Muhammad Muhammad Ismail

Assistant Professor in the Egyptian University

الفِكر الإسلاميّ

The Islamic Thought

(Translation from Arabic and Reviewed Rabi' al-Awwal 1448 AH - August 2026 CE)

1377 AH, 1958 CE

Printing Rights Reserved

for the Office of Al-Waie Magazine in Beirut

The Islamic Thought

(Translation from Arabic and Reviewed Rabi' al-Awwal 1448 AH - August 2026 CE)

1377 AH, 1958 CE

Printing Rights Reserved

for the Office of Al-Waie Magazine

Beirut

Contents

Foreword **6**

Islam Is a Specific Way of Living **7**

The Existence of Allah ﷻ Is a Sensed Reality, Not an Imagined Idea **10**

Ideology (مبدأ al-Mabda') **13**

Criterion of Actions (مقياس الأعمال Miqyas ul- a'mal) **16**

Religiousness Is an Instinct **18**

The Shariah Obligation of Sufficiency (الفرض على الكفاية) Is an Obligation on Every Muslim **21**

La Ilaha Illa Allah (لا إله إلاّ الله) Means: There is None Worshipped (Ma'bood) But Allah ﷻ **24**

Rizq Is in the Hand of Allah ﷻ Alone **30**

Abiding (تَقَيُّد Taqayyud) by the Shariah Rulings Is Obliged by Iman in Islam **34**

Death Does Not Occur Except With the End of the Lifespan (Intihaa' ul-Ajl) **37**

Jihad Is a Shariah Obligation Upon All Muslims **41**

The Five Shariah Rulings (الأحكام الخمسة Al-Ahkam al-Khamsah) **46**

The Opinion Deduced by the Mujtahid Is a Shariah Ruling **51**

The Origin Regarding Actions Is Abiding to the Shariah Rulings (الأصل في الأفعال التقيّد بأحكام الشرع), But Neither Permission nor Prohibition in Origin **55**

The Origin Regarding Objects Is Permission (الأصل في الأشياء الإباحة) **60**

It Is Not Permissible for the Rules to Change with the Change of Time and Place **66**

The Command and the Form of the Imperative Verb (Seeghatul F'il il-Amr) **69**

Wherever the Shariah Is, There Is the Interest (مصلحة Maslahah) 74

The Shariah Rulings of Worship are Strictly Ordained (توقيفية Tawqifiyyah) From Allah ﷻ 77

Thought (الفكر Al-Fikr) 81

The Method of Thinking 85

Fatalism Within the Unseen 89

The Concepts of Islam Are Regulators for Man's Behavior in Life 92

Punishments in Islam 95

Instinctive Discrimination 101

Fear 105

The Reality and the Concept Are What Provoke the Instincts .. 108

Islam Is Concepts for Life and Not Merely Information 111

Personality 115

The Islamic Personality 120

Supplication (دعاء Du'aa') in Islam 123

The Meaning of Sanctification 127

The Infallibility (عصمة 'Ismah) of the Messenger ﷺ 131

It Is Not Permissible Regarding the Messenger ﷺ to Be a Mujtahid 136

Psychology, Sociology, and Educational Sciences 143

The Scientific Method and the Intellectual Method 150

Political Awareness (الوعي السياسي) 156

Spiritual Power Is the Most Influential of Strengths 162

The Intellectual Style and the Literary Style 166

Foreword

Learning about Islamic culture is a Shariah obligation upon Muslims, whether it be learning the Shariah texts themselves or the means to understand and apply them. There is no difference between learning about Shariah rulings and learning about Islamic thought.

However, it is regrettable that since the West invaded Muslim lands with its culture and civilization, imposing its laws, concepts, and authority, Muslims have turned away from Islamic culture. This is a result of the decline of Islam's influence and a deviation from sound judgment due to the misleading propaganda campaigns waged against Islam and its culture.

I felt compelled to publish some of this Islamic culture, hoping that people, both Muslims and non-Muslims, will find in it something to enlighten their minds, refine their tastes, and address some of the intellectual decline that pervades this region.

I ask Allah ﷻ to grant Muslims success in fulfilling what He has obligated them to do: to learn about Islam, to carry its Risaalah message, and to spread its culture. Indeed, Allah ﷻ is the All-Hearing, the Responsive.

Muhammad Muhammad Ismail Abduh

Islam Is a Specific Way of Living

Islam is a specific mode of living that is completely distinguished from everything else. It obliges upon Muslims a certain living that has a specific and constant course that does not change or transform. It dictates upon them to comply by this specific mode in such a way that they do not feel tranquility, both intellectually and emotionally, and nor do they feel happiness except with this mode.

Islam came as a collection of concepts about life. It came as general guidelines, i.e, general imports that treat all man's problems in life, where the solution of every problem that occurs to man is actually derived from them. It made all of that based on an intellectual basis (قاعد فكرية qaa'idah fikriyyah); under which all the thoughts about life are included; and it is used as a criterion (مقياس miqyaas) upon which every detailed thought is measured. It also made the rules, in terms of solutions, thoughts and opinions, which emanate from the 'aqeedah which are derived from the general guidelines.

It determined the thoughts for man, but it did not restrict his mind; it instead freed it.

It restricted his behaviour in life with particular thoughts, but it did not restrict man; it rather freed him.

Thus, the view of the Muslim towards the worldly life became that of promising hope, a realistic seriousness and a view that values life with its true measure, in terms that it must be earned and that it is not an objective, nor is it proper to be an objective. So, the Muslim strives in the walks of life, strives for the provision (رزق rizq) of Allah ﷻ, and enjoys the ornaments of Allah ﷻ that He provided to His servants and also the good forms of rizq. However, he realises that the dunya is temporary, while the akhirah is the abode of eternity.

Shariah rulings came to treat for man the matters of trade as well as the matters of Salah, in a particular way. They also treat the problems of marriage as well as the matters of charity, in a specific way. They demonstrate the matter of property ownership and the matter of its expense, in a certain way. They also detail the Dua supplications and worships, and explain the legal punishments (hudood), assault offences (jinaayaat) and the various punishments (‘uqoobaat); as well as they explain the chastisement of hell (jahannum) and the felicity of paradise (jannah). They guide man to the form of ruling governance and its method, in a specific fashion. They also direct him to the personal aspiration to apply the rules in quest of the pleasure of Allah ﷻ. They direct him to the relationship of the state with the rest of the states, peoples and nations, as they direct him to carry the da’wah to mankind. They oblige him to acquire the elevated attributes, as Shariah rulings (أحكام ahkaam) coming from Allah ﷻ, and not as good attributes among people.

Thus, Islam came to regulate all man’s relationships with himself and with people in the same way it regulates his relationship with Allah ﷻ; all of that in the same system of thought and treatment. Man, thus, became obliged to proceed in this worldly life by a specific motivation, in a specific and determined path and for a defined and designated goal.

Islam obliges people to restrict themselves to this path alone exclusively. It warned them of painful chastisement in the akhirah, as well as of strict punishment in the dunya; where one of these two will inevitably fall on them if they deviated from this path, even a hair breadth.

Accordingly, the Muslim comes to proceed in this life in a particular way, and live in a certain way, within a specific mode by virtue of his embracement of the ‘aqeedah of Islam, and the obligation of his obedience to the commands and prohibitions of Allah ﷻ that restrict him with the rules of Islam.

This specific type of living within a particular understanding of life and specific conduct in a defined path, is inevitably imposed upon every Muslim and all Muslims.

Islam mentioned that explicitly and clearly in the Book and in the Sunnah, in both the Islamic ‘aqeedah and the Islamic Shariah rulings.

Hence Islam is not a spiritual Deen (religion) only nor theological or priestly concepts. It is instead a particular way of life, which every Muslim, and all Muslims, must have their life be in accordance with this alone.

Allah ﷻ is a truth whose existence is perceived and not an idea imagined by the mind.

The Existence of Allah ﷻ Is a Sensed Reality, Not an Imagined Idea

Many people on the face of the earth, particularly in the West, have conviction in Allah ﷻ and believe in Him. However, their conviction and belief are based on the fact that Allah ﷻ is a thought and not a truth.

Such people consider the belief in the existence of a god is a belief in the existence of the idea of a deity, an idea which they say is good. This is because, as long as man imagines it and believes in it, and submits to its power, then he alienates himself from evil and gets close to goodness by the incentive of this idea. It is thus an internal deterrent that has more influence than the external deterrent. That is why they advocate that man must believe in Allah ﷻ and they view the necessity of encouraging this belief, so that people remain righteous and motivated, which they call 'the religious restraint'.

Such people are easy to be drawn to atheism, and close to apostate from their belief once the mind indulged in thinking to perceive the existence of this idea. If man did not perceive its presence and did not realise an effect for this presence, he would deny the existence of a god and thus disbelieve in Allah ﷻ. Moreover, for such people, belief in God is an idea and not a truth, which makes goodness also just an idea and not a truth, and makes evil also just an idea and not a truth. What led these people to this type of faith is that they did not use the mind ('aql) to reach belief (إيمان Iman) in Allah ﷻ, nor were they guided to rationally solve the greatest problem that results from the natural questions about the universe, man and life, about what is before the worldly life and what is after it, and its relationship with what is before it and what is after it. The solution was instead taught to them according to the desires and whims of their instructor, so they accepted this solution and

continued to believe in it without having real perception of the existence of that which they believed in. Many of them tried to use their mind, but they were answered that the religion is beyond the mind and forced into silence.

That which is right is that Allah ﷻ is a truth and not an idea; and that evidence of His ﷻ existence is sensed and conceived, though His ﷻ Essence (ذات Dhaat) is impossible to be realised. Don't you see that man can hear the sound of the plane in the sky without seeing it because he sits inside his room? However, he realises its existence from sensing its sound though he did not see it, and did not sense its essence. Thus, he believes in the presence of a plane in the sky from hearing its sound. In other words, he believes, certainly and definitely, in the existence of the plane. Thus, comprehending the existence of the plane is a matter different to comprehending its essence. Comprehension of its entity does not happen because of the absence of the senses of its essence; while the comprehension of its existence is definite from the sensation of its sound. So, the existence of the plane is a truth and not only an idea.

This is the case of the comprehended and sensed objects. Their existence is definite for they are observed and sensed. Their need for other than them is also definite, because it is observed and sensed. The celestial bodies are in need for the system; and the fire is in need for the one who uses it in order to burn. This is the case of every comprehended and sensed thing in being in need of other than itself. The needy object can't be eternal, for if it was eternal it would have not needed for other than itself. The fact that it is needy and dependent means that it is not eternal (أزلي azali). Therefore, the fact that all the comprehended and sensed things are created is definite. This is because that which is not eternal means it is created by a Creator. The sensation of these created things, as well as the sensation of the sound of the plane, is definite. Similarly, the existence of the Creator of these created objects from which

they come is like the existence of the plane from which the sound came; it is a definite matter. Thus, the existence of the Creator of these created objects is a definite matter. Accordingly, man comprehended the created objects through his sensation and mind; and he comprehended from his sensation of them the existence of their Creator, definitely. Thus, the existence of the Creator is a truth which man has touched its existence through sensation; and it is not an idea which man imagined in his mind.

Rationally, this Creator must be eternal. Had it not been eternal, then it would be dependent; thus it would be created. Since nature is not eternal, because it is in need to function in accordance with specific determined proportioned ratios and situational circumstances, it must be bound by them, then it is in need of these ratios and circumstances. Since matter is also not eternal, because it is dependent, for it can't transform from one state to another except through a specific proportion and specific ratios; and it is bound by these ratios and this proportion. Thus, it is needy. Accordingly, nature is not the creator, for it is not eternal and pre-existent; and matter is also not the creator, for it is not eternal and pre-existent. It thus only remains that the Creator is Allah ﷻ. In other words, the Creator is that eternal (azali) and pre-existent (قديم qadeem) entity which people call Allah or God or Ilaheen or the like of names which all indicate one designated entity, that is Allah ﷻ, the eternal and pre-existent Creator.

Ideology (مبدأ al-Mabda’)

Mabda’ (مبدأ ideology), linguistically is a verbal noun (masdar) beginning with ‘m’ (meem), and derived from the verb bada’a (started), yabda’ (starts), bada’nn (starting) and mabda’ (starting point, principle). According to the terminological use of all people, mabda’ means the basic thought (fikr) upon which thoughts are built. So, a person might say: mabda’i huwas sidq (my ideology is truthfulness), where he means that the basis upon which I build my actions is the truthfulness (sidq). Another person might say: mabda’i huwal wafaa’ (my ideology is faithfulness), where he means that the basis upon which he builds his transactions is the faithfulness. Thus, people also called mabd’a on partial thoughts that are suitable for other partial thoughts as basic thoughts. So, they called truthfulness (sidq) as mabda’, good neighborliness (husnul juwar) as mabda’ and cooperation (ta’awun) as mabda’. Based on that they spoke of mabadi’ul- Akhlaaq (morals), mabadi’ul-iqtisaad (principles of economy), mabadi’ul-qanoon (principles of law) and social principles) etc. They meant by that particular thoughts of economy upon which other thoughts that are derived from them are built; and particular thoughts of law upon which other thoughts which are derived from them are built. So, they called such particular thoughts as economic ideologies and legal ideologies, and so on. In truth, these are not ideologies (mabaadi’ – pl. of mabda’); they are rather general principles (qawa’id) or thoughts (afkar). This is because mabda’ is a basic foundational thought, while these are not basic thoughts; they are instead partial thoughts (afkar far’iyyah). The fact that other thoughts are built on them does not make them at all, basic foundational thoughts. They rather remain to be partial thoughts (afkar far’iyyah), even if other thoughts were built on them or were derived from them, as long as they themselves were not basic and foundational (asassiyyah). Instead they are derived

from other thoughts, or all of them are derived from a basic thought (fikr asaasi).

Truthfulness, faithfulness, cooperation and others are partial thoughts (afkar far'iyyah) and not basic foundational thoughts (afkar asassiyyah). This is because they are derived from a basic thought, rather than being themselves the basis (al-asas), for truthfulness (sidq) is a branch of a basis; it is a hukum shar'i derived from the Quran, for Muslims; and it is a nice and beneficial characteristic derived from the capitalist thought for the non-Muslims.

Therefore, a thought is not called mabda' unless it is a foundational thought from which thoughts are derived. The basic thought (al-fikr ul-asasi) is that which there is not at all, a thought before it. This foundational thought is confined to the collective thought (al-fikrah al-kulliyyah) about the universe, man and life. There is no basic thought other than this. This is because this thought is the basis in worldly life. If man contemplated himself he finds himself a man that lives in the universe. So unless he has a thought about himself, life and the universe in terms of existence and creation, he would not be able to provide a thought suitable to be a basis for his life. Therefore, his life remains functioning without a basis, unstable, whimsical and changeable unless this basic foundational thought exists, i.e. unless the collective thought about himself, about the life and about the universe exists.

Therefore, the collective thought about the universe, man and life is the basic foundational thought, and it is the 'aqeedah. However, thoughts can't emanate from this 'aqeedah nor be built on it, unless it is itself a thought, that is, unless it was the result of intellectual study and discussion. If, otherwise, it was only submission and instruction, then it would not be a thought, nor called a collective thought, though it is correct to be called 'aqeedah. Therefore, man must reach to the collective thought

through the mind (‘aql), that is, it should result from rational study. It would be then a rational creed, and thoughts would then be derived from it and built on it. Such thoughts are the solutions for the worldly life problems. In other words, these thoughts are the rules (ahkaam) that regulate the life affairs of man. Once this rational creed exists, and rules (ahkaam) that treat the life’s problems emanate from it, then the ideology (mabda’) exists. Accordingly, the ideology is defined as a rational creed from which a system emanates. Thereupon, Islam is an ideology, because it is a rational creed with Shariah rulings, which treat the problems of life. Likewise, Communism is an ideology, because it is a rational creed from which a system emanates. This system is the thoughts that treat the problems of life. Capitalism is also an ideology, because it is a rational creed, upon which thoughts, that treat life’s problems, are built. Hence, it is also apparent that nationalism (qawmi’yyah) is not an ideology, nor patriotism (watani’yyah), Nazism or Existentialism (wujoodiyyah). This is because each one of them is not a rational creed, nor is there a system that emanates from it or any thoughts, that treat the problems of life, which are built on it.

As for the Deen, if its creed was rationally reached through the mind and from which a system, that treats life’s problems, emanates or thoughts are built on it, then such a religion is an ideology, upon which the definition of ideology applies. However, if its creed was not rational, and instead it was emotional that has been given through instruction and acceptance of it was requested without the mind’s discussion; and there was no system that emanates from it, nor are there thoughts built on it; then all religions of that type are not an ideology. This is because their creed is not rational, nor do life’s systems emanate from it.

Criterion of Actions (مقياس الأعمال Miqyas ul-a'mal)

Many people proceed in life aimlessly, so they undertake their actions without a criterion to which they measure. Therefore, you see them undertake evil actions they think of them as good. They abstain from undertaking good actions they think of them as evil. The Muslim woman that walks in the streets of the main Islamic cities, such as Beirut, Damascus, Cairo and Baghdad, while uncovering her legs, and showing her beauty and charms, thinking that she undertakes a good action. Similarly, the righteous person who adheres to the masajid abstains from talking about the corrupt actions of the rulers, because this is politics, and he thinks talking about politics is evil. Such a woman and such a man had fallen in sin. She uncovered her 'awrah, and he did not take care of the affairs of the Muslims. This is because they did not take for themselves a criterion to which they measure their actions. Had they taken a criterion, then they would not have such contradiction of their actions with the ideology that they openly declare to embrace. Therefore, it is necessary that man has a criterion to which he measures his actions, so as to know the reality of the action before he undertakes it.

Islam assigned for man a criterion to which he measures his actions, so he knows which of them is evil and which is good. He then abstains from the evil action and performs the good action. This criterion is the Shariah only. Thus, what the Shariah considers as good action is good, and what it considers as evil action is evil. This criterion is constant, so the good would not become evil, and nor the evil would become good. Instead, what the Shariah views as good remains good, and what the Shariah views as evil remains evil.

Thus, man would proceed in a straight path and with awareness, so he understands the matters as they are. This is different to the case if he did not make the Shariah criterion for good and evil, rather he made the mind a criterion for himself. In such case, he would proceed haphazardly, because a matter becomes good in a certain situation and evil in another, for the mind might see the thing itself good today and evil tomorrow. He might see it good in one country and evil in another. Thus, his judgement on things becomes unstable; and the good and evil become relative and not real. Then he would fall in the predicament of undertaking the evil action while thinking it is good; and abstaining from the good while thinking it is evil.

Therefore, reference must be made to Shariah, and it must be taken as a criterion for all actions, and to make good that which Shariah views as good, and to make evil that which Shariah views as evil.

Religiousness Is an Instinct

There is a vital energy in man that drives him to undertake actions and requires satisfaction. This vital energy has two aspects: one of them requires inevitable satisfaction, and man would die if it were not satisfied. This represents the organic needs, such as eating, drinking and response to nature's call. The second aspect requires satisfaction, but man does not die because of not satisfying it, though he would be worried until he satisfies it; and this is the instincts, whose action would be through a natural feeling that outbursts requiring satisfaction. However, the instincts are different to the organic needs in terms of agitation. This is because the organic needs are agitated from inside while what agitates the instincts or shows the feeling of need for satisfaction is either thoughts about what incites the emotions come to mind, or it is a tangible reality that makes the emotions requiring satisfaction. The procreation instinct (ghareezat-un-naw'), for example, is agitated by thinking of a beautiful woman, or of anything related to sex, or by seeing a beautiful woman or anything related to sex. If none of that happened, then nothing would occur to agitate the instinct. Similarly, the religiousness instinct (ghareezat-ut-tadayyun) is agitated by thinking about the verses (aayaat) of Allah ﷻ about the Day of Judgment or what is related to that, or by the contemplation about the perfect creation of Allah ﷻ within the heavens and the earth or what is related to that. Thus, the effects of the instinct appear when there is something of that which agitates it. We do not see such effects in case of the absence of what agitates it, or in case of transferring what agitates it from agitation by misinterpreting it in a way that makes the person lose the concept of its characteristic that incites the instinct.

The religiousness instinct is natural and constant, for it is the feeling of need to the Creator and the Sustainer, regardless

of the interpretation of that Creator and Sustainer. This feeling is innate in man as a man, whether he believes in the existence of the Creator or he disbelieves in Him, but believes in the matter or the nature. The presence of this feeling in man is inevitable, because it is created in a man as part of his creation; and it is not possible to be secluded nor detached from him. This is the reality of religiousness.

The manifestation of this religiousness is sanctification (taqdees) of what is believed to be the Creator and Sustainer or what is conceived that the Creator and Sustainer incarnated in it. Sanctification could appear in its true manifestation, so it is called worship (‘ibadah). It might also appear in a lower form, which is reverence and glorification.

Sanctification is the ultimate emotional respect. It does not result from fear, rather from religiousness. This is because the manifestation of fear is not sanctification, but it is rather flattering, escape or defence; all of that contradict the reality of sanctification. Thus, sanctification is a manifestation of religiousness and not of fear. Therefore, religiousness is an instinct independent of the survival instinct, of which fear is one of its manifestations. That is why man is religious, and we find him worshiping something since Allah ﷻ brought him on the face of the earth. He worshipped the sun, planets, fire and idols. He also worshipped Allah. We do not find in any age, nation or people, except that he worships something. Even the peoples, whom the authority forced to abandon religiousness, were religious and worshipping something, despite the force imposed upon them. They suffered a great deal of harm in pursuit of performing their worship. There is no force that can strip religiousness from man, remove from him the sanctification of the Creator and prevent him from worship. It can rather suppress that for a time. This is because worship is a manifestation of religiousness, which is a natural instinct in man.

As regards to what appears within some atheists in terms of absence of worship or mockery of worship, the religiousness instinct in such people has been turned away from worshipping Allah ﷻ to worshipping the creatures. Its manifestation has been thus made in sanctification of the nature, heroic gigantic things and the like. To achieve this distraction, distortion and erroneous explanation of matters have been used.

Therefore, kufr (كفر disbelief) is more difficult than Iman (إيمان belief), because it is distraction of man from his innate nature (فطرة fitrah) and transferring it from its true manifestations. This would require a great effort. How difficult it is for man to turn away from the dictates of his innate nature.

Therefore, we find that once the truth (حق haqq) is revealed to the atheists, and they sense the existence of Allah and thus realise His existence by mind in a decisive way, you find them rush to Iman and feel with comfort and tranquility; and a heavy nightmare that used to burden them would disappear. The Iman of such people would be strong and steadfast, for it came through sensation and certainty. This is because their mind was linked with their emotion, so they realised the existence of Allah ﷻ in certainty, and they had certain feeling of his existence. Thus, their innate nature (fitrah) met with their mind, thus producing strong Iman.

The Shariah Obligation of Sufficiency (الفرض على الكفاية) Is an Obligation on Every Muslim

Al-Fard (فرض Shariah obligation) is (خطاب الشارع المتعلق بطلب الفعل طلباً جازماً) "the address of the Legislator related to the request (talab) of an action as a decisive (jaazim) request." This is like His saying,

﴿وَأَقِيمُواْ ٱلصَّلَوٰةَ﴾

"Establish the Salah" [TMQ Al-Baqarah:43] and,

﴿ٱنفِرُواْ خِفَافًا وَثِقَالاً وَجَٰهِدُواْ بِأَمۡوَٰلِكُمۡ وَأَنفُسِكُمۡ فِي سَبِيلِ ٱللَّهِ﴾

"Mobilize, lightly and heavily armed, and strive in the way of Allah" [TMQ At-Tawbah: 41].

