becomes incapable to link the news and understand it. Therefore it is necessary to have an unbroken chain in order to have political thinking, i.e. the continuous follow up is a fundamental condition in the political thinking.

Political thinking is not specific to the individuals; it rather exists in the groups as in the individuals. In other words, it exists in the people and nations. Thus, it is not like the literary thinking, or the legislative thinking, which is only realised in the individuals, and not in the people, thus it is individualistic. Rather the political thinking is individualistic and collective. It exists in the individuals as well as in the groups, so it exists in the people and nations and also in the individuals in terms of rulers and politicians. Rather, it is not enough to exist in the individuals, but it must exist in the people and nations. Without its presence in the people and nations, the good ruling will not exist, nor would the revival result; and beside that the people and nations would not be suitable for conveying the messages. Therefore it is necessary that political thinking exists in the people and the nation. This is because ruling is only for the people and the nation and it is latent in them. No power can take it unless the people and nation gave it. If it is taken by force from the ummah, it would be only for a period of time, then either she gives it and continues, or she insists on restoring it, so the ruling will be overthrown. Since the ruling is for the people and the nation (or it is latent in them) then this people or nation must have political thinking. Therefore political thinking is necessary for the *ummah* before the rulers, and it is necessary for the correctness of the ruling more than it is necessary for establishing the ruling. Thus the *ummah* or the people must be cultured politically and must have political thinking. In other words she must be provided with the political information and news and her listening to the political news must be promoted. This should be done in a natural, rather than artificial manner, and through providing her with the correct political culture and the right news, so that she does not fall prey to misinformation. Hence, politics and political thinking is what creates life in the people or the nation. In other words the *ummah* lives by politics, and without politics she would be a dead body that has no activity or development. However the error in understanding politics, and the falsehood that results from understanding politics, only result from thinking about the political texts in the same mode as the literary, intellectual and legislative texts. Thus thinking about the words and

phrases occurs, for example, and so the words and phrases are understood as they are. Or thinking occurs about the meanings contained in these words and phrases and thus the meanings are understood as they are. Or thinking occurs regarding the indications of these words and phrases, and thus these indications are understood. In this manner of thinking error or deception occurs. This is because thinking in the political texts differs completely from thinking in any other type of texts. This is because the danger and error in the political thinking only result from the lack of differentiation between the political texts and the other types of texts. For the meanings of the political texts might exist in the texts, or in other than the texts. They might also exist in the wording of the words and phrases, such as the treaties and the official statements. They might also exist in the meanings and not in the wording. They might also be in the indications and not in the meaning or the words. They might also be beyond the meanings, and the words and the indications. They might even be different to all of that or unlike the texts completely. If what the political text means is not understood from what is contained in the text or from outside of it, then the text will not be understood by any means, and thus the error or deception in the thinking about the political text occurs.

Of the most dangerous matters in the political thinking are its detachment, its generalisation and using comprehensive analogy in it, since the political text is not detached from its circumstances by any means, because they are a part of it. It is also not correct in any way for it to be generalised. Comprehensive analogy, even the analogy itself should not be used in it. In addition to the fact that the circumstances are part of the text, it is a text on a specific incident. So the text should be taken to that incident only, and should not be generalised to cover others; neither should there be analogy to it, either a comprehensive or real analogy. Rather it should be considered for that incident only. Therefore, the detachment (from the circumstances), generalisation and analogy (whether the comprehensive one or the true one) all create the danger of error and danger of falsehood in the political thinking. So an official might give a statement that indicates something, and then give the same statement that indicates something different or even contradictory. An official might give a statement about a true matter, i.e. an honest statement, but it may be understood to be a false statement that is meant to deceive. He might give a false statement, but it is understood to be an

honest statement that aims at what is meant of it. The falsehood in such a statement is that it was given to conceal (the truth) through falsehood. An action might be undertaken in accordance with the statement, or an action might be undertaken different to the text, and so on. Thus it is the circumstances and surroundings that throw light on the statement, thus revealing what is meant by it, and not the political text itself. Therefore, with the political text it is not possible to be close to the truth except in this way, i.e. unless the circumstances are made an indivisible part of the text or the action, and unless every incident was considered by itself, removed from generalisation and analogy.

The Islamic *ummah* has suffered many hardships and tragedies because of bad political thinking. The Ottoman State, for example; when Europe attacked her in the Nineteenth century, it did that using the political actions more than the military actions. Though there were military actions, they were in support of the political actions. What they called, for example, the Balkan issue, was created by the Western states through declarations. So they declared that the Balkan states must be liberated from the Ottomans, i.e. from the Muslims. They did not mean by that fighting against the Ottoman State, they rather relied on creating troubles and disturbances in the Balkans. So they brought forth the idea of nationalism and liberation. Thus, the peoples of the Balkans adopted this idea and started uprisings. The Ottoman State used to carry out military operations against these uprisings taking into account the situation of the other states, and tried to appease the other states, though these states are the ones who supported these uprisings, deceived the Ottomans and made them occupy themselves with the uprisings; so that their preoccupation exhausts their energies rather than finishes these uprisings. Thus the error and deception of the Ottoman State in the political thinking resulted in the loss of the Balkans. The idea of nationalism chased her inside her land till it destroyed her completely.