It is also like his ﷺ saying, **«إِنَّمَا جُعِلَ الإِمَامُ لِيُؤْتَمَّ بِهِ» "The imam was made so that he is followed"** and **«وَمَنْ مَاتَ وَلَيْسَ فِي عُنُقِهِ بَيْعَةٌ مَاتَ مِيتَةً جَاهِلِيَّةً» "Whoever dies without having a pledge (bai'ah) on his neck, he dies the death of Jahiliyyah."** All of these Shariah texts are the address of the Legislator related to a decisive request to perform an action. What makes the request decisive is the contextualization (قرينة qareenah) that came connected with the request, thus making it decisive (جازم jaazim), so it must be performed. The obligation would not be abolished in any way unless the obliged action has been performed. The one who neglects the obligation deserves punishment for such negligence, and he continues to be sinful until he performs it. There is no difference (in this regard) between the individual obligation (فرض العين fard ul-'ayn) and collective obligation of sufficiency (الفرض على الكفاية al-fard 'alal kifayah). All of these are obligations upon all Muslims. The Saying of Allah,

﴿وَأَقِيمُواْ ٱلصَّلَوٰةَ﴾

"Establish the Salah" is an individual obligation (فرض عين fardu 'ayn). His saying,

﴿ٱنفِرُواْ خِفَافٗا وَثِقَالٗا وَجَٰهِدُواْ بِأَمۡوَٰلِكُمۡ وَأَنفُسِكُمۡ فِي سَبِيلِ ٱللَّهِ﴾

"Mobilize, lightly and heavily armed, and strive in the way of Allah" is a collective obligation of sufficiency (فرض كفاية fardu kifayah). Similarly, the saying of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ who said, «**إِنَّمَا جُعِلَ الإِمَامُ لِيُؤْتَمَّ بِهِ**» **"The imam was made so that he is followed"** is an individual obligation. While his ﷺ saying, «**وَمَنْ مَاتَ وَلَيْسَ فِي عُنُقِهِ بَيْعَةٌ مَاتَ مِيتَةً جَاهِلِيَّةً**» **"Whoever dies without having a pledge (bai'ah) on his neck, he dies the death of Jahiliyyah"** is the Legislator's address pertaining to the decisive request of performing an action. The misguided attempt to differentiate between the individual obligation and the collective obligation with regard to their obligation is sin in the view of Allah ﷻ, obstructing from the way of Allah and deception for the sake of neglecting the performance of the obligations of Allah ﷻ. With regard to abolishing the obligation from the one who is obliged to perform it, there is also no difference between the individual obligation and the collective obligation. The obligation is not abolished until the action requested by the Legislator has been performed, whether it was requested to be performed by every Muslim, such as the obligatory Salah, or it was requested to be performed by all the Muslims, such as the pledge (bay'ah) of the Khaleefah. Each one of them would not be abolished until the action is performed, i.e. until the prayer is performed, and the Khaleefah is established and the bay'ah is taken to him. Thus, the collective obligation is not abolished from any one of the Muslims, if some of them work to perform it, until it is performed. So, every Muslim, who does not work to perform this obligation, will remain sinful as long as carrying the action, to perform the obligation has not been completed.

Therefore, it is wrong to say that the collective obligation is that which if some of the Muslims undertook it, it would be abolished from the rest of the Muslims. Instead, collective obligation is that which if some of the Muslims completed it, it

would be abolished from the remaining Muslims. Its abolishment then would be real, for the requested action has been executed and completed, so there is no scope for it to remain. This is the collective obligation. It is the same as the individual obligation. Thereupon, establishing the Islamic State is an obligation upon all Muslims, i.e., upon every one of the Muslims. This obligation would not be abolished from any one of the Muslims, until the Islamic State exists. If some of the Muslims carry out the actions that establish the Islamic State, then the obligation will not be abolished from any Muslims as long as the Islamic State was not established. The obligation remains upon every Muslim, and the sin remains upon every Muslim until the Islamic State is established. The sin would not be abolished from any Muslim, until he pursues the actions that establish it, and continue on doing so till it is established. Similarly, Jihad against the French during their occupation of Algeria is an obligation upon all Muslims. If the people of Algeria undertook Jihad against the French, this does not abolish the obligation from any one of the Muslims, until the French are completely driven out of Algeria, and the victory of Muslims is achieved. This is the case of every collective obligation; thus it remains an obligation upon every Muslim, and it is not abolished until the requested action has been completed.

La Ilaha Illa Allah (لا إله إلاّ الله) Means: There is None Worshipped (Ma'bood) But Allah ﷻ

Since sanctification is natural in man, then man, by his innate nature, worships something. This is because sanctification is a natural response to religiousness. Therefore, when man performs 'ibadah (worship) he feels comfort and tranquility, because by performing the 'ibadah he would have satisfied the religiousness instinct. However, this 'ibadah must not be left to the emotion (وجدان wijdan) to determine the way it likes, nor the man to perform as he wishes. Instead, the mind should associate with the emotion in determining the entity that must be worshipped. This is because the emotion (wijdan) is subject to error and conducive to misguidance (dalaal). It is often that emotion (wijdan) drives man to worship things that must be destroyed. It is also often that it drives man to sanctify things that must be despised. If, thus, emotion (wijdan) was left alone to determine to man what he worships, this would lead to misguidance (dalaal) in worshipping other than the Creator, or to superstition manifested in seeking nearness to the Creator through matters that alienate from Him. This is because emotion (wijdan) is an instinctive sensation or an inner feeling that appears at the presence of a sensed reality, to which it responds; or it appears from thinking in what agitates that feeling. If man responded to that feeling once it occurred without thinking, then this might lead to misguidance (dalaal) or error. For example, you might see, at night, a ghost thinking it is an enemy to you. So the survival instinct is agitated in you through the manifestation of fear. If you responded to that feeling, and did the response that it requires, which is escape, for example, then this would be wrong to do. This is because you might flee from nothing. You might also flee from something, whilst resistance is the only good deed you have to do. Thus, the response you took was wrong. However, if you use your mind, and think of

the feeling that appeared in you before you make the response it requires, then it becomes clear to you what sort of action you have to undertake. It might appear to you that the ghost is an electricity post, a tree or an animal. The fear in you would then disappear and you continue your walk. It might also appear that it is a beast that you can't out run, so you refer to a trick by climbing a tree, or take refuge in a house, thus you save yourself. Therefore, man must not undertake the response required by the instinct except through the use of the mind. In other words, it is not allowed that he undertake actions based on the agitation of the emotion (wijdan) alone. Instead, it is necessary to use the mind and the emotion. Thereupon, sanctification must be built on thinking and not on emotion alone, because it is a response to the religiousness and not on emotion, because it is a response to the religiousness instinct. So, this response should not be made without thinking because it might lead to misguidance or error. Thus, it is necessary that man does not initiate this response to the religiousness instinct, except after thinking, that is, except through the use of mind. Therefore, it is not allowed to have worship except in accordance with what the mind directs to, so that this worship be to whom the innate nature (fitrah) guides to worship, that is the Creator and Sustainer, to Whom man feels the need to.

The mind necessitates that worship is only for the Creator, for He is the eternal (azali) and He is inevitably existent (واجب الوجودwajib-ul-wujood). So, worship must not be to other than Him. It is He Who created man, the universe and life; and it is He Who is characterised with the absolutely perfect attribute. If man believed in His existence, it is necessary that he worships Him, and it is necessary that worship be to Him alone. The acceptance of Him being a Creator, by innate nature and mind, obliges the one who acknowledges this to worship Him. This is because worship is response to his feeling of His existence; and worship is one of the most important manifestations of

gratefulness (shukr), which the creature must perform towards the One who bestowed upon him with the bounty of creation and initiation. Thus, the innate nature obliges the worship, and the mind obliges the worship. The innate nature necessitates also that the worship be to this Creator alone and exclusively; and the mind necessitates that the one who deserves worship, gratefulness and praise is only the Creator, to the exclusion of everything else. Therefore, we find those who submitted to the emotion (wijdan) alone in generating the response of sanctification (taqdees), without using the mind, had went astray. So, they worshipped many things, though they acknowledged the existence of the Creator Who is inevitably existent (wajib ul-wujood), despite their acknowledgement that their Creator is One. However, when they initiated the response of sanctification, they sanctified the Creator, and sanctified others with Him. So, they worshipped the Creator but they also worshipped the creatures, whether considering them as gods that are themselves worthy of worship, or thinking that the Creator was incarnated in them, or he accepts seeking nearness to Him through worshipping them. Thus, the innate nature obliges the existence of a Creator. However, the response of sanctification, which is necessary to arise when what agitates the emotions of religiosity occurs, leads to making the sanctification of everything thought to be worthy of worship; whether because it is the Creator, or it is thought that the Creator accepts to sanctify it, or it is thought that the Creator is incarnated within it. This leads to worshipping many things, despite the fact that the Creator is One.

Therefore, the concept of polytheism (plurality of gods) was directed to what is worshipped and not towards the Creator. So, negation of polytheism must be negation of the worshipped objects, and restricting the worship to the Creator, the eternal (أزلي azali) and inevitably existent (واجب الوجود wajib ul- wujood).

Islam accordingly came to explain to all mankind that worship is only to the entity that is of inevitable existence, which is Allah ﷻ. It came to demonstrate this explanation through an explicit rational manner. It asked them about the thing that has to be worshipped. They answered it is Allah ﷻ, and committed themselves with the evidence.

Allah ﷻ says,

﴿قُل لِّمَنِ ٱلۡأَرۡضُ وَمَن فِيهَآ إِن كُنتُمۡ تَعۡلَمُونَ ٨٤ سَيَقُولُونَ لِلَّهِۚ قُلۡ أَفَلَا تَذَكَّرُونَ ٨٥
قُلۡ مَن رَّبُّ ٱلسَّمَٰوَٰتِ ٱلسَّبۡعِ وَرَبُّ ٱلۡعَرۡشِ ٱلۡعَظِيمِ ٨٦ سَيَقُولُونَ لِلَّهِۚ قُلۡ أَفَلَا تَتَّقُونَ ٨٧
قُلۡ مَنۢ بِيَدِهِۦ مَلَكُوتُ كُلِّ شَيۡءٖ وَهُوَ يُجِيرُ وَلَا يُجَارُ عَلَيۡهِ إِن كُنتُمۡ تَعۡلَمُونَ ٨٨ سَيَقُولُونَ
لِلَّهِۚ قُلۡ فَأَنَّىٰ تُسۡحَرُونَ ٨٩ بَلۡ أَتَيۡنَٰهُم بِٱلۡحَقِّ وَإِنَّهُمۡ لَكَٰذِبُونَ ٩٠ مَا ٱتَّخَذَ ٱللَّهُ مِن وَلَدٖ وَمَا
كَانَ مَعَهُۥ مِنۡ إِلَٰهٍۚ إِذٗا لَّذَهَبَ كُلُّ إِلَٰهِۭ بِمَا خَلَقَ وَلَعَلَا بَعۡضُهُمۡ عَلَىٰ بَعۡضٖ﴾

"Say, 'to whom belongs the earth and whosoever is in it, if you have knowledge?' They will say 'to Allah.' Say, 'will you not then remember?' Say, 'who is the Lord of the seven heavens and the Lord of the Tremendous Throne (al-'Arsh ul-'Atheem)?' They will say, 'to Allah.' Say, 'will you not then keep obligation (to Him)?' Say, 'in Whose hand is the dominion over all things, and He protects while against Him there is no protection, if you have knowledge?' They wil say, 'to Allah.' Say, 'how then are you bewitched?' Nay, but We have brought them the Truth, and lo! They are liars. Allah has not chosen any son, and nor is there any Allah along with Him; else would each Allah have assuredly championed that which he created, and some of them would assuredly have overcome others. Glorified be Allah above all that they allege." [TMQ Surah Al-Mu'minoon: 84-91].

By this acknowledgement from them that Allah ﷻ is the Creator of everything, and His Hand is the dominion over all things, they bound themselves by worshipping Him alone. This is because, according to their confession, He is alone worthy of worship. Islam explained to them in another verse that nothing

besides Allah ﷻ does anything that deserves worship. So, Allah the Exalted said,

﴿قُلۡ أَرَءَيۡتُمۡ إِنۡ أَخَذَ ٱللَّهُ سَمۡعَكُمۡ وَأَبۡصَٰرَكُمۡ وَخَتَمَ عَلَىٰ قُلُوبِكُم مَّنۡ إِلَٰهٌ غَيۡرُ ٱللَّهِ يَأۡتِيكُم بِهِۦ﴾

"Do you see if Allah took away your hearing and your sight and sealed over your hearts, who is, other than Allah can restore it to you" [TMQ Surah Al-An'aam: 46] and Allah the Exalted said,

﴿أَمۡ لَهُمۡ إِلَٰهٌ غَيۡرُ ٱللَّهِ﴾

"Do they have a god other than Allah" [TMQ Surah At-Tur: 43] Allah has confirmed in the Quran the unity of the worshipped in many verses, where He emphasised the unification of Allah. So He ﷻ said,

﴿وَإِلَٰهُكُمۡ إِلَٰهٞ وَٰحِدٞۖ لَّآ إِلَٰهَ إِلَّا هُوَ﴾

"And your god is one god, and there is no god other than Him." [TMQ Al- Baqarah: 163],

﴿ٱللَّهُ لَآ إِلَٰهَ إِلَّا هُوَ﴾

"Allah, there is no god except Him" [TMQ Surah Al-Baqarah: 255],

﴿وَمَا مِنۡ إِلَٰهٍ إِلَّا ٱللَّهُ ٱلۡوَٰحِدُ ٱلۡقَهَّارُ﴾

"And there is no god except Allah, the One, the Overwhelming" [TMQ Surah Sad: 65].

This means there is no one worthy of worship except the inevitably existent (واجب الوجود wajib ul-wujood) entity (dhat), Who is Allah ﷻ, the One God. And He ﷻ said,

﴿وَمَا مِنۡ إِلَٰهٍ إِلَّآ إِلَٰهٞ وَٰحِدٞ﴾

"And there is no god except one God" [TMQ Surah Al-Maidah: 73].

This means there is no one worthy of worship except the One God. Thus, Islam advocates the unification of worship to the inevitably existent (wajib ul-wujood) entity (dhat), which the mind and innate nature (fitrah) confirms its existence, who is Allah. The Quranic verses explicitly indicate in negating polytheism. Allah ﷻ says,

﴿لَوۡ كَانَ فِيهِمَآ ءَالِهَةٌ إِلَّا ٱللَّهُ لَفَسَدَتَا﴾

"Had there been gods other than Allah, they would have been in disarray" [TMQ Surah Al-Anbiyaa:22].

Thus, the verses came to negate polytheism, and to confine worship to one god, Who is Allah. In other words, they came to establish that the worthy of worship is one, who is the inevitable existent (wajib ul-wujood) entity (dhat).

'Ilah' (إِلٰهٌ god) in language has only one meaning, which is 'the worshipped' (ma'bood). It has no Shariah meaning other than that. So the meaning of 'la ilaha' (there is no god) in the language and Shariah is the same which is 'there is none worthy of worship'. 'Illa Allah' (إلاّ الله except Allah ﷻ) means in the language and Shariah the inevitably existent (wajib ul-wujood) entity (dhat), Who is Allah. Therefore, the meaning of the first Shahadah (witness) of Islam is not only witnessing in the unity of the Creator as many presume; it also means to witness that there is no one worthy of worship except Allah, the inevitably existent (wajib ul-wujood). This in order that Allah ﷻ Alone is worshipped and sanctified; and that worship is negated definitely from anything other than Allah ﷻ. Thereupon, the testimony in the existence of Allah ﷻ is not enough in Oneness (wahdaniyyah) there instead must be oneness of the Creator and oneness of the Worshipped. This is because the meaning of 'la illah illa Allah' is that there is none worthy of worship except Allah. Thus, the Shahadah, (witness) of Muslim in that 'la ilaha illa Allah' definitely binds him to worship Allah ﷻ, and obliges him to worship Allah ﷻ alone. Thus, Oneness is the sanctification of the Creator alone, that is, to believe that worship is only for Allah the One.

Rizq Is in the Hand of Allah ﷻ Alone

Rizq (رزق provision) is different than ownership, because provision is granting. Thus, razaqa means ‘gave’. While ownership is the possession of the wealth by any of the means which the Shariah allowed to possess the property with. Rizq could be halal and could be haram. All of it is called rizq. Thus, the property that the worker takes as wage for his work is rizq. Similarly, the wealth that the gambler takes from others in gambling is also rizq, because it is a property that Allah ﷻ gave to every one of them, when he carried out one of the cases in which rizq occurs. It dominates on the mind of the people the concept that they provide themselves by themselves. Thus, the employee who takes a certain salary through his effort and work thinks that he provided himself. When he gets an increase in his salary based on an effort he did, or based on the strife for increase, he thinks that he provided himself with this increase. The merchant, who profits in a wealth through his striving in trading, thinks that he provided for himself. The doctor, who treats the sick people for a wage, thinks that he provides for himself. Thus, everybody who undertakes an action from which he earns a property, thinks that he provides himself. This view the people hold is because they did not understand the situations (حالات haalaat) in which rizq comes to them, so they thought their cases to be causes (أسباب asbab).

The fact that the Muslim must accept is that rizq is from Allah ﷻ and not from man. The cases in which rizq comes are only circumstances in which rizq occurs, and they are not causes from which rizq results. Had these been causes, they would not have failed to produce rizq in any of their situations, though it is noticed through sensation that they fail, for these situations may happen and yet rizq does not occur. Had they been causes (asbab), then their effect, which is the rizq, would have inevitably resulted. Since rizq does not inevitably result from

these situations; it instead comes when they occur, and it fails despite their occurrence. This indicates that these are not causes (asbab); they are instead situations. Moreover, the situations in which the rizq comes as consequence of their occurrence can't be considered causes (asbab) of rizq; nor can the person who undertakes these situations be considered the one who brings the rizq through them. This is because this contradicts with the Quranic text, which is definite in narration and definite in evidencing (القطعي الدلالة والقطعي الثبوت al-qat'iyuth-thuboot wa al-qat'iy ud-dalalah). If anything contradicts with a text, which is definite in narration and definite in evidencing, then such definite text is weighed preponderantly and followed, while everything else is rejected. There are many verses that indicate clearly; in a way that is not subject for interpretation that rizq is from Allah ﷻ alone, and not from man.

This is what makes us confirm that what we witness of styles and means, by which rizq comes are only cases in which rizq occurs. Allah ﷻ says,

﴿وَكُلُوا۟ مِمَّا رَزَقَكُمُ ٱللَّهُ﴾

"And eat of what Allah provided to you" [TMQ Al-Maidah: 88],

﴿ٱلَّذِى خَلَقَكُمْ ثُمَّ رَزَقَكُمْ﴾

"Who created you then provided to you" [TMQ Ar-Rum: 40],

﴿أَنفِقُوا۟ مِمَّا رَزَقَكُمُ ٱللَّهُ﴾

"Spend from within all that Allah provided to you" [TMQ Surah Ya-Sin: 47],

﴿إِنَّ ٱللَّهَ يَرْزُقُ مَن يَشَآءُ﴾

"Indeed, Allah provides to whom He wills" [TMQ Ali-'Imran: 37],

﴿ٱللَّهُ يَرۡزُقُهَا وَإِيَّاكُمۡ﴾

"Allah provides to it and to you" [TMQ Surah Al-Ankabut: 60],

﴿نَّحۡنُ نَرۡزُقُكَ﴾

"We provide to you" [TMQ Ta-Ha: 132],

﴿نَّحۡنُ نَرۡزُقُكُمۡ وَإِيَّاهُمۡ﴾

"Indeed, We provide for you and for them" [TMQ Surah Al-Anaam: 151],

﴿نَّحۡنُ نَرۡزُقُهُمۡ وَإِيَّاكُمۡ﴾

"Indeed We provide for them and for you" [TMQ Surah Al-Israa': 31],

﴿لَيَرۡزُقَنَّهُمُ ٱللَّهُ﴾

"And Allah certainly provides for them" [TMQ Surah Al-Hajj: 58],

﴿يَبۡسُطُ ٱلرِّزۡقَ لِمَن يَشَآءُ﴾

"Allah makes rizq abundant to whom He likes" [TMQ Surah Ar-Rad: 26],

﴿فَٱبۡتَغُواْ عِندَ ٱللَّهِ ٱلرِّزۡقَ﴾

"So seek the rizq from Allah" [TMQ Al-Ankabut: 17],

﴿وَمَا مِن دَآبَّةٖ فِي ٱلۡأَرۡضِ إِلَّا عَلَى ٱللَّهِ رِزۡقُهَا﴾

"There is no beast in the earth, but its rizq is with Allah" [TMQ Hud: 6],

﴿إِنَّ ٱللَّهَ هُوَ ٱلرَّزَّاقُ﴾

"Indeed Allah is the Razzaq (Sustainer)." [TMQ Adh-Dhariyat: 58]

These ayaat, besides others, are definite in their evidencing, and are not subject except to one meaning that does not need interpretation, that rizq is from Allah alone, and not from anything else. However, Allah ﷻ commanded His servants to undertake actions, He made them capable to choose to perform the situations by which rizq comes. They are the ones who by their choice, undertake all the situations within which rizq may come. However, they are not the ones who bring the rizq. This is in the explicit text of the ayaat that Allah ﷻ is the One who provides them in these cases, regardless of whether the rizq being halal or haram, and regardless of whether these cases have been obliged, prohibited or allowed by Allah; and regardless of whether rizq occurred or not by them. However, Islam explained the manner by which the Muslim is allowed to undertake the situation by which rizq occurs, and the manner by which he is not allowed to undertake such and such situations. So, Islam demonstrated means of ownership and not the cause of rizq, and it limited ownership to these means. So, nobody is allowed to own rizq except through a Shariah means, for this is the halal rizq; and anything else is haram rizq. This is despite all rizq, whether halal or haram, being from Allah ﷻ.

Abiding (تَقَيُّد Taqayyud) by the Shariah Rulings Is Obliged by Iman in Islam

Actions which human perform by their choice before the advent of Shariah (ورود الشرع wurood ash-Sharah) have no ruling. So, they are neither obliged upon them, nor preferable (mandoob), nor prohibited (haram), nor disliked (makrooh) nor allowed (mubah). Instead, they undertake them in accordance with what they view of interest to them. This is because there is no legal responsibility (تكليف takleef) before the advent of Shariah. Allah ﷻ says,

﴿وَمَا كُنَّا مُعَذِّبِينَ حَتَّىٰ نَبۡعَثَ رَسُولٗا﴾

"We never punish until We have sent a messenger." [TMQ Al-Israa': 15]. With this ayah, Allah ﷻ secured His creatures from punishment over what we carry out of actions, before the sending of Messengers (as), because they are not charged with any rulings. Once Allah ﷻ sent them a Messenger they become bound with what that Messenger brought to them. They could have no argument for not abiding by the rulings (أحكام ahkaam) that the Messenger brought. Allah ﷻ says,

﴿لِئَلَّا يَكُونَ لِلنَّاسِ عَلَى ٱللَّهِ حُجَّةُۢ بَعۡدَ ٱلرُّسُلِ﴾

"So that men may have no argument against Allah after the messengers." [TMQ An-Nisaa': 165]

So, whoever does not believe in that Messenger would be responsible before Allah ﷻ for his belief, and his abiding with the rulings (ahkaam) he brought. The one who believed in the Messenger, would be confined by the ahkaam that he brought and is responsible for not following any one of the rulings he brought. Accordingly, Muslims are commanded to undertake their actions in accordance with the Shariah rulings of Islam,

because they are obliged to conduct their actions in accordance with the orders and prohibitions of Allah. Allah ﷻ says,

﴿وَمَآ ءَاتَىٰكُمُ ٱلرَّسُولُ فَخُذُوهُ وَمَا نَهَىٰكُمۡ عَنۡهُ فَٱنتَهُواْ﴾

"And whatever the messenger brought to you take it, and whatever he forbade you abstain from it." [TMQ Al-Hashr: 7]. It is incorrect to say here that which he did not bring to you, and he did not forbid you from, you are not responsible for. This is because making Shariah responsibility covers the entire Risaalah (message) to man and not some of his actions. Allah ﷻ says,

﴿قُلۡ يَٰٓأَيُّهَا ٱلنَّاسُ إِنِّي رَسُولُ ٱللَّهِ إِلَيۡكُمۡ جَمِيعًا﴾

"Say: 'O mankind! I am the Messenger of Allah to all of you.'" [TMQ Al- A'raf: 158]. So it is inevitable that what he brought to you is the ruling of every action and what he forbids to you is the ruling of every action. Thereupon, every Muslim who wants to undertake any action to satisfy his needs and to discharge his interests is legally obliged to know the ruling of Allah ﷻ regarding such action before he undertakes it, so that he acts on it in accordance with the Shariah ruling (حكم شرعي hukm shar'ee). It is incorrect to say there are matters that happen which the Shariah did not mention, so it left the choice to us to do them or not. This is because that implies that the Shariah is deficient and not suitable except for the time it came in. This contradicts the Shariah itself and to the reality it applies to. The Shariah did not bring detailed rulings for specific matters so as to be restricted to the time. It instead brought general meanings for the problems of man as man, regardless of the place and time. All the detailed actions come under these meanings.