This is different to Russia or the Soviet Union. It fell down with the same problem in Eastern Europe during the fifties, where America called for the liberation of East Europe from the Communism. She started to call for the liberation and to support these states and people both secretly and openly. However, Russia did not take the same position as the Ottomans, and it knew this idea of liberation is an attack against Russia or the Soviet Union, therefore it did not enter into a truce with

America, rather it took her as the first enemy. So when the revolution in Poland broke out it crushed it and did not give it any chance of success. When Bulgaria rebelled, Russia crushed it without any mercy. It also strengthened its iron fist on East Europe. It prepared itself also to fight against America if she moved to support East Europe, whether secretly or openly. This led to the horrible failure of America, to the point that America was obliged (after her failure and her realisation of the political position and political understanding of Russia) to give up the idea of the fight against communism and of weakening Russia, and instead conclude treaties with Russia and coexist with it. All of this did not result from the power of Russia, rather from the correct political thinking of the Soviet Union.

Another example was when America saw that Israel (which she established as a state) was about to escape from her, and England was about to change what is called the state of Israel into another entity called Palestine. When America noticed that happening at the end of the sixties, it called the problem of Palestine by the name, "the problem of the Middle East". She started to undertake the political actions that enable her alone to have command over the problem. She started to use the term "peace" and the concept of solving the problem as a means to complicate it. Thus she continued in the political deception until both the Arabs and Jews fell to her will. She also started to use the styles of deceit and distortion until she exhausted the powers of both the Arabs and the Jews. Then she did not turn to solve the problem but to transfer the region from the state of disturbance - which she called a state of war - to a state of relative calm, which she called a state of peace. All of this so as to be able, quietly and slowly, to establish the region in the form she drew for it. This is in order to throw the English out from the region completely and to have alone the control and influence on the whole region, through strengthening the so-called state of Israel. Thus what is called the Middle East problem is like the Balkan problem. The same way the Ottomans and the people of South Europe fell into the trap because of political deception, the Arabs and Jews fell into the same trap. Unless the Muslims today have political thinking, to understand the problem of the Middle East (as Russia understood the problem of East Europe) then the future of the Middle East will be exactly the same as the destiny of the Balkans.

So the bad political thinking is the matter that destroys the people and nations. It is the one which destroys the states or weakness them. It is the one that prevents the oppressed people from freeing themselves from the control of colonialism. It is the one that prevents the nations from revival. Therefore, thinking about the political texts is of considerable importance, and its results are either horrible or great, and the dangers of mistakes and error are destructive. Accordingly, it is necessary to have extraordinary care in the political thinking that exceeds the attention to any other thinking. This is because it is as vital to the people as life is.

The political thinking, though it is the most difficult and highest type of thinking, it is not enough for it to be the thinking of individuals only. This is because the individuals are of no value, however great their number might be, and whatever the soundness and genius of their thinking might be. For if the deception in the political thinking gained power over the people or the nation, then the genius of the individuals would not avail it; and the ingenious people in political thinking would have no value, whatever was their number. This is because if deception gained power over the people or the nation, its power will sweep over everything, and the people or the nation will fall prey to this deception. Then the nation, including its ingenious individuals, will easily become swallowed by the enemies. The success of Mustapha Kamal in destroying the Islamic State and demolishing the Khilafah in the beginnings of the twentieth century C.E., and the success of Jamal Abdun Naser in the fifties and the sixties of the 20th century in standing as an obstacle against the liberation of Arabs, where they were ready for liberation after the second world war; these are live examples which show that when the bad political thinking dominates the people and nations, then the genius of the ingenious people would be of no use towards it, as long as they were individuals, even if they numbered thousands.

Therefore bad political thinking does not represent danger for the individuals, it rather represents danger for people and nations. That is why it is necessary to pay attention to the political thinking of the people and nations; an attention that takes priority over everything. It is true that if the political thinking existed among the individuals and developed in the right course, it is possible, through them, for the political thinking that counters the enemies and reveals their deception, to exist. However, this is only possible if the thinking of these individuals was conveyed to

the people or nations, and it became the same amongst the nations as it is with the individuals, and was transferred so as to become the thinking of the *ummah* and not the thinking of individuals. In such a situation these individuals become part of the *ummah* and not just individuals, and the whole *ummah* becomes a thinking ummah, and not just the individuals from it. Unless the individuals' thinking became the collective thinking, and the thinking of the individuals' became the thinking of an *ummah* and not just the thinking of individuals, then there is no value for this thinking and no value for these individuals. The political thinking of the individuals would not be strong in a way to counter the enemies and their deception, however great was the number of the individuals, and whatever the height of their genius. The only thing that would counter them is the thinking of the people and nations, i.e. it is the political thinking that exists in the people and nations.