If a problem occurred or an incident took place, it is studied and its reality is understood, then its solution is deduced through istinbaat (استنباط Shariah deduction) from the general meanings that came in the Shariah. The deduced opinion would be the ruling of Allah ﷻ to this problem or that incident. The

Muslims proceeded on this course since the death of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ until the departure of the Islamic State. The Muslims holding to Islam are still proceeding on this course. Problems occurred at the time of Abu Bakr (ra) that did not exist at the time of the Messenger ﷺ and problems occurred, for example, at the time of Haroon ar-Rasheed that did not exist at the time of Abu Bakr (ra). The Mujtahids, numbering in the hundreds and thousands, deduced Shariah rulings for these issues that had not previously been known. This is the way they preceded in every problem and every incident. This is because the Islamic Shariah is comprehensive; there is no problem for which it does not provide room for a ruling, and no case without a ruling. Therefore, every Muslim must restrict his actions with the Shariah rulings, and he must not undertake any action except in accordance with the orders and prohibitions of Allah ﷻ.

Death Does Not Occur Except With the End of the Lifespan (Intihaa' ul-Ajl)

Many people think that though death is the same, the causes of death are numerous. So, death could be because of a detrimental disease, such as the plague. It could also be due to a stab by a knife, or a gunshot or burning by fire or beheading or a heart attack or others. In their view, all of these are direct causes that lead to death, that is, death occurs because of them. That is why it became common on the lips of people to say, "The causes are many but death is the same."

The truth is that death is the same and its cause (سبب sabab) is also the same, which is the end of the lifespan (انتهاء الأجل Intihaa' ul-Ajl), and nothing else. As regards to these matters, which take place, and within them death occurs, they are situations (أحوال ahwaal) in which death occurs and are not causes of death.

This is because the cause (سبب sabab) produces the effect (مسبب musabbab) definitely; and that the effect (musabbab) can't result save from its cause (sabab) alone. This is different to the situation (حالة halah), it is a specific circumstance within certain surrounding realities in which death usually takes place. However, death could fail to happen. Thus, the situation might exist but the death does not occur; and the death might occur while the situation did not happen.

The one who examines many of the matters within which death occurs, and the one who examines death itself, finds that these matters might take place but the death does not occur. Death might also occur while these situations did not take place. As an example, a person might be fatally stabbed by a knife, and the doctors agree unanimously that it is fatal, but the stabbed person did not die, instead he healed and recovered. Death could

also occur without an apparent cause, such as when the heart of somebody stopped suddenly, and he died immediately without all the doctors being able to discover a reason for this heart attack, even after painstaking investigation.

The incidents about this are many and are known by the doctors. The hospitals have witnessed thousands of these incidents; where a situation that usually certainly leads to death occurs, then the person does not die; and death occurs suddenly without the appearance of any situation that led to it. Therefore, all the doctors say that the so-and-so sick man has no hope of life according to the knowledge of medicine, but he might recover, and this is beyond our knowledge. They also say that so and so person is beyond the danger on his life, and he is healthy, and he passed the danger point on his life, then he suddenly suffers a relapse and dies. All of this is tangible reality sensed by the people and doctors; and it clearly indicates that these matters from which death occurs are not causes for death. For if they were causes they would not fail in bringing about death, and death would have not occurred by other than them. The fact that they failed to cause death even once, and that death occurred by other than them, even once, definitely evidences that they are not causes; they are instead situations within which death occurs. The true cause of death that produces the effect is other than them and not them.

This actual cause could not be discovered by the mind, for it does not fall under sensation. So, it is necessary that Allah ﷻ informs us about it; and that it is proved by evidence that is definite in proof and definite in meaning. Allah ﷻ has informed us, in many ayaat that it is the ajal (end of life-term); and that Allah ﷻ is the One Who causes death. Thus, death occurs because of the ajal and the one who causes death is Allah ﷻ. There are many verses that mentioned this. Allah ﷻ says,

﴿وَمَا كَانَ لِنَفْسٍ أَن تَمُوتَ إِلَّا بِإِذْنِ ٱللَّهِ كِتَٰبًا مُّؤَجَّلًا﴾

"No soul can ever die except by Allah's leave and at a term appointed" [TMQ Aal-'Imran:145],

﴿ٱللَّهُ يَتَوَفَّى ٱلْأَنفُسَ حِينَ مَوْتِهَا﴾

"Allah receives souls at the time of their death" [TMQ Az-Zumar: 42],

﴿رَبِّيَ ٱلَّذِى يُحْىِۦ وَيُمِيتُ﴾

"My Lord is He Who gives life and causes death" [TMQ Al-Baqarah: 258],

﴿وَٱللَّهُ يُحْىِۦ وَيُمِيتُ﴾

"And Allah gives life and causes death" [TMQ Ali-'Imran:156],

﴿أَيْنَمَا تَكُونُوا۟ يُدْرِككُّمُ ٱلْمَوْتُ وَلَوْ كُنتُمْ فِى بُرُوجٍ مُّشَيَّدَةٍ﴾

"Wherever you are, death reaches you, even if you were in lofty towers" [TMQ An-Nisaa': 78],

﴿قُلْ يَتَوَفَّىٰكُم مَّلَكُ ٱلْمَوْتِ ٱلَّذِى وُكِّلَ بِكُمْ﴾

"Say (to them): 'The angel of death, who has charge concerning you, will take you to death'" [TMQ As-Sajda: 11],

﴿قُلْ إِنَّ ٱلْمَوْتَ ٱلَّذِى تَفِرُّونَ مِنْهُ فَإِنَّهُۥ مُلَٰقِيكُمْ﴾

"Say (to them): 'The death which you are fleeing from will surely meet you'" [TMQ Al-Jumu'a: 8],

﴿نَحْنُ قَدَّرْنَا بَيْنَكُمُ ٱلْمَوْتَ﴾

"We mete out death among you" [TMQ Al-Waqi'a: 60],

﴿إِنَّ أَجَلَ ٱللَّهِ إِذَا جَآءَ لَا يُؤَخَّرُ﴾

"Lo! The term of Allah when it comes can't be delayed" [TMQ Nuh: 4],

﴿فَإِذَا جَآءَ أَجَلُهُمۡ لَا يَسۡتَأۡخِرُونَ سَاعَةٗ وَلَا يَسۡتَقۡدِمُونَ﴾

"When their term comes, then they can't put it off an hour, not hasten it" [TMQ Yunus: 49].

These and other verses are definite in narration (قطعية الثبوت qat'iyyat uth-thaboot) that they are from Allah ﷻ and definite in evidencing (قطعية الدلالة qat'iyyat ud-dalaalah) that Allah ﷻ is He Who causes death; and that the cause of death is the End of the Lifespan (انتهاء الأجل intihaa' ul-ajl), and not the situation in which death occurred.

Therefore, it is obligatory that the Muslim believes by mind and Shariah that what he thinks of as causes to death are not causes, instead they are situations in which death occurs; and that the cause is other than them. It has been evidenced by the Shariah through definite evidencing that death is in the Hand of Allah Alone, that Allah ﷻ is He Who causes death and that the cause of death is the End of the Lifespan (انتهاء الأجل Intihaa' ul-ajl). Once the ajal comes, it can't be delayed or hastened; nor is there any person who can avert from death, or escape from it absolutely. Thus, it will most certainly reach him.

As regards what man was ordered to avert and work to distance from oneself, it is the situations within which death occurs. So, he must not submit himself to any of the situation within which death occurs usually. As for death, he must not be scared of, nor flee from, because he can never save himself from it. This is because man does not die except after the End of the Lifespan (انتهاء الأجل intihaa' ul-ajl), whether he died naturally, or by killing or burning or any other thing. So, death is in the Hand of Allah and ajal is in the Hand of Allah.

Jihad Is a Shariah Obligation Upon All Muslims

(بذل الوُسع في القتال في سبيل الله، مباشرة أو معاوَنة بمال أو رأي أو تكثير سواد أو غير ذلك) Jihad is "exerting all efforts in the fighting in the Way of Allah ﷻ, either directly, or by providing aid with wealth or an opinion, or by mobilising people or other than that." It is fighting to raise the Word of Allah ﷻ as the highest. As for Jihad by an opinion in the Way of Allah ﷻ, if it was an opinion related to a battle, or giving an opinion in regards to a plan for fighting, then it is Jihad, whilst giving an opinion over one of the affairs of the enemy is not considered Jihad.

Giving a speech or writing, if it was a speech in the army to encourage them in battle, or it was writing for the fight directly, then this is Jihad. If it was otherwise, it would not be considered Jihad. Thus, Jihad is specific to fighting and what is directly linked to fighting. Mujahidoon are those who actually fight. Jihad is a Shariah obligation evidenced by the text of Quran and hadeeth. Allah ﷻ says,

﴿وَقَٰتِلُوهُمۡ حَتَّىٰ لَا تَكُونَ فِتۡنَةٞ وَيَكُونَ ٱلدِّينُ كُلُّهُۥ لِلَّهِ﴾

"And fight them until there is no more persecution and deen (religion) is all for Allah" [TMQ Al-Anfal: 39],

﴿قَٰتِلُواْ ٱلَّذِينَ لَا يُؤۡمِنُونَ بِٱللَّهِ وَلَا بِٱلۡيَوۡمِ ٱلۡأٓخِرِ وَلَا يُحَرِّمُونَ مَا حَرَّمَ ٱللَّهُ وَرَسُولُهُۥ وَلَا يَدِينُونَ دِينَ ٱلۡحَقِّ مِنَ ٱلَّذِينَ أُوتُواْ ٱلۡكِتَٰبَ حَتَّىٰ يُعۡطُواْ ٱلۡجِزۡيَةَ عَن يَدٖ وَهُمۡ صَٰغِرُونَ﴾

"Fight those who do not believe in Allah and the Last Day, nor comply with what Allah and His Messenger have forbidden, nor embrace the religion of truth from among those who were given the Scripture, until they pay the jizyah tax, willingly submitting, fully humbled" [TMQ Surah At-Tawbah: 29],

﴿يَٰٓأَيُّهَا ٱلَّذِينَ ءَامَنُواْ قَٰتِلُواْ ٱلَّذِينَ يَلُونَكُم مِّنَ ٱلۡكُفَّارِ وَلۡيَجِدُواْ فِيكُمۡ غِلۡظَةٗۚ وَٱعۡلَمُوٓاْ أَنَّ ٱللَّهَ مَعَ ٱلۡمُتَّقِينَ﴾

"O you who believe! Fight those of the disbelievers who are near to you, and let them find harshness in you, and know that Allah is with the righteous (muttaqeen)" [TMQ Surah At-Tawbah: 123],

﴿إِنَّ ٱللَّهَ ٱشۡتَرَىٰ مِنَ ٱلۡمُؤۡمِنِينَ أَنفُسَهُمۡ وَأَمۡوَٰلَهُم بِأَنَّ لَهُمُ ٱلۡجَنَّةَۚ يُقَٰتِلُونَ فِي سَبِيلِ ٱللَّهِ فَيَقۡتُلُونَ وَيُقۡتَلُونَۖ وَعۡدًا عَلَيۡهِ حَقّٗا فِي ٱلتَّوۡرَىٰةِ وَٱلۡإِنجِيلِ وَٱلۡقُرۡءَانِۚ وَمَنۡ أَوۡفَىٰ بِعَهۡدِهِۦ مِنَ ٱللَّهِۚ فَٱسۡتَبۡشِرُواْ بِبَيۡعِكُمُ ٱلَّذِي بَايَعۡتُم بِهِۦۚ وَذَٰلِكَ هُوَ ٱلۡفَوۡزُ ٱلۡعَظِيمُ﴾

"Lo! Allah has bought from the believers their lives and their wealth because the Garden (Jannah) will be theirs; they shall fight in the way of Allah, and shall slay and be slain. It is a promise that is binding on Him in the Torah and the Gospel and the Quran. Who fulfils his covenant better than Allah? Rejoice then in your bargain that you have made; for that is the supreme triumph" [TMQ Surah At-Tauba: 111].

The Messenger of Allah ﷺ also said, **«أُمِرْتُ أَنْ أُقَاتِلَ النَّاسَ حَتَّى يَقُولُوا لَا إِلَهَ إِلَّا اللَّهُ» "I have been commanded to fight against the people until they say, 'La ilaha illa Allah'"** and he ﷺ said, **«الْجِهَادُ مَاضٍ إِلَى يَوْمِ الْقِيَامَةِ» "Jihad will continue till the Doomsday"** **«بُعِثْتُ بِالسَّيْفِ بَيْنَ يَدَيْ السَّاعَةِ» "I have been sent with the sword before the Hour (a-Saa'ah)."** He ﷺ said in the hadeeth narrated by al-Hasan (ra), **«غَدْوَةٌ أَوْ رَوْحَةٌ فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ خَيْرٌ مِنْ الدُّنْيَا وَمَا فِيهَا» "A man going out or returning back in the way of Allah (fee sabeeli Allah) is better than the Dunya and all that is in it."**

Jihad, in origin, is a collective obligation of sufficiency (فرض كفاية fard kifayah), and it is an individual obligation (فرض عين fard 'ayn) if the enemy attacks Muslims. The meaning of Jihad being a collective obligation in origin is that we initiate a fight against the enemy, even if it did not start a fight against us. If none of the Muslims started a fight initially in any time, then

all Muslims will be sinful for abandoning Jihad. If the enemy attacked the Muslims, the Shariah obligation of Jihad will not be abolished from the people of India and Indonesia, say, by the fight undertaken by the people of Egypt and Iraq. It is instead obligatory on those most near to the enemy until sufficiency (كفاية kifayah) is fulfilled by those who undertook the actual fighting. If sufficiency cannot be achieved except by all the Muslims, then Jihad becomes an individual obligation (فرض عينfard ‘ayn) on every Muslim.

This is similar to establishing the Islamic State. It is a Shariah obligation upon all Muslims. If some of the Muslims establish the state, then the obligation of its establishment will be abolished for those who were not striving. However, the sin due to their negligence in striving for its establishment, before it is established, will not be abolished. If Muslims did not establish it, its Shariah obligation will remain upon all Muslims until the sufficiency (كفاية kifayah) for its establishment is achieved, by establishing it practically. Likewise, Jihad, if the enemy was not driven away, will remain as a Shariah obligation upon Muslims until the enemy is driven away.

This is the source of error in the definition of some jurists of fard ul-kifayah (فرض الكفاية collective obligation), as being that which if some of the Muslims undertook it, it will be abolished from the rest of them. This erroneous definition would mean that if the people of Algeria undertook Jihad against France practically when it occupied Algeria, then Jihad is abolished from the remaining Muslims, whether France left Algeria or not. This is because, according to their definition, some of the Muslims undertook the obligation, which is the Jihad, so it is abolished from the rest. This is wrong, without difference in any case of the Muslims since the time of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ till today. It also contradicts the definite text of Quran regarding the Shariah obligation of Jihad until the enemy surrenders, after becoming subdued.

The text of Quran is definite in making Jihad against the previous French occupation in Algeria as an obligation upon all Muslims, and not upon the people of Algeria alone. When the people of Algeria actually undertook Jihad, the obligation was not be abolished from the people of Egypt, the people of Iraq or others. It instead remained as an obligation upon them, and they remained sinful by neglecting it, until France ended its occupation practically.

Therefore, the definition of some jurists for fard ul-kifayah (فرض الكفاية collective obligation) was wrong. The correct definition is that fard ul-kifayah remains as a Shariah obligation and it is not abolished until the matter, for whose sake the obligation existed, has been achieved. Thus, if it was achieved, the Shariah obligation is abolished; otherwise, it is not.

Thus, establishing the Islamic State is obligatory upon all Muslims. If a party (حزب hizb) undertook the action to establish it, its Shariah obligation will not be abolished. It instead remains as an obligation upon all the Muslims until it is actually established. Its Shariah obligation would not be abolished except from those who pursued the actual action for it; and the sin remains upon the remaining people. This is similar to the Jihad against France in Algeria in the era of occupation, and the Jihad against Britain in Oman during its occupation; all of this is fard upon all the Muslims. When the people of Algeria undertook Jihad against French occupation, and the people of Oman undertook Jihad against British occupation, then the obligation of Jihad against these two disbelieving states was not abolished. It instead remained as a Shariah obligation upon all the Muslims until France and Britain were actually driven out. The sin of its obligation was not abolished except from the people of Algeria and people of Oman alone; and it remained on the rest of Muslims.

The colonialist disbelievers have occupied some of the Muslim countries today, so Jihad is a Shariah obligation upon all the Muslims, and it remains as an obligation upon all of them. They will remain sinful due to its negligence until all the lands of Islam are cleared of the authority of the disbelievers from the foreign states, and the Muslims start fighting against their enemies. Once the end of occupation actually occurs, only then is the Shariah obligation abolished from the remaining Muslims. However, before this is achieved, the obligation of Jihad remains upon all the Muslims, and they would be sinful due to their negligence of it. This is even if some of them practically undertook Jihad, but that which Jihad was undertaken to achieve has not been achieved practically.

The Five Shariah Rulings (الأحكام الخمسة Al-Ahkam al-Khamsah)

The Shariah ruling (حكم شرعي Hukm Shar'i) is, (خطاب الشارع المتعلق بأفعال العباد) "The address of the Legislator related to the actions of the servants." Thus, the Shariah ruling is established by the establishment of the address, and what it is becomes evident by the evidence of the meaning of the address. The address of the Legislator is what came in the Quran and the Sunnah of commands and prohibitions. Therefore, understanding the Shariah ruling is dependent upon understanding the Quran and the Sunnah, for they are the origin of legislation and the source of the rulings.

However, it is not the case that every address of the Legislator must be undertaken, with its abstention being punished, or that doing it is prohibited, whilst its undertaking is punished. Instead, that depends on the type of address. From this premise, it is a sin, and an audacity against the Deen of Allah ﷻ, for a person to hasten to declare that this is an obligation (فرض fard) merely because he read a verse or a Hadith evidencing a demand to undertake, or to hasten to issue a fatwa that this is prohibited (حرام Haram) because he read a verse or a Hadith evidencing a demand of abstention (طلب الترك talab ut-tark).

Muslims have been afflicted in these days by many of the likes of these people who hasten to declare things permitted (حلال Halal) and prohibited (حرام Haram) merely upon reading a command or prohibition in a verse or Hadith. Mostly, these are among those who assumed they understood, before they actually understand, and rarely are they among those who understand the meaning of legislation (تشريع tashree'). Therefore, it is imperative to understand the type of the address of the Legislator prior to giving an opinion on the type of the Shariah ruling. That is, it is imperative to understand the meaning of the Hadith or the verse with a legislative understanding, not merely

a linguistic understanding, so that the Muslim does not err by prohibiting what Allah ﷻ has permitted, or permitting what He has prohibited.

The address of the Legislator is understood by the text, and by the contextualization (قرائن qara'in) that designates the meaning of the text. Not every command (أمر amr) is for obligation (وجوب wujub), nor is every forbidding (نهي nahi) for prohibition (تحريم tahrim). Instead, the command may be for recommendation (ندب nadb) or permission (إباحة ibahah), and the prohibition may be for dislike (كراهة karahah).

Thus, when Allah ﷻ says,

﴿قَٰتِلُوا۟ ٱلَّذِينَ لَا يُؤْمِنُونَ بِٱللَّهِ وَلَا بِٱلْيَوْمِ ٱلْـَٔاخِرِ وَلَا يُحَرِّمُونَ مَا حَرَّمَ ٱللَّهُ وَرَسُولُهُۥ﴾

"Fight those who do not believe in Allah ﷻ or in the Last Day and who do not prohibit what Allah ﷻ and His Messenger ﷺ prohibit." [TMQ Surah At-Tawbah: 29], Allah ﷻ is commanding Jihad. This command in this verse is an obligation (فرض fard) as Allah ﷻ punishes for abandoning it. However, its being a Shariah obligation did not come from the form of the command alone. Instead, it came from other contextualization besides it which evidenced that this command (أمر amr) is a decisive request (طلب جازم talab jaazim) to undertake the action. This contextualization (قرينة qareenah) is other texts, such as His ﷻ saying in another verse,

﴿إِلَّا تَنفِرُوا۟ يُعَذِّبْكُمْ عَذَابًا أَلِيمًا﴾

"If you do not go forth, He will punish you with a painful punishment" [At-Tawbah: 39].

When Allah ﷻ says,

﴿وَلَا تَقْرَبُوا۟ ٱلزِّنَىٰٓ﴾

"And do not approach unlawful sexual intercourse" [TMQ Surah Al-Isra: 32], He ﷻ is prohibiting Zina (fornication and adultery). This forbidding (نهي nahee) in this verse is a

prohibition (تحريم tahrim) of Zina. Allah ﷻ punishes for undertaking Zina. However, its being Haram did not come from the form of the forbidding (صيغة النهي seeghat un-nahee) alone. Instead, it came from other contextualization besides it which evidenced that this forbidding, a demand of abstention (طلب الترك talab ut-tark), is as a decisive request (طلب جازم talab jaazim). This contextualization (قرينة qareenah) is within other texts, such as His ﷻ saying in the same verse,

﴿إِنَّهُۥ كَانَ فَٰحِشَةً وَسَآءَ سَبِيلًا﴾

"Indeed, it is ever an immorality and is evil as a way" [TMQ Surah Al-Isra: 32], and His ﷻ saying in another verse,

﴿ٱلزَّانِيَةُ وَٱلزَّانِي فَٱجْلِدُوا۟ كُلَّ وَٰحِدٍ مِّنْهُمَا مِاْئَةَ جَلْدَةٍ﴾

"The unmarried woman or unmarried man found guilty of sexual intercourse - lash each one of them with a hundred lashes" [TMQ Surah An-Nur: 2].

When the Messenger of Allah ﷺ says, «**صَلاةُ الجماعةِ تَفضُلُ عَلَى صَلاةِ الفَذِّ بِسَبعٍ وَعِشرينَ دَرَجةً**» **"The Salah in congregation is superior to the prayer of the individual by twenty-seven degrees,"** he ﷺ is commanding the Salah in congregation (جماعة jamaa'ah), even if the demand (طلب talab) came in other than the form of a command (صيغة الأمر seeghatul amr). When he ﷺ says, «**كُنْت نَهَيْتُكُمْ عَنْ زِيَارَةِ الْقُبُورِ، أَلَا فَزُورُوهَا**» **"I had forbidden you from visiting graves, but now visit them,"** he is commanding the visiting of graves. However, this command ﷺ or this demand in these two Hadiths is recommended (مندوب mandub) and is not an obligation (فرض fard). Its being recommended comes from other indications, such as his ﷺsilence (سكوت sakoot) regarding a group who prayed individually, and his silence regarding people who did not visit graves. Thus, it evidenced that it is a non-decisive request (طلب غير جازم talab ghair jaazim).

When the Messenger of Allah ﷺ says, «**مَنْ كَانَ مُوسِراً فَلَمْ يَنْكِحْ فَلَيْسَ مِنَّا**» **"Whoever possesses the means and does not marry is not**

of us," and when we read the forbidding (نهي nahee) of the Prophet ﷺ against celibacy (تبتل tabattul)—that is, against not marrying—in the Hadith from Samurah who said, «**أَنَّ النَّبِيَّ ﷺ نَهَى عَنْ التَّبَتُّلِ**» **"The Prophet ﷺ forbade celibacy,"** we find that the Messenger forbids not marrying for the one possessing means in the first Hadith, and forbids not marrying absolutely in the second Hadith. However, the meaning is neither that not marrying, for the one possessing means, is Haram, nor that not marrying in any case, absolutely, is Haram. Instead, this prohibition indicates that it is disliked (مكروه makruh) and not Haram. Its being merely disliked comes from other contextualization, such as his ﷺ silence regarding those possessing means while he knew they did not marry, and his silence regarding some of the Companions (ra) while they did not marry.

When Allah ﷻ says,

﴿وَإِذَا حَلَلْتُمْ فَٱصْطَادُواْ﴾

"But when you come out of Ihram, then you may hunt" [TMQ Surah Al-Ma'idah: 2], and,

﴿فَإِذَا قُضِيَتِ ٱلصَّلَوٰةُ فَٱنتَشِرُواْ﴾

"And when the Salah has been concluded, disperse" [TMQ Surah Al-Jumu'ah: 10], He ﷻ is commanding hunting after lifting the Ihram, and He ﷻ is commanding dispersing after the prayer. However, this command (أمر amr) does not evidence that hunting after coming out of the Ihram is either a Shariah obligation or recommended, nor that dispersing after the Salah of Jumuah is either an obligation or recommended. Instead, it evidences that it is permitted (مباح mubah). Its being mubah came from another contextualization, which is that Allah ﷻ commanded hunting after Ihram, whilst He had forbidden it prior to Ihram. Also, He ﷻ commanded dispersing after the Salah of Jumuah, after He had forbidden it during the Salah of

Jumuah. Thus, that contextualization evidenced that this command is for permission, and that hunting in this circumstance, and dispersing in that circumstance, is permitted.