It is true that the ingenious individuals are ordinary people, like the rest of the people. They are not distinguished in their human nature from any ordinary person. The people look at these individuals in an ordinary way, for their genius is not touched and neither is it felt. Therefore, when their genius is first utilised and they start to produce [things], at the beginning no superiority or genius is noticed in their production. This is because if they were educated, there are many educated people like them. If they were intelligent, there are many intelligent people like them. If their thoughts draw attention, then this only occurs from other individuals, who attend to their thought so as to be like them, or in order that this thinking helps them to elevate their status in their society or in their field. They may use this thinking as a means to achieve personal aims or selfish objectives. If this thinking remained like that and did not move to the communities, then it will remain an individual thinking, however great the number of the individuals with this thinking were, even if it was a unique thinking accepted by everyone who started it or knew it. Therefore, in order that this thinking becomes useful, and becomes able to counter the enemies, it must be transferred to being a collective thinking, and must come out of the shell of individualism and the cocoon of isolation. Once it transferred to a collective thinking, and was conveyed to the people or the ummah, then the power that counters the enemies would have existed, and the strong seed that would produce the tree of revival would have existed as well.

This is the useful political thinking; that is the collective rather than the individualistic thinking. In other words, it is the thinking of the people and the nation and not the thinking of the individuals, even if they were ingenious. Therefore it is necessary to provide the *ummah* with the political culture, and train and teach the *ummah* to practice political thinking, so that the political thinking becomes the thinking of the *ummah* and not the thinking of the individuals.

This is political thinking. It is thinking about the political sciences and political studies. It is also thinking about the political incidents and political events. The first (type of) thinking is of no value and it is no more than knowledge of the thoughts, while the political (second type of) thinking is the one that benefits, and it is the one which has a splendid effect and great influence. It is allowed to have political thinking about the political sciences and the political studies and it has benefits for the individual scholars in politics. However, thinking about the incidents and events is a collective duty in the *ummah*. There must be an endeavour to create it in the *ummah*, particularly in those who had such thinking, whether they were of the educated or the uneducated people.

Thereupon:

This is a short brief about the subject of thinking, in its capacity as thinking. We present it to the Islamic *ummah*, hoping that its study might produce thinking in this *ummah*, so that this thinking makes it return to being the best *ummah* brought out to mankind. This is particularly after ten centuries have passed with the *ummah* being far away from thinking, though she attempted thinking many times.

The Islamic *ummah* suffered in the fourth *Hijri* century from scholars who worked to suspend the thinking in the *ummah*, and they announced the danger of thinking on the *ummah* and its harm upon Islam and Muslims. This happened when a band of scholars, like the famous scholar called al-Qaffal called for the suspending of the *Ijtihad*, and they worked to prevent *Ijtihad*. The Muslims believed this call and acted upon it. Thus the scholars refrained from making *ijtihad* and the thinkers were scared of doing *Ijtihad*; beside that the people hated the presence of *Mujtahideen*. The public opinion in all the lands of Islam adopted that view, and thus thinking was suspended and the people were satisfied with *Taqleed* only, and abolished thinking and they no longer dared to

make *Ijtihad*. This prevention of *ijtihad* and thinking mentioned above was only in Islam. This led to the people suspending thinking, and they enjoyed this suspension of thinking, particularly since man by his nature is a lazy being. That is why the *ummah* stopped thinking up until this century, the fourteenth *Hijri* century. Thus, the *ummah* was stripped of ten centuries while she suspended thinking. Therefore, it is not easy for an *ummah* that was stripped of ten centuries of her life (in which she was stripped of thinking) for thinking to be generated in her and for her to understand with awareness the value of thinking and the value of thinkers. So, even having millions similar to this book, does not guarantee the mobilisation of the *ummah* towards thinking, and drive her to make thinking one of her characteristics. However, the painful incidents which bruise the *ummah* badly and crush her severely, started to awaken the hope that thinking finds its way in the *ummah*. Particularly after the presence amongst her of groups that think and groups that attempt to think, and after thousands in whom the love of thinking was embodied existed amongst her; and they became thinkers, who do not enjoy other than thinking until they became a thinking which lives, moves and grows. Therefore, the enormity and atrocity of the incidents, and the fact that thinking is embodied in a person until it became a thinking that walks in the markets amongst the people. These two matters bring a shining hope that the thinking in the individuals transfers to the groups, and becomes a collective rather than individualistic thinking, and becomes the thinking of the *ummah* and not just the thinking of the individuals. Thus the Islamic *ummah* becomes a thinking *ummah* and returns back to become the best *ummah* brought forward to mankind.

8 Safar 1393 AH
12 March 1973 CE