Accordingly, knowing the type of Shariah ruling from the Shariah text depends upon understanding the text with a legislative understanding, by linking it to the contextualization that evidences the meaning of the address within it. From this premise, it becomes evident that the Shariah rulings are of various types.

It appears from the inductive study (tatabbu') of all texts and rulings that the Shariah rulings are five: the obligation (فرض fard) and its meaning is the wajib (واجد); the prohibited (حرام Haram) and its meaning is the mahzhur (محظور); the recommended (مندوب mandub); the disliked (مكروه makruh); and the permissible (مباح mubah). This is because the address of the Legislator is either a request to do (طلب الفعل talab ul-f'il), a request to abstain (طلب الترك talab ut-tark), or a choice (تخيير takhyeer) between doing and abstaining. The request is either decisive (جازم jaazim) or indecisive (غير جازم ghair jaazim). If the request to do the action is decisive, it is a Shariah obligation, but if it is indecisive, it is recommended. If the request to abstain is decisive, it is Haram but if it is indecisive, it is disliked. As for the request of choice, it is permissible. Hence, the Shariah rulings are five and no other: the fard, the Haram, the mandub, the makruh, and the mubah.

The Opinion Deduced by the Mujtahid Is a Shariah Ruling

The subversive process of diverting Muslims from adhering to the Shariah ruling takes various forms. Among the most malicious of these methods is what some individuals claim: that the opinion of the Mujtahid Imams, such as Al-Shafi'i, Ja'far al-Sadiq, or Abu Hanifa, is not a Shariah ruling, but instead merely his personal opinion which is not binding to adhere to. They claim that the Shariah ruling is only the explicit text of the Quran or the Hadith. This results in restricting the Shariah rulings to what the text has explicitly mentioned and what is understood from it merely by reading. Accordingly, numerous renewed problems and various emergent issues for which no Shariah text has been revealed would remain without a Shariah ruling. Instead, everyone would proceed regarding them according to his own opinion, and the intellect would arbitrate over them, laying down the solution it sees fit and the rule that suits its desire.

In truth, this is a manifest sin, a fabrication against the Islamic Shariah, a suspension of Ijtihad, and a diversion of people from the rulings of Islam. This is because the Book and the Sunnah—which are the source of the Islamic Shariah—came in broad outlines and general meanings. Their texts came as legislative expressions indicating a reality and realities. Thus, they are understood with a legislative understanding, and what is taken from them is by their explicit meaning (منطوق mantuq), which is the meaning evidenced by the expression alone explicitly; by their implied meaning (مفهوم mafhum), which is the meaning indicated by the meaning of the expression; and by their required meaning (اقتضاء iqtida'), which is the meaning required by both the mantuq and the mafhum. These expressions have both linguistic meanings and Shariah legislative meanings.

They have other Shariah texts from the Book and the Sunnah that are specified (تخصيص takhsees) in the case of generality (عموم ‘umum), and restricted (تقييد taqyeed) in the case of absoluteness (اطلاق itlaq). They have contextualizations (قرائن qara’in) that designate the intended meaning from them, and the ruling they require regarding the evidencing of the command for obligation (وجوب wujub), recommendation (ندب nadb), or permission (إباحة ibahah); and the indication of the prohibition for prohibition (تحريم tahrim) or dislike (كراهة karahah); and whether they are specific to an incident or general to every matter, among other matter contained within the texts of the Quran or the Hadith. Therefore, they are understood with a Shariah legislative understanding, and neither a solely literal (dhahiri) understanding, nor a logical (mantiqi) understanding. For this reason, juristic difference (اختلاف ikhtilaaf) occurs from the understanding of a single Shariah text, such that two different or contradictory opinions are given regarding it.

This is from the perspective of understanding—that is, from the perspective of the evidencing (دلالة dalalah) of the expression. In addition to the difference in the authentication (ثبوت thubut) of the text of the Hadith in terms of its consideration or non-consideration, difference also occurs in the consideration or non-consideration of the ruling taken from it. All of this results in a difference in opinions: regarding whether such-and-such meaning is the Shariah ruling, or the meaning contrary to it, or different from it. All of them are evidenced by the Shariah text, so all of them are a Shariah ruling, no matter how much they enumerate, differ, or contradict. This is because the Shariah ruling is (خطاب الشارع المتعلق بأفعال العباد) “the address of the Legislator related to the actions of the servants.” The address of the Legislator brought by the revelation requires understanding from the one addressed so that it becomes a Shariah ruling in his regard, because the text requires

understanding to become a subject of action. Thus, the address of the Legislator becomes a Shariah ruling when it is understood from the authentication (ثبوت thaboot) of the text, after the text is authenticated as Quran or Hadith. Prior to the authentication of the text and the understanding of its evidencing, it is not considered a Shariah ruling. Accordingly, that which made the text the address of the Legislator is the understanding of it. Therefore, the Shariah ruling is the opinion taken from the Shariah text, and it is what is considered the address of the Legislator. From this premise, the opinion of the Mujtahid is a Shariah ruling, as long as he relies in it upon the Book and the Sunnah, or upon what the Book and the Sunnah have evidenced of the Shariah evidences.

Accordingly, the opinions of the previous Mujtahids from the founders of the Madhahib and others are Shariah rulings. The opinions of the Mujtahids today are Shariah rulings. The opinions of the Mujtahids in the future, in every time and place, are Shariah rulings, as long as they deduced them through a valid Ijtihad, relying within them upon the Shariah evidences. The Prophet ﷺ approved the consideration of the understanding of the text as the Shariah ruling, and he approved the difference in it. Following the departure of the Confederates (Al-Ahzab) in the Battle of the Trench (Al-Khandaq), he ﷺ commanded a caller to announce among the people, «**مَنْ كَانَ سَامِعاً مُطِيعاً فَلا يُصَلِّيَنَّ الْعَصْرَ إلا فِي بَنِي قُرَيْظَةَ**» **"Whoever is hearing and obedient, let him not pray 'Asr except at Banu Quraydha."** Some of them understood to leave the 'Asr prayer in Madinah, so they did not pray until they reached Banu Quraydha. Others understood that the intent was to hasten, so they prayed 'Asr and went to Banu Quraydha after performing the 'Asr prayer. They presented that to the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, and he approved both understandings and considered them valid. The Sahabah, may Allah ﷺ be pleased with them, used to differ in the understanding of the

Quran and the Hadith, and they had different opinions regarding that. Every opinion among their opinions is a Shariah ruling. They had a Unanimous Consensus (إجماع Ijma') that the opinion understood by any Mujtahid from the text is a Shariah ruling.

On this basis, the Sunnah and the Consensus of the Sahabah (إجماع الصحابة Ijma' al-Sahabah) evidence that the opinion deduced by any Mujtahid is considered a Shariah ruling. It is obligatory to adhere to it, upon the one who deduced it by istinbaat (استنباط Shariah deduction), upon everyone who agrees with him on this understanding, and upon everyone who undertakes his imitation (تقليد taqlid) in it.

The Origin Regarding Actions Is Abiding to the Shariah Rulings (الأصل في الأفعال التقيّد بأحكام الشرع), But Neither Permission nor Prohibition in Origin

The permitted (مباح mubah) is what the transmitted evidence (دليل سمعي dalil sam'i) evidences regarding the address of the Legislator (خطاب الشارع Khitab Al-Shari') by giving a choice between undertaking the action and leaving it without a substitute, or it is that which a person is given a choice between undertaking it and leaving it legislatively (Shar'an).

Permission (إباحة ibahah) is from the Shariah rulings, so the mubah is a Shariah ruling. The Shariah ruling requires an evidence that evidences it. Thus, whatever has no evidence evidencing it is not a Shariah ruling. Therefore, knowing that the ruling of Allah ﷻ regarding an action is permitted (مباح mubah) requires a Shariah evidence. The absence of a Shariah evidence does not indicate that the action is permitted, because the absence of evidence does not indicate the existence of the ruling of permission, nor the existence of any ruling for it. Instead, it evidences the negation of the existence of a ruling for it, and it evidences the obligation of seeking the evidence to know the ruling of Allah ﷻ regarding it so that he determines his stance towards it. This is because knowing the Shariah ruling regarding the action is an obligation (فرض fard) upon every legally responsible person (مكلف mukallaf) to determine his stance towards the action: whether he undertakes it or leaves it. Thus, permission is the address of the Legislator giving a choice between undertaking and leaving. So, as long as the address of the Legislator is not known, the Shariah ruling is not known, and as long as the address of the Legislator with permission does not exist, the rule of permission does not exist. For there is

no rule for the actions of rational beings prior to the arrival of the Shariah. Consequently, judging an action as being permitted, recommended, obligatory, disliked, or prohibited depends upon the arrival of the transmitted evidence (دليل سمعي dalil sam'i) with these rulings. Without the transmitted evidence, it is impossible to give the action any of the rulings. Hence, it is impossible for us to judge with permission, prohibition, or any other of the five Shariah rulings unless the transmitted evidence establishes that.

The meaning of this is not to abandon seeking the ruling of Allah ﷻ regarding the action and to suspend the Shariah rulings, or to abandon undertaking the burdens of life under the pretext of ignorance of Allah's ﷻ ruling regarding them. All of that is not permissible legislatively (Shar'an). Instead, it means that man's action requires knowing the ruling of Allah ﷻ regarding it, and that necessitates seeking the Shariah evidences and applying them to that action until the rule of Allah ﷻ regarding the action is known, in terms of it being permitted, prohibited, obligatory, disliked, or recommended. This is because the criterion (مقياس miqyas) of actions for the Muslim is the commands and prohibitions of Allah ﷻ. Allah ﷻ has obligated upon every Muslim to look into every action he approaches to know the ruling of Allah ﷻ regarding it prior to undertaking the action: is it prohibited, obligatory, disliked, recommended, or permitted. Thus, every action must have one of the five aforementioned rulings related to it; it must be either obligatory, prohibited, recommended, disliked, or permitted. Every action among the actions that the Muslim undertakes, he must know the ruling of Allah ﷻ regarding this action prior to his direct engagement in it, because Allah ﷻ will question him about it. Allah ﷻ said,

﴿فَوَرَبِّكَ لَنَسْـَٔلَنَّهُمْ أَجْمَعِينَ ۝٩٢ عَمَّا كَانُوا۟ يَعْمَلُونَ ۝٩٣﴾

"So by your Lord, We will surely question them all, about what they used to do" [TMQ Surah Al-Hijr: 92-93]. And He ﷻ said,

﴿وَمَا تَكُونُ فِي شَأْنٍ وَمَا تَتْلُوا مِنْهُ مِن قُرْءَانٍ وَلَا تَعْمَلُونَ مِنْ عَمَلٍ إِلَّا كُنَّا عَلَيْكُمْ شُهُودًا إِذْ تُفِيضُونَ فِيهِ﴾

"And you are not engaged in any matter or recite any of the Quran and you people do not do any deed except that We are witness over you when you are involved in it" [TMQ Surah Yunus: 61]. The meaning of His informing His servants that He is a Witness over their actions is that He will hold them accountable for them and question them about them.

The Prophet ﷺ clarified the obligation that the action must be in accordance with the rulings of Islam, saying, «**مَنْ عَمِلَ عَمَلاً لَيْسَ عَلَيْهِ أَمْرُنَا فَهُوَ رَدٌّ**» **"Whoever does an action that is not upon our matter, it is rejected."** The Companions (ra) continuously asked the Messenger of Allah ﷺ about their behaviors so that they would know the rule of Allah ﷻ regarding them prior to doing them. Ibn al-Mubarak transmitted that Uthman bin Madh'un came to the Prophet ﷺ and said, "Do you permit me to castrate myself?" The Prophet ﷺ said, «**لَيْسَ مِنَّا مَنْ خَصَى وَلا اخْتَصَى، وَإِنَّ اخْتِصَاءَ أُمَّتِي الصِّيَامُ. قَالَ: يَا رَسُولَ اللَّهِ: أَتَأْذَنُ لِي فِي السِّيَاحَةِ؟ قَالَ: سِيَاحَةُ أُمَّتِي الْجِهَادُ فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ، قَالَ: يَا رَسُولَ اللَّهِ أَتَأْذَنُ لِي فِي التَّرَهُّبِ؟ قَالَ: إِنَّ تَرَهُّبَ أُمَّتِي الْجُلُوسُ فِي الْمَسَاجِدِ لانْتِظَارَ الصَّلاةِ**» **"He is not of us who castrates or gets castrated; indeed, the castration of my Ummah is fasting."** He said, "O Messenger of Allah ﷻ, do you permit me tourism (Siyaha)?" He said, **"The tourism of my Ummah is Jihad in the way of Allah ﷻ."** He said, "O Messenger of Allah ﷻ, do you permit me devotional seclusion (Tarahhub)?" He said, **"Indeed, the devotional seclusion of my Ummah is sitting in the masjids waiting for the Salah."** It is explicit that the Companions (ra) would not embark upon an action except that they asked about it prior to embarking upon it to know the ruling of Allah ﷻ regarding it. Had the principle regarding actions been permission, they would

have done it and not asked about it; if Allah ﷻ prohibited it, they would leave it, otherwise they would continue doing it and there would be no need for them to ask.

As for the silence of the Legislator (سكوت الشارع Sakoot ush-Shaari') regarding actions for which He did not clarify the ruling of Allah ﷻ while people were doing them, it does not mean that the absence of the Legislator in giving a verbal or practical opinion is in itself an evidence for the permission of the actions, for which there is no explicit verbal or practical text clarifying them. Instead, the meaning of silence is that the actions which were done in front of the Messenger ﷺ, or which he knew people were doing within his authority, is the evidence for the permission of these actions specifically, not for the permission of all actions absolutely. This is because his ﷺ silence regarding the actions—that is, his approval (إقرار Iqrar) of them—is a Shariah evidence for the permission of those specific actions. Thus, silence regarding the action is considered a Shariah evidence for its permission if that was with knowledge of it, such that it was done in front of him or he knew about it. As for his silence regarding the action without his knowledge of it, or regarding the action occurring outside his authority even if he knew about it, it is not called silence in the context of silence being from the Shariah evidences.

The silence which alone is the evidence for permission is the silence of the Messenger ﷺ, not the silence of the Quran. This is because the Quran is the Speech of Allah ﷻ, and Allah ﷻ knows what actions were, what will be, and what is currently happening. Thus, the Quran's absence of clarification of the rule of an action is not considered that it remained silent about it. Instead, the intended meaning of silence regarding the action is in the case of the silence of the Messenger ﷺ regarding it, with his knowledge of it—that is, the action is performed in front of him, or performed within his authority with his knowledge, and he remains silent about it.

Some of the Companions (ra) deduced the permissibility of ‘azl (coitus interruptus) by the silence of the Prophet ﷺ regarding it, saying, «**كُنَّا نَعْزِلُ وَالْقُرْآنُ يَنْزِلُ**» **“We used to practice ‘Azl while the Quran was being revealed,”** meaning while the Messenger of Allah ﷺ was among us, since his saying “while the Quran was being revealed” is a metonymy (كناية Kinayah) for the presence of the Messenger ﷺ among them. Some of the Mujtahids deduced by istinbaat (استنباط Shariah deduction) the permissibility of eating the meat of the Dabb (spiny-tailed lizard) by the silence of the Prophet ﷺ regarding eating it. It was narrated that «**أُكل الضب على مائدة النبي ولم يأكل منه**» **“the Dabb (lizard) was eaten at the table of the Prophet and he did not eat from it.”** Thus, his silence regarding the Companions (ra) while they were eating the Dabb at his table is an evidence for the permission of eating it. Therefore, the silence of the Legislator regarding the action with His knowledge of it is an evidence for its permission, and the absence of the Legislator clarifying a ruling for the action is not an evidence for its permission. There is a difference between silence and the absence of clarification in terms of evidencing (دلالة dalalah).

From all of that, it becomes evident that the principle regarding the actions of the servants is that they have a Shariah ruling which must be sought from the Shariah evidences, prior to undertaking the action. Judging the action as being permitted, obligatory, recommended, prohibited, or disliked depends upon knowing the transmitted evidence (دليل سمعي dalil sam’i) for this rule from the Book, the Sunnah, Unanimous Consensus (إجماع Ijma’), or Analogy (قياس Qiyas).

The Origin Regarding Objects Is Permission
(الأصل في الأشياء الإباحة)

Objects (أشياء Ashya') are different from actions (أفعال Af'aal). Objects are the materials that man utilizes through his actions. As for actions, they are the physical or verbal behaviors that man undertakes to satisfy his drives.

Actions must inevitably be related to material objects used to execute the action by which man intends satisfaction. Thus, eating, drinking, walking, standing, and the like are physical actions and behaviors. Selling, leasing, agency (وكالة wakala), suretyship (كفالة kafala), and the like are verbal actions and behaviors. All of these actions, whether physical or verbal behaviors, are inevitably related to objects. Eating, in its capacity as eating, is an action, but it is related to bread, apples, pork, and so forth. Drinking, in its capacity as drinking, is an action, but it is related to water, honey, wine, and so forth. These objects must have a ruling, just as actions must have a Shariah ruling. Now, do objects take the ruling of the action related to them in terms of obligation (وجوب wujub), prohibition (حرمة hurmah), recommendation (ندب nadb), dislike (كراهة karahah), or permission (إباحة ibahah)? Or do they take a ruling other than the ruling of the action? Or do they have no ruling, and the ruling is solely for the action?

What comes to mind is that objects and actions are one and the same. The action does not separate from the objects, and the object does not separate from the actions, if it is to have any consideration. If one separates from the other, it loses consideration. Based on this, it also comes to mind that the ruling of the action applies to the ruling of the objects related to the action. For this reason, the ulema in the era of decline did not differentiate between the object and the action. Some of them said, (الأصل في الأشياء الإباحة) "The origin of objects is

permission, making it comprehensive of both actions and things. Others said, (الأصل في الأشياء التحريم) "The origin of objects is prohibition," making it comprehensive with respect to both actions and objects.

The truth is that there is a difference between actions and objects in the Islamic Shariah. The one who inductively studies the Shariah texts and the Shariah rulings realizes that the Legislator (الشارع Ash-Shari') made the rulings related to actions not depart from five rulings: obligation, prohibition, recommendation, dislike, or permission. Every action does not depart from being obligatory, prohibited, recommended, disliked, or permitted.

The Shariah ruling has been defined as (خطاب الشارع المتعلق بأفعال العباد) "the address of the Legislator related to the actions of the servants." Thus, the Shariah ruling was made for the action, regardless of the object to which it relates. Therefore, the Shariah ruling is solely for actions, not for objects. Allah ﷻ permitted selling in its capacity as selling, so Allah ﷻ said,

﴿وَأَحَلَّ ٱللَّهُ ٱلۡبَيۡعَ﴾

"And Allah ﷻ has permitted trade" [Al-Baqarah: 275].

As for the objects to which selling relates, among them is what Allah ﷻ has permitted, such as grapes, and among them is what Allah ﷻ has prohibited, such as wine. The ruling is for the action of selling, and the prohibition is for the action of interest (riba), regardless of the thing to which the action relates. As for objects, the one who inductively studies the Shariah texts sees that Allah ﷻ gave them the description of permitted (حِل hill) or prohibited (حرمة hurmah) only, and did not give them the ruling of obligation, recommendation, or dislike. Allah ﷻ made prohibition or permission a description of the object. Allah the Exalted said,

﴿قُلۡ أَرَءَيۡتُم مَّآ أَنزَلَ ٱللَّهُ لَكُم مِّن رِّزۡقٖ فَجَعَلۡتُم مِّنۡهُ حَرَامٗا وَحَلَٰلٗا﴾

"Say, 'Have you seen what Allah ﷻ has sent down to you of provision, of which you have made some lawful and some unlawful?'" [TMQ Surah Yunus: 59]. And He ﷻ said,

﴿وَلَا تَقُولُواْ لِمَا تَصِفُ أَلۡسِنَتُكُمُ ٱلۡكَذِبَ هَٰذَا حَلَٰلٞ وَهَٰذَا حَرَامٞ﴾

"And do not say about what your tongues assert of untruth, 'This is lawful and this is unlawful'" [TMQ Surah An-Nahl: 116],

﴿إِنَّمَا حَرَّمَ عَلَيۡكُمُ ٱلۡمَيۡتَةَ﴾

"He has only forbidden to you dead animals" [Al-Baqarah: 173],

﴿حَرَّمۡنَا كُلَّ ذِي ظُفُرٖ﴾

"We forbade every animal with undivided hooves" [Al-An'aam: 146],

﴿وَيُحَرِّمُ عَلَيۡهِمُ ٱلۡخَبَٰٓئِثَ﴾

"And He forbids them the impure things" [TMQ Surah Al-A'raaf: 157],

﴿لِمَ تُحَرِّمُ مَآ أَحَلَّ ٱللَّهُ لَكَ﴾

"Why do you forbid what Allah has made lawful for you?" [At-Tahreem: 1]. Thus, all the Shariah texts do not give anything except one of two matters: either it is Halal or it is Haram, with no third option, and it does not depart from one of the two options.

This permitting and prohibiting is the prerogative of Allah ﷻ Alone; no one has the right to associate with Him in it. Anyone who gives an opinion from himself is a sinful transgressor and fabricator against Allah ﷻ. Permission (حِل hill) and prohibition (حرمة hurmah) are two descriptions, one of which inevitably applies to everything Allah ﷻ has created that can fall under man's sensation, whether it is eaten, worn, ridden,

inhabited, used, or not used. If we inductively study the Shariah texts, we find that Allah ﷻ established an origin regarding all these objects and made it permission (ibahah). Allah ﷻ granted us a concession to benefit from everything within man's reach, and He excepted from that generality some objects which He explicitly specified and prohibited.

That permission is understood from the texts of the Shariah generally (ijmala) and comprehensively (ta'mima). We find the texts generalizing permission in the likes of His saying,

﴿هُوَ ٱلَّذِى خَلَقَ لَكُم مَّا فِى ٱلْأَرْضِ جَمِيعًا﴾

"It is He who created for you all of that which is on the earth" [Al-Baqarah: 29]. And they make it comprehensive in the likes of His saying,

﴿أَلَمْ تَرَوْا۟ أَنَّ ٱللَّهَ سَخَّرَ لَكُم مَّا فِى ٱلسَّمَٰوَٰتِ وَمَا فِى ٱلْأَرْضِ وَأَسْبَغَ عَلَيْكُمْ نِعَمَهُۥ ظَٰهِرَةً وَبَاطِنَةً﴾

"Do you not see that Allah ﷻ has made subject to you whatever is in the heavens and whatever is in the earth and amply bestowed upon you His favors, both apparent and unapparent?" [Luqman: 20]. And He generalizes and details in the likes of His saying,

﴿ٱلَّذِى جَعَلَ لَكُمُ ٱلْأَرْضَ فِرَٰشًا وَٱلسَّمَآءَ بِنَآءً وَأَنزَلَ مِنَ ٱلسَّمَآءِ مَآءً فَأَخْرَجَ بِهِۦ مِنَ ٱلثَّمَرَٰتِ رِزْقًا لَّكُمْ﴾

"He who made for you the earth a bed [spread out] and the sky a ceiling and sent down from the sky, rain and brought forth thereby fruits as provision for you" [Al-Baqarah: 22],

﴿وَسَخَّرَ لَكُمُ ٱلْفُلْكَ لِتَجْرِىَ فِى ٱلْبَحْرِ بِأَمْرِهِۦ ۖ وَسَخَّرَ لَكُمُ ٱلْأَنْهَٰرَ ﴿٣٢﴾ وَسَخَّرَ لَكُمُ ٱلشَّمْسَ وَٱلْقَمَرَ دَآئِبَيْنِ ۖ وَسَخَّرَ لَكُمُ ٱلَّيْلَ وَٱلنَّهَارَ ﴿٣٣﴾ وَءَاتَىٰكُم مِّن كُلِّ مَا سَأَلْتُمُوهُ ۚ وَإِن تَعُدُّوا۟ نِعْمَتَ ٱللَّهِ لَا تُحْصُوهَآ﴾

"And He subjected for you the ships to sail through the sea by His command and subjected for you the rivers. And He subjected for you the sun and the moon, continuous in orbit, and subjected for you the night and the day. And He gave you from all you asked of Him. And if you should count the favor of Allah ﷻ, you could not enumerate them" [TMQ Surah Ibrahim: 32-34],

﴿وَنَزَّلْنَا مِنَ ٱلسَّمَآءِ مَآءً مُّبَٰرَكًا فَأَنۢبَتْنَا بِهِۦ جَنَّٰتٍ وَحَبَّ ٱلْحَصِيدِ ۝ وَٱلنَّخْلَ بَاسِقَٰتٍ لَّهَا طَلْعٌ نَّضِيدٌ ۝ رِّزْقًا لِّلْعِبَادِ﴾

"And We sent down from the sky blessed water, and thereby We caused gardens to grow and the grain of the harvest (9) and tall palm trees with layered clusters of fruit (10) as provision for the servants." [Qaf: 9-11],

﴿قُلْ مَنْ حَرَّمَ زِينَةَ ٱللَّهِ ٱلَّتِىٓ أَخْرَجَ لِعِبَادِهِۦ وَٱلطَّيِّبَٰتِ مِنَ ٱلرِّزْقِ﴾

"Say, 'Who has forbidden the adornment of Allah ﷻ which He has produced for His servants and the good [lawful] things of provision?'" [Al-A'raf: 32],

﴿إِنَّمَا حَرَّمَ عَلَيْكُمُ ٱلْمَيْتَةَ وَٱلدَّمَ وَلَحْمَ ٱلْخِنزِيرِ وَمَآ أُهِلَّ لِغَيْرِ ٱللَّهِ بِهِۦ﴾

"He has only forbidden to you dead animals, blood, the flesh of swine, and that which has been dedicated to other than Allah ﷻ" [Al-Baqarah: 173],

﴿قُل لَّآ أَجِدُ فِى مَآ أُوحِىَ إِلَىَّ مُحَرَّمًا عَلَىٰ طَاعِمٍ يَطْعَمُهُۥٓ إِلَّآ أَن يَكُونَ مَيْتَةً أَوْ دَمًا مَّسْفُوحًا﴾

"Say, 'I do not find within that which was revealed to me [anything] forbidden to one who would eat it unless it be a dead animal or blood spilled out...'" [Al-An'am: 145].

These verses indicate that Allah ﷻ permitted all things for man, and that what He prohibited from them, He excepted, and He explicitly specified it alone. Likewise, the Hadith came and explicitly specified some prohibited things. It was narrated that the Prophet ﷺ forbade eating the meat of domestic donkeys, every beast of prey with fangs, and every bird with talons.

Thus, the Legislator permitted all objects, meaning He made them Halal, since permission (ibahah) regarding things means Halal, the opposite of haram. If He explicitly specified the prohibition of some of them, He made this portion alone an exception. Therefore, hill (حِل) and hurmah regarding things are a description for them, and things have no Shariah description other than them. The permission of an object—that is, its being Halal—does not require an evidence, because the general evidence in the texts permitted all objects. As for its prohibition, that is what requires evidence, because it is made an exception and specified from the general evidences of permission, so it must have a text. For this reason, (الأصل في الأشياء الإباحة) "the origin regarding things is permission (ibahah)"; that is, the principle regarding them is that they are Halal.

It Is Not Permissible for the Rules to Change with the Change of Time and Place

A belief dominates the minds of the majority of Muslims these days, the essence of which is that Islam is flexible, and that it goes along with the social, economic, and political situations in every time and place, evolving so that its rulings apply to the requirements of modern situations, and the demands of what people have become familiar with, and accustomed to, in our time.

To support their argument, they cite what they call a legislative maxim, (لا يُنكَر تغير الأحكام بتغير الزمان) "The change of rules with the change of time is not denied"! On this basis, their conduct conforms to contemporary realities, and they adjust their actions according to modern demands. When confronted with the rulings of Shariah, they contend that these laws were time-bound, arguing instead that Islam obligates individuals to keep pace with modernity and act in accordance with their specific time and place! Thus, they justify the existence of riba (interest) banks and joint-stock companies and dealing with them, on the basis that this is a realistic interest and Islam must be twisted to accept it, for it is flexible as they fabricate. And the tabarruj (تبرج displaying of beauty) of women and their mixing with others without a need approved by the Shariah, and staying up late with strangers in parties, must be permitted and accepted because it is from the requirements of the time. And how could Islam contradict the era when the alleged Shariah maxim that says, "Islam changes with the change of time and place"?! That is what they claim. And polygyny's ruling has ended because the time no longer finds it palatable. And cutting the hand of the thief, and stoning the fornicator or lashing him, it is not permissible to discuss them, because they do not suit the taste of our time.

Thus, the maxim and its examples proceed to become completely entrenched in the minds of Muslims, whereas it contradicts Islam totally. Instead, it destroys Islam's foundations and branches, eliminates its legislation, and obliterates its features. This only emerged at the end of the nineteenth century during the days of severe intellectual decline; then colonialism came and nourished it, ultimately leading to its violent and disruptive culmination.

The rulings of Shariah in Islam constitute a comprehensive system designed to govern the satisfaction of human instincts and organic needs. These have been addressed to us by the Lawgiver within the Book and the Sunnah, which remain the exclusive foundational sources for the jurisprudential deduction (استنباط istinbat) of Islamic rulings. The Shariah ruling is (خطاب الشارع المتعلق بأفعال العباد) "the address of the Legislator related to the actions of the servants," and it—meaning the Shariah ruling—must be established by evidence that it is the address of the Legislator. This means, the ruling must be taken from the text, which is the Quranic verse or the Hadith, or what is established by the text, such as the Consensus of the Companions (ra) (إجماع الصحابة ijma' al-Sahabah) and Analogy (قياس qiyas) with a Shariah cause (علة شرعية 'illah shar'iyyah). On this basis, the source of the Shariah rulings is one and no other: the Book of Allah ﷻ and the Sunnah of His Messenger ﷺ. From them, the treatments are deduced to solve the problems of people and settle disputes among them. So, are time and place either a Book or a Sunnah? On what basis is it permissible for man to organize the treatments for himself, or for the Ummah to organize the relationships of its society according to time and place, when Allah ﷻ has obligated that the reality be treated by the Shariah rulings deduced from His ﷻ Book and the Sunnah of His Messenger ﷺ?

Indeed, the Islamic Shariah, in its treatment regarding man, dictates studying the reality of his problems, then

recognizing the ruling of Allah ﷻ regarding them by deducing it from the Book and the Sunnah, or what they guided to. Thus, it is obligatory upon every Muslim, when applying the Shariah to the society, to study the society with a precise study, then treat it with the Shariah of Allah ﷻ, and change it with a radical, revolutionary change on the basis of the ideology of Islam, without giving any weight to circumstances and conditions in contradicting the Shariah. Everything that contradicts Islam must be removed, and everything that Islam commanded must be empowered and made the subject of application. Therefore, the reality of the society must be restricted by the commands and prohibitions of Allah ﷻ. It is not permissible for Muslims to adapt according to the reality of their time and place. Instead, they must treat that with the Book of Allah ﷻ and the Sunnah of His Messenger ﷺ.

The Command and the Form of the Imperative Verb (Seeghatul F'il il-Amr)

In Shariah, Muslims are legally responsible (مكلف mukallaf) in this life to proceed according to the commands and prohibitions of Allah ﷻ. His commands and prohibitions came upon the tongue of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, our master Muhammad ﷺ, in the Noble Quran and the Prophetic Sunnah. From them we deduce the rulings by istinbaat (استنباط Shariah deduction), and we deduce what is valid to be evidence for the rulings alongside them, which are the Consensus of the Companions (ra) and Shariah Analogy.

These rulings are taken from the commands and prohibitions mentioned in the Book and the Sunnah. The commands mentioned in the Book and the Sunnah are not restricted to the form of the imperative verb (صيغة فعل الأمر seeghatul f'il il-amr). Instead, they come in several forms. Therefore, those who assume that the meaning of the command of Allah ﷻ is that Allah ﷻ commands a matter with the form "Do" (If'al) are mistaken. Instead, He may command it with the imperative form, and He may command with other forms.

Thus, when Allah ﷻ says,

﴿كُتِبَ عَلَيۡكُمُ ٱلصِّيَامُ﴾

"Decreed upon you is fasting" [Al-Baqarah: 183], He is commanding fasting. And when He says,

﴿وَلِلَّهِ عَلَى ٱلنَّاسِ حِجُّ ٱلۡبَيۡتِ﴾

"And due to Allah ﷻ from the people is a pilgrimage to the House" [Aal-i Imran: 97], He is commanding Hajj, just as He commands that in His saying,

﴿أَقِيمُواْ ٱلصَّلَوٰةَ﴾

"And establish prayer" [Al-Baqarah: 43], and in His saying,

﴿إِذَا تَدَايَنتُم بِدَيۡنٍ إِلَىٰٓ أَجَلٖ مُّسَمّٗى فَٱكۡتُبُوهُ﴾

"When you contract a debt for a specified term, write it down" [Al-Baqarah: 282], which came in the imperative form. Thus, the command from Allah ﷻ is His demand for us to undertake the action, whether He demanded it with the imperative form or with the declarative form (صيغة الإخبار sighat al-ikhbar).

So, it is not said that this action is not obligatory because no text came commanding us with it due to the absence of the imperative verb, and its coming in the declarative form. Nor is it said that this matter is obligatory only because it came in the form of the imperative verb. For an action may be obligatory and come in other than the imperative form. It also may be non-obligatory yet came in the form of the imperative verb. This is because the intended meaning of the command is the demand of the action regardless of the form in which the demand came, because the command does not have a form specific to it.

As for the form "do" (افعل if'al), it is not specific to the command alone. Instead, it is a homonym (لفظ مشترك lafzh mushtarak) between the command and other than it. It may be for threat, it may be for guidance, and it may be for permission, and all of these are not commands. A linguistic homonym with multiple definitions, when stripped of contextual indicators (قرائن qara'in), applies equally to all of its recognized meanings. It is not restricted to any single definition unless there is corroborating evidence that dictates a specific interpretation.

For example, the word "Al-'Ayn" (العين) is a homonym with several meanings. It is applied to the seeing eye, to the spy, to the flowing spring, and to currency. Not a single one of these meanings outweighs the others except by a contextualization (قرينة qareenah), because it is literal (حقيقة haqiqah) in all of

them, and it is not literal in some of them and metaphorical (مجاز majaz) in the others.

Likewise, the form "do" (افعال if'al) is a homonym with several meanings. It is applied and the command is intended by it, it is applied and choice is intended by it, it is applied and bestowal of favor is intended by it, and it is applied and threat is intended by it. Not a single one of these meanings outweighs the others except by an evidencing, because it is literal in all of them, and not literal (حقيقة haqiqah) in some of them and metaphorical (مجاز majaaz) in the others. The Quran has come with that in multiple explicit verses that do not accept interpretation.

It appears from the inductive study (tatabbu') of the verses in which the form of the imperative verb came that the Quran applied it to several considerations and did not specify it to the command. It came for obligation, like His saying,

﴿أَقِمِ ٱلصَّلَوٰةَ﴾

"And establish prayer" [Al-Israa': 78]. It also came for recommendation (ندب nadb), like His saying,

﴿فَكَاتِبُوهُم﴾

"Then write a contract with them" [An-Nur: 33]; for guidance, like His saying,

﴿وَٱسۡتَشۡهِدُواْ﴾

"And bring to witness" [Al-Baqarah: 282]—meaning if you want to complete a transaction, it is more appropriate for you to have witnesses over it so your right is not lost. It came for permission (إباحة ibahah), like His saying,

﴿وَإِذَا حَلَلۡتُمۡ فَٱصۡطَادُواْ﴾

"But when you come out of ihram, then you may hunt" [Al-Ma'idah: 2] and,

﴿فَإِذَا قُضِيَتِ ٱلصَّلَوٰةُ فَٱنتَشِرُواْ فِى ٱلأَرۡضِ﴾

"And when the Salah has been concluded, disperse within the land" [Al-Jumu'ah: 10]; for bestowal of favor, like His saying,

﴿كُلُواْ مِمَّا رَزَقَكُمُ ٱللَّهُ﴾

"Eat of what Allah ﷻ has provided for you" [Al-Ma'idah: 88]; for honoring, like His saying,

﴿ٱدۡخُلُوهَا بِسَلَٰمٍ﴾

"Enter it in peace" [TMQ Surah Al-Hijr: 46]; for threat, like His saying,

﴿ٱعۡمَلُواْ مَا شِئۡتُمۡ﴾

"Do whatever you will" [Fussilat: 40], and,

﴿تَمَتَّعُوا حَتَّىٰ حِينٍ﴾

"Enjoy yourselves for a time" [TMQ Surah Az-Zariyat: 43]; for subjugation,

﴿كُونُواْ قِرَدَةً خَٰسِـِٔينَ﴾

"Be apes, despised" [Al-Baqarah: 65]; for incapacitation,

﴿كُونُواْ حِجَارَةً أَوۡ حَدِيدًا ۝٥٠ أَوۡ خَلۡقًا مِّمَّا يَكۡبُرُ فِى صُدُورِكُمۡ﴾

"Be stones or iron, (50) or some other creation that seems even greater in your minds." [Al-Israa': 50-51]; for humiliation, like His saying,

﴿ذُقۡ إِنَّكَ أَنتَ ٱلۡعَزِيزُ ٱلۡكَرِيمُ﴾

"Taste [this]; indeed, you are the honored, the noble!" [Ad-Dukhan: 49]; and for equalization,

﴿فَٱصۡبِرُوٓاْ أَوۡ لَا تَصۡبِرُواْ﴾

"So be patient or be impatient" [At-Tur: 16].

On this basis, the form of the imperative verb bears several meanings. If it comes stripped of clear contextualization, it is imperative to deduce the contextualization in the address in which it came, or in other addresses that came regarding its subject, or in the circumstance regarding which it came, so that the intended meaning of the command in the text is designated, or the intended meaning of the imperative verb form in the text is designated.

In this manner, the Shariah text can be understood, and the ruling of Allah ﷻ intended from this text can be deduced from it. Thus, man follows the Halal as it came, not as the person desires it, and he avoids the Haram that came, not what the person himself views. Consequently, man would have followed the Halal and avoided the Haram (prohibited) in the manner that Allah ﷻ intended.

Wherever the Shariah Is, There Is the Interest (مصلحة Maslahah)

Allah ﷻ said in His Noble Book addressing the Messenger of Allah ﷺ,

﴿وَمَآ أَرۡسَلۡنَٰكَ إِلَّا رَحۡمَةٗ لِّلۡعَٰلَمِينَ﴾

"And We have not sent you, O Muhammad, except as a mercy to the worlds" [Al-Anbiya: 107]. The fact that he ﷺ came as a mercy to them means that he came with that which contains their welfare. And Allah ﷻ said,

﴿يَٰٓأَيُّهَا ٱلنَّاسُ قَدۡ جَآءَتۡكُم مَّوۡعِظَةٞ مِّن رَّبِّكُمۡ وَشِفَآءٞ لِّمَا فِي ٱلصُّدُورِ وَهُدٗى وَرَحۡمَةٞ لِّلۡمُؤۡمِنِينَ﴾

"O mankind, there has to come to you instruction from your Lord and healing for what is in the breasts and guidance and mercy for the believers" [Yunus: 57]. And Allah ﷻ said,

﴿فَقَدۡ جَآءَكُم بَيِّنَةٞ مِّن رَّبِّكُمۡ وَهُدٗى وَرَحۡمَةٞ﴾

"There has now come to you a clear evidence from your Lord and a guidance and mercy" [Al-An'am: 157]. Thus, guidance and mercy are either bringing a benefit to people or repelling a harm from them. This is the ultimate interest (مصلحة maslahah), because interests are the bringing of benefits and the repelling of harms. Determining whether a matter is a maslahah or not a maslahah belongs solely to the Shariah, because it is what brought the ultimate good, and it is what determines this a maslahah for people. This is because the intended meaning of maslahah is the maslahah of man in his capacity as a human being. Even the intended meaning of the maslahah is his welfare in his capacity as a human being, not in his capacity as an individual alone.

Moreover, the maslahah is either determined by the intellect or by the Shariah. If the determination of the maslahah is left to the intellect, determining the true interest becomes obscured to people. This is because the intellect is limited; it cannot comprehend the essence of man and his reality. Thus, it cannot determine what is good for him, because it has not perceived his reality in order to perceive that this matter is an interest or a harmful corruption (مَفْسَدة mufsadah). No one perceives the reality of man except the Creator of man. Therefore, it is impossible to determine what is a maslahah for him or a mufsadah with absolute certainty except the Creator of man, which is Allah ﷻ.

Yes, man can assume that this matter is a maslahah or a mufsadah, but he cannot be decisive regarding that. Leaving the determination of maslahah to human assumption leads to falling into destruction. For he may assume a matter is a maslahah, then it manifests as a mufsadah; thus, he would have determined a mufsadah as a maslahah, thereby inflicting harm (ضرر darar) upon himself. Conversely, a matter may appear to be a mufsadah, but manifests as a maslahah. Thus, he would have distanced a maslahah from man as a mufsadah, thereby inflicting harm upon himself by depriving himself of a maslahah (مصلحة interest).

This is from one perspective. From another perspective, the intellect may judge a matter to be a maslahah today, and then it becomes evident to the intellect tomorrow that this matter is a mufsadah, so it judges it as a mufsadah. This may also occur regarding the mufsadah, so it says about a matter that it is a mufsadah today, but then it becomes evident to it tomorrow that it is a maslahah, so it then judges that it is a maslahah. Consequently, a single matter becomes a maslahah and a mufsadah, and this is not permissible, nor can it be, since a matter is either a good or a harm for a single situation. By this, the maslahah becomes a subjective interest, not a true interest.

From this premise, it is obligatory that the intellect is not left to determine what maslahah is. Instead, the Shariah alone must determine that, because it is what determines the true maslahah and the true mufsadah. The intellect merely understands the reality of the matter as it is with a complete understanding, then it understands the Shariah text that came regarding this matter, then it applies the text to the reality. When it applies to it explicitly literally, it is a maslahah or a mufsadah according to the text of the Shariah. When it does not apply to it explicitly literally, then the understood meaning that applies to the reality is searched for, until the maslahah determined by the Shariah is known, by knowing the Shariah ruling of Allah ﷻ regarding that matter.

On this basis, the maslahah is a Shariah maslahah, not a rationalized maslahah. It revolves wherever the Shariah revolves. Thus, wherever the Shariah is, there is maslahah, because the Shariah is what determines the interests of the servants of Allah ﷻ.

The Shariah Rulings of Worship are Strictly Ordained (توقيفية Tawqifiyyah) From Allah ﷻ

Acts of worship (عبادات ‘ibaadaat) are the utmost degrees of sanctification, and they are innate in man, as they are a response to the instinct of religiosity. The intellect only combines in them with feeling so that man worships the One who deserves worship, which is the Creator, so that sentiment does not go astray and worship what does not deserve worship, or err and seek proximity to the Worshipped Entity (معبود ma’bud) with that which distances him from Him. Thus, the role of the intellect in worship is inevitable in being guided to the One Who is worshipped, and designating the One who is worshipped, which is the Creator.

As for the manner in which the created being performs worship to the Creator, there is no room for the intellect in it, nor can it know it. This is because this manner consists of rulings according to which man undertakes the worship of Allah ﷻ. In other words, it is a system that organizes the relationship of the created with the Creator—that is, the relationship of the worshipper with the Worshipped. It is absolutely impossible for this system to come from the created being, because the created being does not perceive the reality of the Creator in order to organize his relationship with Him, nor does he perceive His Essence in order to know how to worship Him. Thus, it is impossible for man to lay down with his intellect a system for acts of worship, between himself and the Creator that organizes his relationship with the Creator—that is, organizes his sanctification of the Creator. This is because laying down this organization necessitates perceiving the reality of the Creator, which is impossible. Thus, it became impossible for man to lay down the rulings of worship with his intellect.

From this premise, it was inevitable that the system of worship comes from the Creator, not from the created being—that is, coming from the Worshipped, not from the worshipper. Thus, it was inevitable that the rulings of worship come from Allah ﷻ alone, and not from man. The human-being has no interference in any of it, no matter how small, because it is impossible for him to lay it down. This system must be conveyed by the Creator to the created being, so that he undertakes the worship of the Deity according to it. Hence, the need for Messengers (as) to convey the rulings of worship to people is of inevitable existence, due to the impossibility of people laying down rulings in acts of worship, and because they do not come except from Allah ﷻ.

It may be said that man has no need for a system for acts of worship. Instead, he can undertake acts of worship without a system, since they are the utmost degrees of sanctification. So, he undertakes worship as he wills because it is a response to satisfy the instinct of religiosity and requires nothing but satisfaction alone. Thus, he satisfies the instinct with any action among the actions of sanctification that achieves this satisfaction. So, what is the need for organizing sanctification—that is, for the Shariah rulings of worship?

The answer to that is that the response of any instinct among the instincts must have an organization of the actions that perform this response. This is because the lack of their organization leads to chaos, which drags into erroneous satisfaction or deviant satisfaction, both of which contradict the basis upon which the instinct was established. For example, if the procreation instinct demands sexual satisfaction and does not have a system for this satisfaction, it would attempt satisfaction with anything that achieves it. This drags it either to deviant satisfaction in a direction that is not a subject for satisfaction, and this means the destruction of the human species for whose sake the instinct exists; or to erroneous satisfaction, which is

satisfaction in a direction that is a subject for satisfaction, but merely for temporary satisfaction. This also means diverting from the result of satisfaction, which is procreation, and in this is a reduction of progeny, if not its eradication, which is a diversion of the instinct from that for which it exists, which is the survival of the species.

Therefore, there must be a system that organizes the procreation instinct.

Likewise, the instinct of religiosity must have an organization of the actions that perform the response of sanctification—that is, there must be an organization of sanctification, which is worship. This is because the lack of its organization leads to man attempting to undertake any action that performs sanctification. This drags into deviant satisfaction by sanctifying a direction that is not a subject for sanctification, such as sanctifying fire considering it a deity, or sanctifying an idol made of dates which he makes with his own hand, worships it, and then eats it. This means diverting the instinct to sanctifying other than the Creator, even though it is the feeling of incapability and need for the Creator, the Organizer. Thus, sanctification becomes contradictory to the instinct driving it. It may also drag into sanctifying a direction that is a subject for sanctification but merely for satisfaction, not to seek its reality, such as sanctifying an idol on the assumption that the Deity incarnated within it, or on the assumption that sanctifying it brings him closer to Allah ﷻ. This means diverting from the result of satisfaction—which is the arrival of gratitude to the One deserving of praise and commendation—to performing this praise to other than the One to whom it belongs, which is the idol. In this is a deviation of the instinct from that for which it exists, which is the sanctification of the Creator, the Organizer.

Therefore, there must be a system that organizes the instinct of religiosity, just as it organizes the procreation

instinct. The difference between them is that regarding the procreation instinct, man can possibly lay down a system from his intellect for the actions that perform its response, because it is from the relationships of man with man. Thus, he can possibly perceive him and can organize his relationship with him, even if he cannot form a complete system. As for the instinct of religiosity, man cannot possibly lay down a system for the actions that perform its response from his intellect, because it is a relationship of man with his Creator and Organizer, whom he cannot possibly perceive, so he cannot organize his relationship with Him. Instead, this system must come from the Creator.

From this premise, it was imperative that the Shariah rulings of worship come from the Creator, not from the created human being.

Thought (الفكر Al-Fikr)

Thought (فكر Fikr), perception (إدراك Idrak), and the intellect (عقل ‘Aql) have the same meaning; they are multiple names for a single named entity. The word thought is expressed and what is meant by it is thinking—that is, the thinking process. It may be expressed and what is meant by it is the result of thinking—that is, what man has arrived at from the thinking process. Thought, by the meaning of thinking, does not have a specific organ such that it is valid to point to it. Instead, it is a complex process consisting of the tangible reality, man’s sensation, his brain, and previous information he possesses. Unless these four things combine in a specific process, neither thought, nor perception, nor intellect can occur.

Therefore, the ancients erred when they researched the intellect and attempted to designate its location in the head, the heart, or other than that. It appears they assumed that the intellect is a specific organ, or that the intellect has a specific organ. The modernists erred when they made the brain the location of the intellect, perception, and thought, whether those who said that thought is the reflection of the brain upon reality, or those who said that thought is the reflection of reality upon the brain. This is because the brain is an organ like the rest of the organs. No reflection occurs from it, nor does any reflection occur upon it. Reflection is the projection of light upon an object and its bouncing back from it, and the projection of an object upon a body that has the capability of reflection and its bouncing back from it in the presence of light. This is like projecting an electric lamp upon a body, then the light bouncing back from this body, so the body is seen and the light is seen. Or the projection of the sun, the moon, or any light from any direction. It is like the projection of a body upon a mirror in the presence of light; the light bounces back, and the image of the body bounces back from the mirror, so it is seen as it is. For the image

of the body bounces back as if it were drawn behind the mirror and thus seen, while in reality it was not drawn, but instead reflected just as light reflects upon any body. This is reflection.

In the process of thought, no reflection occurs. No reflection whatsoever occurs in it from reality upon the brain. Thus, reflection, as such, did not occur. As for the eye, through which it is falsely imagined that reflection occurs, no reflection occurs in it, nor from it. Instead, what occurs is refraction. The image of the seen object does not bounce back outwards. Instead, by its projection upon the eye, refraction occurs, as the image of the seen object refracts and settles inside, so the object is seen. It cannot bounce backwards, and no reflection can occur from it nor by it absolutely. Accordingly, the brain is not the locus of thought.

What occurs is that an image of the tangible reality is transferred to the brain via the senses, and this image is according to the sense that transferred the reality. If it is sight, it transfers the image of the body. If it is hearing, it transfers the representation of its sound. If it is smell, it transfers the representation of its scent, and so forth. Thus, the reality is drawn as it was transferred to the brain—that is, according to the image or representation that was transferred. By this, sensation of the reality occurs only, and thinking does not occur. Only an instinctive discrimination occurs in terms of it being satisfying or not satisfying, painful or not painful, gladdening or not gladdening, pleasurable or not pleasurable, and nothing more than that occurs. Thus, thinking does not occur. If there is previous information, it is linked—via the linking capability present in the brain—with the tangible reality that was drawn in the brain. Thereby, the thinking process occurs, and so perception of the object and knowing what it is results. If there is no previous information, perception of the reality of the object cannot occur. Instead, it remains merely at the limit of sensation, or merely at the limit of instinctive discrimination in terms of it

being satisfying or not satisfying and nothing else, and thought does not occur absolutely.

On this basis, the thinking process does not occur except by the realization of the existence of four things: the tangible reality, the senses or at least one of them, the brain, and previous information. If one of these four things is missing, thought cannot occur absolutely. What occurs of attempts at thinking with the absence of the tangible reality, and with the absence of previous information, are empty imaginations that have no existence, and they are not thoughts. Surrendering to them by distancing oneself from the tangible reality, or from the previous information connected to it, leads to drowning in illusions and misguidance. It may lead to exhausting the brain such that it is afflicted with diseases of disorder, epilepsy, and the like. Therefore, there must be the existence of the tangible reality, and the existence of previous information, just as there must be the existence of the brain, and the existence of the senses.

Accordingly, thought, perception, or the intellect is the transfer of the reality via the senses to the brain, alongside previous information by which this reality is explained. It is said "the transfer of the reality," not "the transfer of the image of the reality," because what is transferred is the sensation of the reality, not an image like a photographic image. It is an image of the reality, and it is the reality sensorially. Therefore, saying that it is the transfer of the reality is more precise than saying it is the transfer of the image of the reality, because the transferred image is a sensation of the reality, not merely an image of it.

This is the definition of thought; that is, this is thought, perception, or the intellect. This process occurs for the thinking person who produces the thought, not for the one to whom the thought is transferred. As for the one to whom the thought is transferred, this process does not occur for him, because the thought has been produced and concluded. Its producer gives it

to people, and people transfer it to one another, expressing it with the terminologies of language or other than that, even though expression via language is what is prevalent across the entire world.

The thought that is transferred to a person is examined. If it has a tangible reality which the person previously sensed, or sensed when it was transferred to him; or if he did not previously sense it, nor sensed it when it was transferred to him, but rather conceptualized it in his mind as it was transferred to him, believed in it, and it acquired a reality in his mind as if he had sensed it, and he submitted to it just as he submits to the tangible reality—then in both of these cases he has perceived it. Thus, by the existence of this reality for it in his mind. It becomes a concept among his concepts. It is a thought in reality just as if this thought had been produced by him. If this thought does not have a reality for the person to whom it was transferred, but instead he understood the sentence, understood the thought, and understood what is intended by it, yet a reality did not form for it in his mind—neither sensorially nor through belief and submission—then it is information alone, that is, mere knowledge about matters. It is a thought considering its denotations, but it is mere knowledge for the one who does not have a reality for it in his mind. Therefore, information does not influence persons. Instead, concepts influence them because they are thoughts that have a reality in the mind of the one who perceived them. Therefore, it was imperative to know what thought is, so that it is known how thought influences.

The Method of Thinking

Thought arises in man from the contextualization of the reality he has with previous information about it. It cannot arise from the reality alone absolutely, nor from information alone, in any way whatsoever.

Place, before a small child, objects about which he has not previously known anything, and observe: does thought occur in him? You will find that from the repetition of his sensation of the reality alone, a sensation of the existence of the reality occurs in him. A discrimination of objects from one another occurs in him, and a discrimination of what is painful or pleasurable, what gladdens or disturbs, what satisfies, or other than that which relates to the instincts or organic needs. Nothing more than that occurs in him, no matter how much the sensation varies, repeats, and diversifies. That is, sensation occurs in him, and as a result of this sensation and its repetition, only an instinctive discrimination occurs. However, if you place an object before him and then couple it with information about it, he perceives what the object is. If you ask him about it, he explains it to you and clarifies to you what it is. At that point, perception of the object occurs in him—that is, thought occurs in him. As for if you gave him information only about the object and repeated this information to him, he would repeat reciting it to you as it is, and thought would not occur in him as long as he does not link it with the reality.

The tangible proof for that is the following: place before a child a scale, an apple, and fire, then make him memorize information about each one of them, such as saying to him: a scale weighs, an apple is eaten, fire burns. Repeat it to him several times, then ask him, “Where is the scale?” He will place his finger on the apple or the fire, and he may place his finger on the scale, but if he sees you are not pleased with that, he will

change immediately and place his finger on something else. He has received information and repeated it, but thought did not occur within him. As for if you showed him the scale and said to him, “This is a scale that weighs,” and clarified the process of weighing to him and repeated that, then showed him the apple or the fire and repeated that, thought occurs in him. If you say to him, “Where is the scale?” he places his finger on it and guides you to it. If you reject that and try to mislead him, he will not yield to you and will insist on the scale that was explained to him because he perceived it. Thus, he comes to know it merely by seeing it or merely by the mention of its name, because a thought about these objects has formed in him by the coupling of the reality with the information.

Accordingly, thinking arises in man from his sensation of the reality alongside his receiving information from others with the sensation; thus, a thought occurs in him from that. This is if he does not have information. As for if he has information, a thought would have previously arisen in him. So, if he wants to generate a new thought about an object, he senses the reality, then links his sensation of the reality with his previous information, thus producing a thought. If he does not have any information connected to this thing, he is in need of receiving information about it; thus, from his receiving of the information alongside his sensation of the reality, a new thought occurs in him. In this method, thought arises.

This origination is the natural method of thinking for man, and it is the fundamental method of thinking, and it is what brings thought into existence.

On that basis, the method of thinking, as such, dictates the contextualization of the sensation of the reality with previous information about it, or the contextualization of previous information with the sensation of the reality; at that point, thought occurs. In other than that, thought does not occur

absolutely. Therefore, it is imperative to give information alongside the sensation of the reality when we want to generate a thought, and it is imperative to bring about the sensation of the reality alongside the information when giving it, if we want the thought we give to be perceived. Thus, there must be the existence of a tangible reality, and the existence of information, so that thought exists. This alone is the method of thinking. For this reason, giving bits of information alone and linking them with each other, without coupling them with a tangible reality does not form a thought in the person. Instead, it brings about information in him and does not bring about any thought, no matter how much you explain to him, as long as he does not perceive its reality and this reality is not tangible.

This is in terms of bringing a thought into existence in the thinking person who brought the thought into existence or generated it. It is likewise for the one who gives the thought to another. If it is desired to give this thought to people, it can be transferred to them by any means of expression, such as language, for example. If it is coupled in them with a reality they previously sensed, or sensed the likes of it or something close to it, it would have transferred to them as a thought. Thus, it becomes a concept among their concepts, as if they themselves had arrived at it. If it is not linked in them with a tangible reality they possess—in that they understood the meaning of the sentences and they were explained to them, but they did not conceptualize any reality for it—then it would not have transferred to them as a thought. Instead, mere information was transferred to them. By this information, they become informed but do not become thinking people, because a thought was not transferred to them. Instead, sentences containing information were transferred.

From this premise, it is imperative for those who transfer thoughts to people to bring the meanings within them closer to

people’s minds by attempting to link them with their tangible reality, or with a reality close to what they sense, so that they take thoughts from them. If they do not do that, they would not have transferred their thoughts to people. Instead, they transferred information to them which they taught them.

For this reason, it is imperative to be keen on the method of thinking, by coupling information with the reality when generating the thought, or by bringing the thoughts closer to the tangible reality for the one who takes them so that the information couples with the reality and thus brings a thought into existence.

Hence, being guided to the method of thinking and being keen regarding it is among the most important matters that must be available in people.

Fatalism Within the Unseen

Fatalism within the Unseen is surrendering to destiny (قدر qadr), and attributing everything in life to the actions of destinies hidden from man, and the belief that man's action in life has no effect whatsoever. It is the belief that man is compelledand not given a choice, and he is like a feather in space moved by the winds wherever they will!

This thought became widespread, and was adopted as a belief, since the late Abbasid era, and has continued until now. The obligation to believe in Fate (القضاء Al-Qada') and Destiny (القدر Al-Qadar) was taken as a means through which this thought was introduced to the Muslims. As a result of it, the failures found within its fold a justification for their failure, and the ignorant passively negligent found within relying upon it an excuse for their laziness and inaction. Many people accepted the oppression descending upon them, the poverty gnawing at their flesh, the humiliation overshadowing them, and the sins dominating their actions, out of their surrender to the Fatalism within the Unseen which they believe in, claiming that this is surrender to the Qada' of Allah ﷻ and His Qadar!

This thought continues to dominate people, controlling many of their behaviors, whereas the meticulous researcher finds that Fatalism within the Unseen was not known in the era of the Sahabah (ra), nor did it cross their minds. Had it existed among the Muslims, they would neither have made the conquests, nor endured the hardships. Instead, they would have left destiny to do as it wills, and they would have said, "What is destined will be, whether you strive for it or not!"

However, those knowledgeable Muslims perceived: that the fortress is not conquered except with the sword, that the enemy is not vanquished except with force, that provision (rizq) must be striven for, that disease must be warded off, that the

Muslim who drinks wine must be lashed, that the thief's hand must be cut, that the ruler must be accounted, and that political maneuvers must be undertaken against the enemies. They could not possibly believe otherwise, having witnessed the army of the Muslims under the leadership of the Messenger ﷺ defeated in the Battle of Uhud because the archers disobeyed the commands of the leadership, and victorious on the day of Hunayn after defeat, because the army that fled from the battle out of fear of arrows returned to fight when the Messenger ﷺ called them, while he stood firm with a few men in the battle, before the eyes of the fleeing army.

Allah ﷻ has taught us to link causes (أسباب asbab) with effects (مسببات musabbabat), and made the cause produce the effect: fire burns and burning does not occur without fire, and a knife cuts and cutting does not occur without a knife. Allah ﷻ created man, placed within him the ability to undertake action, and gave him absolute choice in undertaking his actions: he eats when he wills, walks when he wills, travels when he wills, learns and thus knows, murders and thus is punished, abandons Jihad and thus is humiliated, and neglects the striving (سعي sa'ee) for provision (رزق rizq) and thus becomes poor. Thus, there is no existence for Fatalism within the Unseen, neither in the reality of life, nor in the Shariah of Allah ﷻ.

As for Al-Qadaa' and Al-Qadar, they have nothing to do with Fatalism of the Unseen, neither from near nor from afar. This is because Al-Qada' is the actions that occur from man and upon him by compulsion. Such as his seeing with his eyes, not his nose, and hearing with his ears, not his mouth, and his lack of control over his heartbeats. It is also like a thunderbolt descending from the sky or an earthquake shaking the earth, causing harm to man, or a person falling from a roof onto a man and killing him. All of these are actions included in Al-Qadaa', and man is not held accountable for them, and they have no relationship with man's voluntary actions.

Al-Qadar is the attributes of objects by which the production of the object occurs, such as the burning destined (مقدر muqaddar) in fire, the cutting destined in the knife, and the procreation instinct destined in man. All of these cannot undertake the action except by the action of a doer. If man directly engages in an action with them by his choice, he is the doer of the action, not the Qadar existing in the object. If a man undertakes burning a house with fire, he is the doer of the burning, not the fire that burnt by the attribute destined in it. Thus, man is held accountable for his action of burning, because he is the one who directly engaged in a specific action with the Qadar, by his choice. Therefore, Al-Qadar does not do anything without the action of a doer, and Al-Qadaa' has no interference in the actions of man which he undertakes by his choice. Thus, both of them have no interference in the voluntary actions of the servants, nor do they have interference in the system of existence in terms of controlling it. Instead, they are from the created system of existence that proceeds according to the universal laws which Allah the Exalted created for the universe, man and life.

Accordingly, man is capable of influencing the striving to earn a living and the method of living, and is capable of straightening the crookedness of the oppressive ruler or removing him, and is capable of influencing everything that falls within his voluntary actions. Fatalism within the Unseen is nothing but a superstition among superstitions and an illusion among illusions.

The Concepts of Islam Are Regulators for Man's Behavior in Life

The thoughts of Islam are concepts and not information for mere knowledge. The meaning of them being concepts is that they have denotations existing in the arena of life, and are not merely an explanation of things whose existence is assumed by abstract logic. Instead, every denotation they indicate has a reality upon which man can place his finger, whether they are deep concepts requiring depth and enlightenment to perceive them, or apparent ones that can be understood easily. It is also whether they are sensed by the senses, having a tangible reality like the treatments, thoughts, and general opinions, or they are unseen but whose truth is definitively established for the intellect, like angels, Paradise, and Hell. All of them are existing realities having denotations existing sensorially and intellectually, or denotations existing intellectually in a decisive, certain manner.

However, these existing denotations are not mere researches in astronomy, nor information in medicine, nor thoughts in chemistry that came to us to benefit from what is in the universe. Instead, they are essential regulators for man's behavior in this worldly life and towards the Next Life, and they have no relationship with other than that absolutely. They came as guidance, mercy, and admonition, and they came as treatments for man's actions and a designation for the manner of his behavior. If we inductively study these concepts in the Shariah texts from which these concepts emanated—in other words, which contained the thoughts evidencing these concepts—we find that all of them, without exception, came in this manner and no other, and were restricted to this aspect alone. The Shariah texts of the Noble Quran and the Prophetic Sunnah in their expressed literal meaning (منطوق mantuq)—

which is what the wording of the sentence explicitly evidences—and their implied meaning (مفهوم mafhum)—which is what the meaning of the sentence evidences—or their evidencing (دلالة dalalah)—which is what the meaning of the sentence mandates—are all restricted within a single framework: the ‘Aqeedah and the rulings that emanate from it and the thoughts built upon it, and there is nothing other than this.

On this basis, it is imperative for the Muslim to perceive regarding the texts of the Shariah, which are the Noble Book and the Prophetic Sunnah, that they came to be acted upon, and they came specifically for his behavior in life. That is, the Muslim must perceive two matters in Islam:

One of them is that it came with concepts to regulate his behavior in the worldly life and towards the Next Life. Thus, he takes every thought as a law to regulate his behavior within this law. Consequently, the practical aspect appears in it, not the academic aspect. It must be clear that if the academic aspect alone is taken from it, it loses its original hue, which is its being a law to regulate behavior, and it becomes knowledge like the knowledge of geography and history. Thereby, it loses the warmth of life existing within it, and it becomes not pure Islam, but instead Islamic academic knowledge. By confining to the academic aspect, the disbelieving Orientalist who does not believe in it, and who learns it to fight it and fight its people, becomes equal with the Muslim ‘Alim who believes in it but excavates it as information only, and for academic pleasure, without it crossing his mind to take it as regulators for his behavior in life.

From this premise, knowing the Islamic thoughts and the Shariah rulings, without realizing their consideration as regulators for human behavior in life, is the affliction that has rendered Islam without effect in the behavior of the lives of Muslims today.

As for the second matter which the Muslim must perceive in Islam, it is that the Noble Quran and the blessed Hadith came only as a Deen and a Shariah, not as knowledge and sciences. They have no interference in any of the sciences, neither in history nor geography, nor in physics or chemistry, nor in inventions or discoveries.

As for what is mentioned in the Noble Quran of verses about the moon, stars, planets, seas, mountains, rivers, animals, birds, and plants, such as His saying,

﴿وَٱلشَّمۡسُ تَجۡرِي لِمُسۡتَقَرّٖ لَّهَا﴾

"And the sun runs on course] toward its stopping point" [Ya Sin: 38],

﴿ٱلَّتِي تَطَّلِعُ عَلَى ٱلۡأَفۡـِٔدَةِ﴾

"which penetrates to the hearts" [Al-Humazah: 7], among other verses. They have no indication towards any of the sciences. Instead, they are a drawing of attention to the Power of Allah ﷻ, evidences for the Greatness of Allah ﷻ, and signs that guide man to what convinces his intellect of the necessity of belief in Allah ﷻ.

Thus, they are evidences of His Power and Greatness, and a drawing of attention for the intellects to perceive and take admonition, and not for any research in knowledge or science.

Accordingly, the thoughts of Islam brought by the Noble Quran and the blessed Hadith did not come for mere knowledge nor for academic research. Instead, they came to treat the problems of man. Thus, they are regulators for his behavior in the worldly life and towards the Next Life.

Punishments in Islam

Allah ﷻ legislated punishments in Islam as deterrents and expiations. They are deterrents to deter people from committing crimes, and they are expiations that expiate the punishment of Allah ﷻ on the Day of Judgment from the Muslim.

As for the punishments in Islam being deterrents, this is established by the text of the Noble Quran. Allah ﷻ said,

﴿وَلَكُم فِي ٱلۡقِصَاصِ حَيَوٰةٞ يَٰٓأُوْلِي ٱلۡأَلۡبَٰبِ﴾

"And there is for you in legal retribution saving of life, O you people of understanding" [Al-Baqarah: 179]. The fact that Allah ﷻ placed life in Qisas (قصاص Shariah punitive retribution) means that the execution of Qisas is what preserves life. That is not in preserving the life of the one upon whom Qisas is executed, for in Qisas is his death, not his life. Instead, it is the life of the one who witnesses the execution of Qisas. Moreover, the predominant state of a rational person is that if he knows that if he murders another, he will be killed, he will not embark upon killing. So is the case with all deterrents.

These punishments are not permissible to be executed except upon the criminal, because the meaning of them being deterrents is that people are deterred from the crime—that is, they refrain from committing it.

A crime is a hideous action, and the ugly (qabeeh) is what the Shariah considers ugly (qabeeh). Therefore, an action is not considered a crime unless the Shariah explicitly states that it is an ugly action; at that point, it is considered a crime.

Crime does not exist in the innate nature of man, nor is it acquired such that man acquires it, just as it is not a disease that afflicts man. Instead, it is a violation of the system that organizes man's actions.

This is because Allah ﷻ created man and created within him instincts and organic needs. These instincts and organic needs are vital energies in man that drive him to strive to satisfy them. Thus, he undertakes the actions that emanate from him for the sake of this satisfaction.

Leaving this satisfaction without a system leads to chaos and disorder, and leads to the erroneous satisfaction or the deviant satisfaction.

Allah ﷻ organized the satisfaction of these instincts and organic needs when He organized man's actions with the Shariah rulings. Thus, the Islamic Shariah clarified the treatment for man's actions in the broad outlines, which are the Noble Book and the Prophetic Sunnah, and placed within these broad outlines the subject of a ruling for every incident that occurs to man. It legislated the Halal and the Haram, bringing that from which the ruling for every action among man's actions is deduced, and clarified the objects He prohibited for man. For this reason, the Shariah came with commands and prohibitions, and made man legally responsible to perform what Allah ﷻ commanded him, and to abstain from what He ﷻ prohibited him from. If man violates that, he has done an evil action—that is, he has committed a crime—whether that was failing to undertake what he was commanded with, or doing what he was prohibited from. In both cases, he is considered to have committed a crime. Thus, there had to be a punishment for these crimes so that people comply with what Allah ﷻ commanded them, and refrain from what He prohibited them from. Otherwise, there is no meaning to those commands and prohibitions, if there is no punishment for violating them. Indeed, there is no value to any command demanding an action, if there is no corresponding punishment for the one who does not fulfill this demand, whether it is a demand to undertake or a demand to leave and abstain from.

The Islamic Shariah clarified that for these crimes there are punishments in the Hereafter and punishments in the worldly life. As for the punishment of the Hereafter, Allah ﷻ is the One who punishes the criminal with it, tormenting him on the Day of Judgment. Allah ﷻ said,

﴿يُعۡرَفُ ٱلۡمُجۡرِمُونَ بِسِيمَٰهُمۡ فَيُؤۡخَذُ بِٱلنَّوَٰصِي وَٱلۡأَقۡدَامِ﴾

"The criminals will be known by their marks, and they will be seized by the forelocks and the feet" [Ar-Rahman: 41],

﴿وَٱلَّذِينَ كَفَرُواْ لَهُمۡ نَارُ جَهَنَّمَ﴾

"And for those who disbelieve will be the fire of Hell" [Fatir: 36],

﴿هَٰذَاۚ وَإِنَّ لِلطَّٰغِينَ لَشَرَّ مَـَٔابٖ ۝٥٥ جَهَنَّمَ يَصۡلَوۡنَهَا فَبِئۡسَ ٱلۡمِهَادُ﴾

"This is Hell, which the criminals deny. They will go around between it and scalding water, heated to the utmost degree" [Ar-Rahman: 43-44],

﴿إِنَّآ أَعۡتَدۡنَا لِلظَّٰلِمِينَ سَلَٰسِلَا وَأَغۡلَٰلٗا وَسَعِيرًا﴾

"Indeed, We have prepared for the wrongdoers a fire whose walls will surround them" [Al-Kahf: 29].

Allah ﷻ clarified these punishments explicitly in the Quran. They will inevitably occur because they came in verses that are decisive in authenticated transmission (قطعية الثبوت qata'iyya uth-thuboot) and decisive in evidencing (قطعية الدلالة qata'iyyah ud-dalaalah). Allah ﷻ said,

﴿إِذِ ٱلۡأَغۡلَٰلُ فِيٓ أَعۡنَاقِهِمۡ وَٱلسَّلَٰسِلُ يُسۡحَبُونَ ۝٧١ فِي ٱلۡحَمِيمِ ثُمَّ فِي ٱلنَّارِ يُسۡجَرُونَ﴾

"When the shackles are around their necks and the chains; they will be dragged. In boiling water; then in the Fire they will be filled with flame" [Ghafir: 71-72],

﴿فَلَيۡسَ لَهُ ٱلۡيَوۡمَ هَٰهُنَا حَمِيمٞ ۝٣٥ وَلَا طَعَامٌ إِلَّا مِنۡ غِسۡلِينٖ ۝٣٦ لَّا يَأۡكُلُهُۥٓ إِلَّا ٱلۡخَٰطِـُٔونَ﴾

"So, this Day, he has no close friend here, (35) nor any food except the filth from the washing of wounds, (36) which none shall eat except the sinners" [Al-Haaqaah: 35-37],

﴿يُصَبُّ مِن فَوۡقِ رُءُوسِهِمُ ٱلۡحَمِيمُ﴾

"Scalding water will be poured over their heads" [TMQ Surah Al-Hajj: 19],

﴿إِنَّ ٱلۡمُجۡرِمِينَ فِي ضَلَٰلٖ وَسُعُرٖ ۝٤٧ يَوۡمَ يُسۡحَبُونَ فِي ٱلنَّارِ عَلَىٰ وُجُوهِهِمۡ ذُوقُواْ مَسَّ سَقَرَ﴾

"Indeed, the criminals are in error and madness. The Day they are dragged into the Fire on their faces [it will be said], 'Taste the touch of Saqar'" [Al-Qamar: 47-48],

﴿فِي سَمُومٖ وَحَمِيمٖ ۝٤٢ وَظِلّٖ مِّن يَحۡمُومٖ﴾

"They will be in scorching fire and scalding water. And a shade of black smoke" [Al-Waqi'ah: 42-43],

﴿لَأٓكِلُونَ مِن شَجَرٖ مِّن زَقُّومٖ ۝٥٢ فَمَالِـُٔونَ مِنۡهَا ٱلۡبُطُونَ ۝٥٣ فَشَٰرِبُونَ عَلَيۡهِ مِنَ ٱلۡحَمِيمِ ۝٥٤ فَشَٰرِبُونَ شُرۡبَ ٱلۡهِيمِ ۝٥٥﴾

"You will be eating from trees of Zaqqum * And filling with it your bellies * And drinking on top of it from scalding water And will drink as the drinking of thirsty camels" [TMQ Surah Al-Waqi'ah: 52-55],

﴿فَنُزُلٞ مِّنۡ حَمِيمٖ ۝٩٣ وَتَصۡلِيَةُ جَحِيمٍ﴾

"Then [for him is] accommodation of scalding water. And burning in Hellfire" [Al-Waqi'ah: 93-94],

﴿كَلَّآۖ إِنَّهَا لَظَىٰ ۝١٥ نَزَّاعَةٗ لِّلشَّوَىٰ﴾

"No! Indeed, it is the Flame [of Hell], A remover of exteriors" [Al-Ma'arij: 15-16],

﴿خُذُوهُ فَغُلُّوهُ ۝٣٠ ثُمَّ ٱلۡجَحِيمَ صَلُّوهُ ۝٣١ ثُمَّ فِي سِلۡسِلَةٖ ذَرۡعُهَا سَبۡعُونَ ذِرَاعٗا فَٱسۡلُكُوهُ﴾

"Allah ﷻ will say, 'Seize him and shackle him. Then into Hellfire drive him. Then into a chain whose length is seventy cubits insert him'" [Al-Haqqah: 30-32],

﴿كُلَّمَا نَضِجَتۡ جُلُودُهُم بَدَّلۡنَٰهُمۡ جُلُودًا غَيۡرَهَا لِيَذُوقُواْ ٱلۡعَذَابَ﴾

"Every time their skins are roasted through We will replace them with other skins so they may taste the punishment" [An-Nisa: 56].

Thus, many verses clarify the punishment of Allah ﷻ with a decisive clarification in a miraculous style. When man hears them, terror seizes him, panic overcomes him, and every punishment in the worldly life and every material hardship becomes easy for him, if he conceptualizes the punishment of the Hereafter and its terror. Thus, he does not embark upon violating the commands and prohibitions of Allah ﷻ, unless he forgets this punishment and its terror.

This is the punishment of the Hereafter. As for the punishment of the worldly life, Allah ﷻ clarified it in the Noble Quran and the Prophetic Sunnah, both generally and in detail, and made the state the one that executes it. The punishment of Islam whose execution upon the criminal in the worldly life has been clarified is executed by the Imam or his appointed deputy—that is, it is executed by the Islamic State by implementing the Hudud (حدود) of Allah ﷻ, and what is below the Hudud of ta'zir (تعزير discretionary punishment) and kaffarat (كفّارات expiations). This punishment in the worldly life for a specific sin by the state removes the punishment of the Hereafter from the sinner.

Thus, the punishments are deterrents and expiations. They deter people from committing sins, crimes, and transgressions. They also expiate the punishment of the Hereafter, removing the punishment of the Hereafter from the Muslim.

The evidence for that is what Al-Bukhari narrated from ‘Ubadah bin As-Samit (ra) who said, “The Messenger of Allah ﷺ said to us in a gathering: «تُبَايِعُونِي عَلَى أَنْ لا تُشْرِكُوا بِاللَّهِ شَيْئاً، وَلا تَسْرِقُوا، وَلا تَزْنُوا، وَلا تَقْتُلُوا أَوْلادَكُمْ، وَلا تَأْتُوا بِبُهْتَانٍ تَفْتَرُونَهُ بَيْنَ أَيْدِيكُمْ وَأَرْجُلِكُمْ، وَلا تَعْصُوا فِي مَعْرُوفٍ، فَمَنْ وَفَّى مِنْكُمْ فَأَجْرُهُ عَلَى اللَّهِ، وَمَنْ أَصَابَ مِنْ ذَلِكَ شَيْئاً فَعُوقِبَ فِي الدُّنْيَا، فَهُوَ كَفَّارَةٌ لَهُ، وَمَنْ أَصَابَ مِنْ ذَلِكَ شَيْئاً فَسَتَرَهُ اللَّهُ فَأَمْرُهُ إِلَى اللَّهِ إِنْ شَاءَ عَاقَبَهُ وَإِنْ شَاءَ عَفَا عنه» **‘Pledge allegiance to me that you will not associate anything with Allah ﷻ, you will not steal, you will not commit Zina, you will not kill your children, you will not bring forth a slander you invent between your hands and feet, and you will not disobey in what is good. Whoever among you fulfills this, his reward is upon Allah ﷻ. Whoever commits any of that and is punished in the worldly life, it is an expiation for him. Whoever commits any of that and Allah ﷻ conceals him, his affair is up to Allah ﷻ; if He wills, He punishes him, and if He wills, He forgives him.’** So we pledged allegiance to him upon that.”

This is explicit that the punishment of the worldly life from the Imam or his appointed deputy for a specific sin drops the punishment of the Hereafter. For this reason, many of the Muslims used to come to the Messenger of Allah ﷺ and confess to the crimes they committed, so that he would execute the Hadd upon them in the worldly life, removing the punishment of Allah ﷻ on the Day of Judgment. They endured the pains of the Hadd and Qisas in the worldly life because that is easier than the punishment of the Hereafter.

Instinctive Discrimination

People have often confused thought with instinctive discrimination, rendering them unable to distinguish between the two. Consequently, they fell into errors, some of which are unfortunate and others misleading. Among them are those who attributed intellect and thought to a child the moment he is born, and those who attributed thought to animals. Among them are those whose failure to distinguish between thought and instinctive discrimination dragged them into misguidance in defining thought, and into error in understanding what the intellect is. For this reason, clarifying what instinctive discrimination is becomes necessary, just as clarifying what thought, intellect, or perception is, becomes necessary.

Instinctive discrimination occurs in the animal as a result of the repetition of its sensation of the reality. This is because the animal possesses a brain and possesses senses, just as is the case with man. However, the animal's brain is devoid of the capability to link contextualization. Instead, it only contains a center for sensation. It does not possess previous information to link with the reality or with the sensation. Instead, it possesses impressions about the reality, and it recalls these impressions upon sensing the reality. This recall is not linking. Instead, it is an activity of the center of sensation as a result of sensing the first reality, or a new reality connected to the first reality. From this recall of sensation, an instinctive discrimination occurs, which is what designates the animal's behavior towards satisfying the instinct or the organic need. This behavior is solely for satisfaction or non-satisfaction, and it is absolutely never for anything more than that.

On this basis, what occurs in the animal is merely a sensation of the reality, no matter how much this sensation multiplies and diversifies. This sensation is what drives it to

satisfaction or non-satisfaction. For example, if food is presented to an animal or a bird, it discriminates whether it is eaten or not eaten, then designates its behavior towards it. So it eats it or turns away from it, and it does not exceed that. If it reaches this discrimination from the perspective of satisfaction, it stops at its limit. It cannot exceed that, nor does it attempt to exceed that. If barley and dirt were presented to a horse, it attempts to test which of them contains satisfaction. If it finds that in the barley and not in the dirt, the sensation becomes concentrated in it that the barley satisfies its need, and the dirt does not satisfy it. Thereafter, it leaves the dirt merely upon sensing it, and takes the barley merely upon sensing it, if it is feeling hungry.

Thus, this discrimination occurred in the animal from an experience (تجربة tajrubah) that occurred via sensation. This experience is sufficient even if it is once, whether it occurred from it, or from another while it sensed what occurred to the other. It is also whether that was from the experience of a single object or from the experiences of multiple, different objects, with all of them producing an instinctive discrimination. However, the experience of a single object is what appears in the animal more than others. Multiple experiences may occur in it, such as the experience with barley and dirt, or the experience with sweet, bitter, and sour. Complex experiences may occur in it, such that a recall of sensation emanates from it that resembles thinking, but in reality, it is a recall of what it previously sensed, and not a linking with information for contextualization.

An example of that is the experience of mice stealing eggs. It was observed that two mice go to the egg market. One of them lies flat on its back, and the other pushes the egg onto the belly of the flat mouse. That one grips its legs around it, and the other mouse drags it by its tail to their nest, until they place the egg in it, then they return to bring another in the previous

manner. This process is complex, but it resulted from experiences in recalling sensed objects, not from linking information. These experiences do not occur except with that which achieves satisfaction, or is connected to that which achieves satisfaction. Thus, the issue of the mice does not occur with other than what is eaten, but it may occur with other than eggs, among that which contains satisfaction. Therefore, what occurred from the mouse and the horse, and what occurs from the chimpanzee, the camel, and others, is not thinking. Instead, it is an instinctive discrimination. It is specific only to what satisfies, and does not exceed discrimination. It cannot reach the knowledge of what this object is that satisfied, nor what the object is that does not achieve satisfaction. Hence, it is an instinctive discrimination, and not thought, nor the intellect, nor faculty of perception.

Similar to the animal is the child when he is born. Even though his brain contains the capability to link, he does not yet possess information to link with the sensation of the new reality in order to discriminate it. Therefore, neither thought, nor intellect, nor perception occurs in him. Instead, only an instinctive discrimination of the thing occurs in him in terms of it being satisfying or not satisfying, and it does not produce in him knowledge about the reality of the object in which he discriminated satisfaction. He does not know what the object is that satisfied, nor what the object is that did not satisfy. Instead, discrimination occurs in him strictly within the limits of whether it satisfies or does not satisfy only. If you presented an apple and a stone to a child, he tests one of them. Whatever he finds satisfaction in, he eats, and he throws the other away. Thus, an experience occurs in him from that, by which he is able to take the apple and throw the stone, by an instinctive discrimination that occurred from the experience only, because information does not yet exist in him. Once information exists in him, he

uses it naturally, because linking is part of the constitution of his brain. His sensation of the object is inevitably linked with his linking it to information. Thus, the existence of a concept about the object is inevitably linked with sensing it. At that point, thought, intellect, or perception begins in the child merely by the existence of the information with which he links.

On this basis, instinctive discrimination is a sensation of the reality via the senses, by which a discrimination of the object occurs in terms of it being satisfying or not satisfying. This is contrary to thought, for it is the transfer of the reality via the senses to the brain, alongside information that explains this reality. Thus, thought is a judgment upon the object, whereas instinctive discrimination is merely an elucidation that the object satisfies or does not satisfy, and nothing else.

Fear

Fear is a manifestation among the manifestations of the survival instinct. Its existence in man is inevitable because it is part of his constitution, and it exists in him innately with his existence. However, like the rest of the manifestations of the survival instinct—such as dominance, defense, mercy, and others—and indeed like the rest of the instincts, which are religiosity and procreation, it does not appear except by the existence of a factor that provokes it. As long as this provoking factor does not exist, fear does not appear absolutely. The factor that provokes fear is that which provokes any instinct among the instincts: it is either a tangible material object, or a thought among the thoughts connected to it or related to it. However, this material object or conceived thought must be of that which is perceived to be frightening, or of that which is felt sentimentally to be frightening. As long as this perception or this feeling does not occur, fear does not occur, because the energy of the instinct does not move nor is it provoked unless the object has been linked with the feelings of fear by perception by instinctive discrimination. On this basis, it does not occur except by the existence of what provokes it, even though it is innate, having been created with the creation of man.

Fear is one of the dangerous problems from which declining peoples and weak nations suffer, leading to humiliation and backwardness. If fear dominates a person, it deprives him of the pleasure of living, strips him of the noblest traits, causes mental confusion and the inability to judge matters, and paralyzes his memory and capability of discrimination.

The most dangerous type of fear is the fear of illusions and phantoms. This only occurs in those with weak intellects: either because the growth of their intellect is not yet complete, like children; or due to the lack of sufficient information to link with the reality. This is like the ignorant and anyone lacking information by virtue of their life in society; or due to an innate

weakness in their brains, like the simpletons, the feeble-minded, and those similar to them. The fear in these people is treated either by delving deeply with them in discussion and bringing things closer to their perception, or by giving them thoughts connected to what they fear, provided that these thoughts have a tangible reality for them. Through this treatment, they are freed from the domination of fear, either by removing it or by gradually alleviating it until the remnants of its concepts existing in the depths are uprooted.

There is a type of fear less dangerous than the fear of illusions, which is the fear resulting from not evaluating matters with a correct evaluation. This is when man sees an object that might be frightening and might not be frightening. He may see a sleeping dog and assume it is a rabid dog because he previously saw a rabid dog like it, so he fears passing by the road and flees from it. Had he verified, he would have seen that it is a tame dog that does not frighten, and it is sleeping, unaware of his passing. He may see a lion in a cage and fear approaching the cage lest the lion comes out at him. The lion may roar, so his fear increases and he flees, assuming it might break out of the cage, and so forth. The lack of evaluation occurs most often in intangible matters, such as writing an article, delivering a speech in a place, conversing with a ruler, or debating a person of influence, and the like. Not evaluating things with a correct evaluation causes him fear, so he refrains from writing, speaking, or debating out of fear of harm.

There is a common type of fear resulting from the lack of balancing between what results from undertaking the action, and what results from not undertaking it, when both cause harm. The error in this balancing leads to fear of simple matters, and falling into dangers. This is like the fear of the oppressive ruler inflicting harm upon the individual, which leads to inflicting harm upon the Ummah and upon himself in his capacity as one of the Ummah. It is also like the fear of the soldier on the battlefield of death, which leads to the annihilation of the entire

army, of which he is one. It is like the fear of imprisonment for the sake of the belief he carries, which leads to the loss of the belief from him—which is more painful than imprisonment—or the loss of the belief from existence in life. This fear is very dangerous to the Ummah and leads to dangers, and perhaps even leads to destruction and ruin.

However, fear is beneficial and useful in some instances, and its existence or bringing it into existence is imperative, just as it is harmful and destructive in some instances and must not exist, but rather must be treated and removed. Fear of real dangers is a beneficial matter, and it is an obligation. Recklessness towards them, and lack of fear of them, is a harmful matter and is not permissible to exist, whether they are dangers to the individual himself or to his Ummah. Fear in this case is the guard and the protector. Therefore, it is imperative to explain the dangers surrounding the Ummah, so that it takes them into account and strives to defend itself and remove these dangers. Fear of Allah ﷻ and of the punishment of Allah ﷻ is a beneficial and obligatory matter, and it is the guard and the protector. Therefore, it is imperative to incite the fear of Allah ﷻ in the souls, and to explain the magnitude of the punishment of Allah ﷻ for committing sins and for disbelief, so that people follow His Deen, undertake His commands, and avoid His prohibitions. This fear and its likes are beneficial and useful, and they must exist and be worked upon to be brought into existence, because it is the guard and the protector, and it is what guarantees man's progression upon the straight path.

Accordingly, fear is part of man's innate nature. Concepts are what provoke fear in man, and they are what distance fear from man. It is among the most dangerous matters for man in some aspects, just as it is among the most beneficial in other aspects. In order for man to ward off its dangers and enjoy its benefits, it is obligatory upon him to make the truthful concepts alone the arbitrator over it, which are the concepts of Islam.

The Reality and the Concept Are What Provoke the Instincts

The instinct differs from the organic need, even though each of them is an innate vital energy. The organic need demands inevitable satisfaction, and if it is not satisfied, man dies. This is contrary to the instinct, for it demands satisfaction alone, and if it is not satisfied, man becomes anxious, but he does not die. Instead, he remains alive. If man does not eat or relieve himself, he dies, but if he does not satisfy his instinct, he does not die. If he does not have intimate relations with women or does not perform Salah, he does not die, because the instinct does not demand inevitable satisfaction.

Furthermore, the organic need mobilizes for satisfaction internally from itself, and is provoked for satisfaction externally from outside itself. This is contrary to the instinct, for it does not mobilizes internally absolutely, and the feeling of the need for satisfaction does not occur except by an external stimulus. If that which provokes it from the outside exists, it is provoked and the feeling that demands satisfaction exists. If nothing from the outside exists to provoke the instinct, it remains dormant and no feeling for satisfaction exists. Hunger comes from the inside naturally and its existence does not require any external stimulus. Thus, the feeling that demands satisfaction for the organic need exists from man himself, so he feels hunger even if nothing occurs from the outside. As for the external stimulus, it may mobilize hunger; delicious food may provoke the feeling of hunger, and talking about delicious food may provoke the feeling of hunger. As for the sexual feeling, it does not provoke itself absolutely. Instead, its incitement requires what provokes it from externally. Thus, the feeling that demands satisfaction for the instinct does not provoke itself from man himself absolutely, nor does man feel it, unless an external factor occurs

that provokes it. Therefore, the desire for sexual relations does not exist, nor does any feeling of it exist, unless man sees a tangible reality that provokes this feeling, or a person talks in front of him about realities that provoke this feeling, or meanings associate in his mind such that concepts exist that provoke this feeling. As long as the tangible reality or the thought does not exist, this feeling cannot be provoked.

For this reason, the existence of the instinct, in its capacity as an instinct in man, does not cause anxiety. Instead, it is the provocation of the feeling that demands satisfaction that causes anxiety when satisfaction is not attained. If the feeling of satisfaction does not exist due to the absence of what provokes it, no anxiety exists absolutely. Therefore, there is no anxiety for man as a result of not satisfying the sexual instinct, and there is no suppression, if a reality or thought that provokes it does not occur. Accordingly, it is from foolishness and short-sightedness to place among people thoughts that give concepts about sex, such as erotic literature and novels. It is from foolishness and short-sightedness to open the field for bringing about the tangible reality that provokes the procreation instinct through the free mixing of men with women. This means bringing about what provokes the sexual feeling, and bringing about anxiety until this feeling is satisfied, then bringing about the reality that provokes it once again so it moves for satisfaction constantly. Thus, he becomes preoccupied with working to achieve satisfaction, or restless when he does not achieve this satisfaction. This is intellectual decline or perpetual misery. Therefore, the free mixing of men with women is among the most harmful matters for the society. It diverts effort towards satisfaction, preoccupies the mind with concepts of satisfaction, or places man in perpetual agitation. The spread of erotic literature is likewise among the most harmful matters for society as a whole.

Islam came with concepts that organize the sexual instinct positively through the system of marriage and what branches from marriage and relates to marriage, and negatively by prohibiting man from what agitates the procreation instinct without achieving its satisfaction, and prohibiting man from what makes him occupy most of his time thinking or working to satisfy the procreation instinct. Thus, it prohibited seclusion between a man and a woman who is not a Mahram and not his wife, for it agitates the procreation instinct, while its satisfaction according to the system he embraces cannot be achieved for him. This causes anxiety within him or a gross violation of the system by him. The evidence for this prohibition came as a clear prohibition in the authentic Hadith. The Messenger of Allah ﷺ said, «لَا يَخْلُوَنَّ أَحَدُكُمْ بِامْرَأَةٍ إِلَّا مَعَ ذِي مَحْرَمٍ» **"Let not any one of you be in seclusion with a woman except with a Mahram."** And he ﷺ said, «لَا يَخْلُوَنّ رَجُلٌ بَعْدَ يَوْمِي هَذَا سِرّاً عَلَى مُغِيبَةٍ إِلَّا وَمَعَهُ رَجُلٌ أَوِ اثْنَان» **"Let no man, after this day of mine, enter secretly upon a woman whose husband is absent, unless there is with him one or two men."** He clarified in another Hadith that Satan tempts both the woman and the man in the state of seclusion, as he is their third. The Messenger of Allah ﷺ said, «لَا يَخْلُوَنَّ رَجُلٌ بِامْرَأَةٍ إِلَّا كَانَ ثَالِثَهُمَا الشَّيْطَانُ» **"No man is in seclusion with a woman except that Satan is their third."** For this reason, it is obligatory upon Muslims to distance what provokes the procreation instinct and moves its feelings, in response to the command of Islam.

Islam Is Concepts for Life and Not Merely Information

The concepts of Islam are not monastic concepts, nor purely unseen information. Instead, they are thoughts that have real world applications, which the intellect perceives directly when it is within its capability to perceive them, or it perceives what evidences them decisively, not speculatively, when it is incapable of perceiving them directly. Thus, it perceives the sensed object that was evidenced for them decisively without any doubt.

Thus, all Islamic concepts fall under sensation directly, or what evidenced them falls under sensation directly. That is, all the thoughts of Islam are concepts, because either the intellect perceives them, or they emanate from a matter the intellect perceived—that is, evidenced it. There is no thought in Islam except that it has a concept—that is, it has a reality in the mind, perceived rationally, or submitted to with decisive belief and has a reality in the mind whose evidence is perceived rationally.

Therefore, there are no purely unseen matters in Islam. The unseen matters which Islam commanded belief in are not purely unseen. Instead, they are unseen matters to the intellect, through the intellect's perception of what evidenced them, which is the Noble Quran and the Mutawatir (متواتر multiple parallel chains) Hadith. On this basis, all of Islam is an existing reality in the worldly life, because every thought in it has a reality in man's mind, built upon sensation, built upon the intellect. From this premise, the intellect is the basis upon which Islam is built, as a belief and as rulings. Its belief and rulings are thoughts that have a reality, and its belief and rulings are perceived with a realistic perception. There is no difference in that between the unseen matters and the sensed matters, nor between the judgments upon matters, which are thoughts, and

the rulings of matters, which are treatments, or informing with things or about matters.

Thus, thoughts, rulings, sensed things, and unseen matters are all realities that have a reality in the mind resting upon the intellect, perception, or thought.

As for the belief, which is the belief in Allah, His Angels, His Books, His Messengers (as), the Last Day, and Al-Qadaa' and Al-Qadar, all of them are believed in based on an existing reality for them, and each one of them has a reality in the mind.

Thus, belief in Allah ﷻ, the Noble Quran, and the Prophethood of Muhammadﷺ has occurred based on the intellect's perception, sensorially. It is of the existence of the Eternal Allah ﷻ who has no beginning. The intellect's perception, sensorially, is also that the Noble Quran is the Speech of Allah ﷻ, through its perception at every time, sensorially, of the humanly inimitable miracle of the Noble Quran. It is the intellect's perception, sensorially, that Muhammad ﷺ is the Prophet of Allah and His Messenger, through its perception, sensorially, that he is the one who brought the Noble Quran, the miraculous speech of Allah ﷻ to human beings. Thus, regarding these three matters; the existence of Allah ﷻ, the Noble Quran being the Speech of Allah ﷻ, and Muhammad ﷺ being the Messenger of Allah, the intellect has directly perceived their reality via sensation decisively. So, it believed in them, and they acquired a reality in the mind and a tangible reality.

As for the belief in the angels, the Torah, the Injeel, and other heavenly revealed Books, and the belief in the Prophets (as) and Messengers (as) such as Musa (as), 'Isa (as), Harun (as), Nuh (as), and Adam (as), it has existed based on the information of the Quran and the Mutawatir Hadith about them, and their command to believe in them. Thus, they acquired a

reality in the mind resting upon a tangible reality, which are the Noble Quran and the Mutawatir Hadith. So, they all became concepts because they are the meanings of thoughts, since they have a reality existing in the mind.

As for the belief in Al-Qadaa' and Al-Qadar, it has existed based on the intellect's perception, sensorially, of the action of the servant, in that it occurred from him or upon him by compulsion. And the intellect's perception, sensorially, that the properties of objects are not created by them, evidenced by the fact that burning does not occur except at a specific degree. Had it been created by it, it would occur as it wills without submitting to a specific proportion—that is, to a specific system. Thus, it was created by other than it, which is Allah ﷻ, and not by itself. Therefore, the intellect has directly perceived the reality of Al-Qadaa' and Al-Qadar via sensation decisively. So, it believed in them, and they acquired a reality in the mind and a tangible reality. Thus, they became concepts because they are the meanings of thoughts, since they have a reality existing in the mind. On this basis, the Islamic Doctrine (عقيدة 'Aqeedah) in its entirety consists of concepts that are decisive in existence and decisive in evidencing, having a reality in the mind of the Muslim which he senses, or he senses what evidences it. Through this, they have an effective influence upon him.

As for the Shariah rulings, they are treatments for a reality. It is imperative regarding them to study the reality and understand it, and to study the ruling of Allah ﷻ regarding this reality by understanding the Shariah texts related to it, then applying this understanding to it to perceive whether it is the ruling of Allah ﷻ regarding it or not. If it applies to it in the view of the Mujtahid, that understanding is the ruling of Allah ﷻ in its regard. If it does not apply to it, the mujtahid searches for another understanding, or another Shariah text, until he finds an understanding of a text that applies to the reality, and so forth.

By this, the Shariah rulings become a concept having a reality in the mind, because they are a tangible treatment, for a tangible reality, understood from a tangible text. Thus, they are concepts.

Accordingly, the Islamic Doctrine (‘Aqeedah) and the Shariah rulings are not information for memorization alone, nor abstract thoughts for intellectual pleasure. Instead, they are concepts that drive towards action, making man’s behavior restricted by them and adapted according to them. From this premise, Islam in its entirety is concepts that drive man, and not merely information.

Personality

The personality in every human being is composed of his mentality and his emotional disposition. His appearance, his body, his attire, and other than that have no interference; all of them are superficialities. It is superficial for anyone to assume that they are a factor among the factors of personality or that they influence the personality. This is because man is distinguished by his intellect, and his behavior is what indicates his elevation or decline. Since man's behavior in life is only according to his concepts, his behavior is inevitably linked to his concepts, inseparable from them. Behavior is the actions of man which he undertakes to satisfy his instincts or his organic needs. Thus, he proceeds according to the emotional inclinations existing in him for satisfaction, an inevitable progression. On that basis, his concepts and his inclinations are the pillars of his personality. As for what these concepts are, what they are composed of, and what their results are; and what these inclinations are, what brings them about, and what their effect is, that requires clarification.

Concepts are the meanings of thoughts, not the meanings of words. A word is speech that indicates meanings which may exist in reality and may not exist. Thus, when the Arabic poet says:

ومن الرجال إذا أنبريت لهدمهم هرم غليظ مناكب الصفاح

"Among men, if you set out to demolish them, is a broad-shouldered edifice."

فإذا رميت الحق في أجلاده ترك الصراع مضعضع الألواح

"However, if you hurl the truth at his body, he leaves the struggle shattered."

This meaning exists in reality, and is perceived sensorially, even if its perception requires depth and enlightenment.

However, when the Arab poet says,

قالوا أينظم فارسين بطعنة يوم النزال ولا يراه جليلا

"They said: 'Does he skewer two knights with one thrust on the day of battle, and not consider it a great feat?'"

فأجبتهم لو كان طول قناته ميلاً إذن نَظْم الفوارس ميلا

"I answered them, 'Had the length of his spear been a mile, he would have skewered a mile of knights.'"

This meaning does not exist absolutely. The praised one did not skewer two knights with one thrust, nor did anyone ask this question, nor is it possible to skewer a mile of knights.

Thus, the meanings of sentences both explain and interpret their words.

As for the meaning of the thought, it is that if this meaning contained in the word has a reality upon which sensation falls, or the mind conceptualizes it as a tangible object, this meaning is a concept for the one who senses it and conceptualizes it. It is not a concept for the one who does not sense it and does not conceptualize it, even if he understood this meaning from the sentence that was said to him, or which he read. From this premise, it is imperative for the person to receive speech with an intellectual reception, whether he reads it or hears it. That is, to understand the meanings of the sentences as they indicate in themselves, not as the one uttering them desires, nor as he himself desires them to be. And to perceive at the same time the reality of these meanings in his mind with a perception that personifies (yushakhis) this reality for him, so that these meanings become concepts. Thus, concepts are the meanings for which a reality is perceived in the mind, whether it is a tangible reality in the external world, or a reality submitted to as existing in the external world, a submission built upon a tangible reality. Whatever is besides that of the meanings of words and sentences is not called a concept; rather, it is merely information.

These concepts are formed from linking the reality with information, or from linking information with the reality. This formation crystallizes according to the basis (Qa'idah) or bases upon which the measurement (Qiyas) of the information and the reality occurs during linking. That is, according to his mind's (‘Aqlihi) understanding of the reality and the information during linking—that is, according to his perception of them. By this, a mentality (Aqliyyah) exists for the person that understands words and sentences, perceives meanings with their personified reality, and issues its judgment upon it. On that basis, the mentality is the method (Kayfiyyah) upon which the mind's understanding of a thing—that is, its perception—occurs. In other words, it is the method in which the reality is linked with information, or information with the reality, by measuring them against a single basis or specific bases. From here comes the difference in mentalities, such as the Islamic mentality, the Communist mentality, the Capitalist mentality, the anarchic mentality, and the routine mentality.

As for the results of these concepts, they are what designate man's behavior towards the perceived reality, and designate for him the type of inclination towards this reality, in terms of approaching it or turning away from it, and they may create for him a specific inclination and a specific taste.

As for inclinations (Muyool), they are the drives that push man towards satisfaction, linked to the concepts existing in him regarding the things intended to satisfy. They are brought about in man by the vital energy that drives him to satisfy his instincts and organic needs, and the linking that occurs between this energy and the concepts.

These inclinations alone—that is, the drives linked to the concepts about life—are what form man's disposition (Nafsiyyah). Thus, the disposition is the method (Kayfiyyah) upon which the satisfaction of instincts and organic needs

occurs. In other words, it is the method in which the drives for satisfaction are linked with concepts. It is a mixture of the inevitable linkage that occurs naturally inside man between his drives and the concepts existing in him about things, linked to his concepts about life.

From this mentality (Aqliyyah) and disposition (Nafsiyyah), the personality (Shakhsiyyah) is formed. Although the intellect or perception is innate in man and its existence is inevitable in every human being, the formation of the mentality occurs by the action of man. And although inclinations are innate in man and their existence is inevitable in every human being, the formation of the disposition occurs by the action of man.

Since the existence of bases or a basis upon which the measurement (Qiyas) of information and reality occurs during linking is what crystallizes the meaning so that it becomes a concept; and since the mixture that occurs between the drives and the concepts is what crystallizes the drive so that it becomes an inclination; the basis or bases against which man measures information and reality during linking has the greatest effect in forming the mentality and forming the disposition—that is, the greatest effect in forming the personality with a specific formation. If this basis or bases upon which the formation of the mentality occurs is the exact same basis or bases upon which the formation of the disposition occurs, a personality distinguished by a specific hue (لون lawn) exists in the person. If the basis or bases upon which the formation of the mentality occurs is different from the basis or bases upon which the formation of the disposition occurs, man's mentality would be different from his disposition. Because at that point, he would be measuring his inclinations against a basis or bases existing in the depths, thus linking his drives with concepts other than the concepts by which his mentality was formed. Consequently, he

becomes a personality with no distinguishing feature, differing and contradictory, his thoughts differing from his inclinations, because he understands words and sentences and perceives realities in a manner that differs from his inclination towards things.

From this premise, the treatment of the personality and its formation is only by bringing about a single basis for man's mentality and disposition together. That is, the basis against which he measures information and reality during linking is made to be the exact same basis upon which the mixture between the drives and the concepts occurs. By this, the personality is formed upon a single basis and a single criterion (Miqyas), thus becoming a distinguished personality.

The Islamic Personality

Islam treated humans with a complete treatment to bring about a specific personality for them, distinguished from others. It treated their thoughts with the ‘Aqeedah (عقيدة doctrine), as it made it an intellectual basis, for them upon which they build their thoughts, and upon whose basis they form their concepts. Thus, they distinguish the correct thought from the erroneous thought when they measure this thought against the Islamic ‘Aqeedah, building it upon it considering it an intellectual basis. Consequently, their mentality is formed upon this ‘Aqeedah, and by this, they possess a mentality distinguished by this intellectual basis. A correct criterion for thoughts exists in him or her, thereby securing him or her from behavioral lapses, warding off corrupt thoughts, and they remain truthful in thought and sound in perception.

At the same time, Islam treated the actions of human beings emanating from their organic needs and instincts with the Shariah rulings emanating from this exact same ‘Aqeedah, with a truthful, correct treatment. It organizes the instincts and does not suppress them, and coordinates them and does not unleash them excessively or in deviance. It prepares for them the satisfaction of all their drives with a coordinated satisfaction that leads to tranquility and stability. Islam made the Islamic ‘Aqeedah rational, so it was valid to be an intellectual basis against which thoughts are measured, and made it a comprehensive thought about the universe, man, and life. Since the person is a human living in the universe, this comprehensive thought solved all his problems internally and externally. Thus, it was valid to be a general concept—that is, a criterion used naturally when the mixture between the drives and the concepts occurs, meaning a criterion upon whose basis inclinations are formed. Through this, Islam brought about in the human being a decisive basis that was a decisive criterion for both concepts and inclinations together—that is, for the mentality and the emotional disposition at the same time. Through this, Islam

formed the personality with a specific formation distinguished from other personalities.

On this basis, we find that Islam forms the Islamic personality with the Islamic ‘Aqeedah; by it, his or her mentality is formed, and by it itself, his or her disposition is formed. From this, it becomes evident that the Islamic mentality is the one that thinks on the basis of Islam—that is, it makes Islam alone the general criterion for thoughts about life, and it is not merely the knowledgeable or thinking mentality. Instead, the human being merely making Islam the criterion for all thoughts practically and in reality brings about an Islamic mentality in him.

As for the Islamic emotional disposition, it is the one that makes all its inclinations on the basis of Islam. That is, it makes Islam alone the general criterion for all satisfactions, and it is not merely the ascetic or strict one. Instead, man merely making Islam the criterion for all satisfactions practically and in reality, brings about an Islamic disposition in him. At that point, with this mentality and this emotional disposition, he or she is an Islamic personality, regardless of whether he or she is an alim or ignorant, undertaking the performance of obligations and recommended acts and leaving the prohibited and disliked acts, or undertaking that and what is more than that of the desirable acts of obedience nd distancing from doubtful matters. Each of them is an Islamic personality, because everyone who thinks on the basis of Islam and makes their desires subservient to Islam is an Islamic personality.

Yes, Islam commanded seeking more Islamic culture to develop this mentality and make it capable of measuring every thought among the thoughts. Islam commanded more than the obligations, recommended acts, and desirable acts, and prohibited more than the prohibited acts, disliked acts, and doubtful matters, to strengthen this emotional disposition and make it capable of deterring every inclination that contradicts Islam. However, all of this is to elevate this personality and make it proceed on the path of sublime ascent, but it does not make the one below it a non-Islamic personality. Instead, it is an

Islamic personality, and the one below it among those who evaluate their behavior by Islam, and the educated who restrict themselves to undertaking the obligations and leaving the prohibited acts, is an Islamic personality. Even if these personalities vary in strength of quality, they are all indeed Islamic personalities.

The important factor in judging a person as an Islamic personality is their making Islam the basis for their thinking and the basis for his inclinations. From here comes the variation in Islamic personalities, the variation in Islamic mentalities, and the variation in Islamic dispositions. Therefore, those who conceptualize the Islamic personality as an angel make a great error. The harm of these people in society is very immense because they search for an angel among human beings and absolutely never find one. Instead, they do not find it in themselves, so they despair and wash their hands of the Muslims. These idealists merely prove that Islam is utopian, that it is impossible to apply, and that it is merely beautiful ideals which man cannot apply or endure. Thus, they turn people away from Islam and paralyze many from striving. Whereas Islam came to be applied practically, and it is in the real world, not difficult to apply, and within the reach of every human being, no matter how weak their thinking becomes, and no matter how strong his instincts and needs become. It is possible for them to apply Islam upon themselves with ease and facility, after they perceive the ‘Aqeedah and becomes an Islamic personality. Merely by making the ‘Aqeedah of Islam the criterion for their concepts and inclinations and proceeding upon this criterion, they are decisively an Islamic personality. What is upon them after that is only to strengthen this personality with Islamic culture, to develop their mentality, and with acts of obedience to strengthen their disposition, so that they proceed towards the sublime ascent and remains steadfast upon this ascent in the worldly life, and attains the Pleasure of Allah ﷻ in the worldly life and the Hereafter.

Supplication (دعاء Du’aa’) in Islam

Du’aa’ is the servant's asking of his Lord. Supplication is among the greatest acts of worship (عبادة ‘ibadah); that is, among the greatest means by which one worships. Al-Tirmidhi transmitted from the Hadith of Anas (ra), «**الدُّعَاءُ مُخُّ العِبَادَة**» **“Du’aa’ is the marrow of worship.”** Traditions from the Prophet ﷺ have successively encouraged and urged Du’aa’. Ibn Majah transmitted from the Hadith narrated by Abu Hurayrah (ra), «**لَيْسَ شَيْءٌ أَكْرَمَ عَلَى اللَّهِ مِنَ الدُّعَاءِ**» **“There is nothing more honorable to Allah than Du’aa’.”** Al-Bukhari transmitted the Hadith, «**مَنْ لَمْ يَسْأَلْ اللَّهَ يَغْضَبْ عَلَيْهِ**» **“Whoever does not ask Allah, He becomes angry with him.”** The Hadith narrated by Ibn Mas’ud (ra), states «**سَلُوا اللَّهَ مِنْ فَضْلِهِ؛ فَإِنَّ اللَّهَ يُحِبُّ أَنْ يُسْأَلَ**» **“Ask Allah from His bounty, for indeed Allah loves to be asked,”** transmitted by Al-Tirmidhi. There is also the Hadith narrated by Ibn ‘Umar (ra), «**إِنَّ الدُّعَاءَ يَنْفَعُ مِمَّا نَزَلَ وَمِمَّا لَمْ يَنْزِلْ فَعَلَيْكُمْ عِبَادَ اللَّهِ بِالدُّعَاءِ**» **“Indeed, Du’aa’ benefits against what has descended and what has not descended, so upon you, O servants of Allah, is supplication.”** Al-Tirmidhi and Al-Hakim transmitted from the Hadith narrated by Ubadah bin As-Samit: «**مَا عَلَى الأَرْضِ مُسْلِمٌ يَدْعُو بِدَعْوَةٍ الله إِلاَّ آتَاهُ اللَّه إِيَّاهَا، أَوْ صَرَف عنْهُ مِنَ السُّوءِ مِثْلَهَا**» **“There is no Muslim on earth who supplicates to Allah with a supplication except that Allah grants it to him, or averts from him an equivalent evil.”** Ahmad has in the Hadith of Abu Sa'id, from the Prophet ﷺ who said, «**مَا مِنْ مُسْلِمٍ يَدْعُو بِدَعْوَةٍ لَيْسَ فِيهَا إِثْمٌ وَلَا قَطِيعَةُ رَحِمٍ إِلَّا أَعْطَاهُ اللَّهُ بِهَا إِحْدَى ثَلَاثٍ: إِمَّا أَنْ يُعَجِّلَ لَهُ دَعْوَتُهُ، وَإِمَّا أَنْ يَدَّخِرَهَا لَهُ فِي الْآخِرَةِ، وَإِمَّا أَنْ يَصْرِفَ عَنْهُ مِنَ السُّوءِ مِثْلَهَا**» **“There is no Muslim who supplicates with a supplication that does not contain sin or the severing of family ties except that Allah gives him one of three matters by it: either He hastens his supplication for him, or He stores it for him in the Hereafter, or He averts from him an equivalent evil.”**

These Hadiths and others indicate in their totality the establishment of supplication, which is the servant’s asking of

his Lord. Several verses have been revealed in the Quran indicating supplication. Allah ﷻ said,

﴿وَقَالَ رَبُّكُمُ ٱدْعُونِيٓ أَسْتَجِبْ لَكُمْ﴾

"And your Lord says, 'Call upon Me; I will respond to you'" [Ghafir: 60],

﴿وَإِذَا سَأَلَكَ عِبَادِي عَنِّي فَإِنِّي قَرِيبٌ ۖ أُجِيبُ دَعْوَةَ ٱلدَّاعِ إِذَا دَعَانِ﴾

"And when My servants ask you concerning Me - indeed I am near. I respond to the invocation of the supplicant when he calls upon Me" [Al-Baqarah: 186],

﴿أَمَّن يُجِيبُ ٱلْمُضْطَرَّ إِذَا دَعَاهُ وَيَكْشِفُ ٱلسُّوٓءَ وَيَجْعَلُكُمْ خُلَفَآءَ ٱلْأَرْضِ﴾

"Is He not best Who responds to the desperate one when he calls upon Him and removes evil and makes you inheritors of the earth?" [An-Naml: 62]. Allah ﷻ said regarding the supplication of the angels,

﴿ٱلَّذِينَ يَحْمِلُونَ ٱلْعَرْشَ وَمَنْ حَوْلَهُۥ يُسَبِّحُونَ بِحَمْدِ رَبِّهِمْ وَيُؤْمِنُونَ بِهِۦ وَيَسْتَغْفِرُونَ لِلَّذِينَ ءَامَنُوا۟ رَبَّنَا وَسِعْتَ كُلَّ شَىْءٍ رَّحْمَةً وَعِلْمًا فَٱغْفِرْ لِلَّذِينَ تَابُوا۟ وَٱتَّبَعُوا۟ سَبِيلَكَ وَقِهِمْ عَذَابَ ٱلْجَحِيمِ ۝ رَبَّنَا وَأَدْخِلْهُمْ جَنَّٰتِ عَدْنٍ ٱلَّتِى وَعَدتَّهُمْ وَمَن صَلَحَ مِنْ ءَابَآئِهِمْ وَأَزْوَٰجِهِمْ وَذُرِّيَّٰتِهِمْ ۚ إِنَّكَ أَنتَ ٱلْعَزِيزُ ٱلْحَكِيمُ﴾

"Those angels who carry the Throne and those around it exalt Allah with praise of their Lord and believe in Him and ask forgiveness for those who have believed, saying, 'Our Lord, You have encompassed all things in mercy and knowledge, so forgive those who have repented and followed Your way and protect them from the punishment of Hellfire. Our Lord, and admit them to gardens of perpetual residence which You have promised them and whoever was righteous among their fathers, their spouses and their offspring. Indeed, it is You who is the Exalted in Might, the Wise'" [TMQ Surah Ghafir: 7-8].

Thus, Allah ﷻ has demanded us to supplicate to Him and clarified to us that He alone is the one who answers supplication, to the exclusion of others. Allah ﷻ clarified to us some of what the angels used to supplicate with. Therefore, it is recommended (مندوب mandub) for the Muslim to supplicate to Allah ﷻ in times of ease and hardship, in secret and in public, so that he attains the reward of Allah ﷻ. Supplication is better than silence and contentment, due to the abundance of evidences evidencing it, and because it contains the manifestation of submission and neediness towards Allah ﷻ.

However, it must be clear that supplication does not change what is in the Knowledge of Allah, nor does it avert Qadaa' (fate), nor does it strip away Qadar (destiny), nor does it bring about a matter without its cause. This is because the Knowledge of Allah is inevitably realized, and the Qadaa' of Allah will inevitably occur, for if supplication averted it, it would not be Qadaa'. And Qadar was brought into existence by Allah ﷻ, so supplication does not strip it away. Allah created causes and their effects, and made the cause inevitably produce the effect; had it not produced it, it would not be a cause. Therefore, it is not permissible to believe that supplication is a practical method for fulfilling a need, even though Allah ﷻ responds and the need is actually fulfilled. This is because Allah ﷻ has established for the universe, man, and life a system upon which they proceed, and He ﷻ linked causes with effects. Supplication does not influence the breaching of Allah's systems, nor the failure of causes. Instead, the objective of supplication is the attainment of reward by complying with the command of Allah ﷻ. It is an act of worship among the acts of worship. Just as Salah is an act of worship, Siyyam is an act of worship, Zakat is an act of worship, likewise, Du'aa' is an act of worship. Thus, the believer supplicates and asks Allah ﷻ to fulfill his need, or to remove his distress, or other supplications related to the worldly life and the Hereafter, as a refuge in Allah

ﷻ, in submission, seeking His reward, and complying with His commands. If his need is fulfilled, it is a bounty from Allah ﷻ, and its fulfillment occurs in accordance with the systems of Allah ﷻ, proceeding upon the basis of linking causes with effects. If Allah ﷻ does not fulfill it, its reward is written for his obedient servant.

In this manner, the Du'aa' of the Muslim should be: submission to Allah ﷻ, compliance with His command, and seeking His reward, whether his need is fulfilled or not fulfilled. It is permissible for the Muslim to supplicate with any Du'aa' he desires, with the heart or the tongue, or with any expression he sees fit. He is not restricted to a specific supplication. He may supplicate with the supplications mentioned in the Noble Quran, he may supplicate with the supplications mentioned in the Prophetic Sunnah, he may supplicate with a supplication from himself, or with a supplication that another has supplicated with. Thus, he is not restricted to a specific Du'aa.' Instead, what is demanded of him is to supplicate to Allah ﷻ. However, it is better to supplicate with what is mentioned in the Noble Quran or the Prophetic Sunnah.

The Meaning of Sanctification

Sanctification is the utmost heartfelt respect. It occurs from man towards persons and things either based on an emotional motive coupled with instinctive concepts, or by an intellectual motive coupled with feelings provoked by the motivating thought itself. Thus, the sanctification of idols and mythical heroes occurs by an emotional motive coupled with instinctive concepts about deities and greatness. As for the sanctification of Allah ﷻ through His worship or through submission and yielding to His rulings, it occurs by the motive of the intellect's perception that Allah ﷻ alone deserves worship, or by the intellect's perception that these rulings are from Allah ﷻ, so submission and yielding to them is obligatory. In both cases, this motive is coupled with the feelings of the instinct of religiosity, which is the feeling of weakness and need for the Creator, the Organizer.

Sanctification is an innate matter, and it is a response to the instinct of religiosity. It has multiple manifestations, the highest of which is worship in its various forms, including submission (خضوع khudu'), humility (خشوع khushu'), and submissiveness (تذلل tadhallul), just as among them are veneration (إكبار ikbar) and glorification (إجلال ijlal).

Feelings vibrate for this sanctification with a vibration that strengthens and weakens according to the concepts linked to the feelings, because they are what designate the manner of sanctification, when sanctification occurs, and when it does not occur. Therefore, the fallacy occurs in diverting sanctification from some things to other things, just as the fallacy occurs in diverting the sanctification of the Creator to the sanctification of creations. The fallacy may also occur in the manners of sanctification. Thus, one may considers their undertaking of kissing the Quran as their sanctification of it, even if they do or say at the same time that which contradicts this sanctification,

such as touching the Noble Quran while not having Wudu, or saying that the Noble Quran has become invalid for this era. He has sanctified the Noble Quran by kissing it even if he contradicted what it explicitly stated, which is His saying:

﴿لَّا يَمَسُّهُۥٓ إِلَّا ٱلۡمُطَهَّرُونَ﴾

"None touch it except the purified" [Al-Waqi'ah: 79], or explicitly disbelieved in it by saying it is invalid.

From this premise, it is possible to strip sanctification from matters, either for the sake of other matters, or by creating the illusion that such-and-such action alone is sanctification for it, and the other action is not sanctification, has nothing to do with sanctification, and does not contradict it. This stripping occurs via fallacies through changing concepts. This is easy, accessible, and within the reach of all people, to do with those whose sanctification arises by the motive of their feelings alone, because it is easy to change the concepts linked to these feelings, since they are mostly instinctive concepts or submissive concepts that are easy to uproot. As for the sanctification resulting from the motive of thought coupled with feelings provoked by the thought itself, it is difficult to strip the sanctification—even if it is possible for those with the capability to manipulate thoughts and sentences—but it meets violent resistance before change occurs in it. For this reason, sanctification must occur from an intellectual motive coupled with feelings, so that it is a firm sanctification and so that its error and misguidance are secured against.

Sanctification, as such, for the Muslim—like the ‘Aqeedah—must emanate from an intellect that is by its nature resulting from the motive of the ‘Aqeedah, which is a rational ‘Aqeedah. Therefore, it is imperative to verify the one who sanctifies and what is sanctified. However, if it is established that it is obligatory to sanctify it, its sanctification becomes imperative. At that point, the meaning of its sanctification

becomes the non-acceptance of debate regarding it after the correctness of its sanctification has been established, except in the case of wanting to convince others of its sanctification. The meaning of re-debating and researching it after the establishment of the correctness of sanctification contradicts sanctification, just as re-debating and researching the ‘Aqeedah after the establishment of the ‘Aqeedah contradicts it being an ‘Aqeedah. Instead, the ‘Aqeedah must transition from philosophy to practice, and sanctification from an intellectual motive and rational research to a practice and submission. Otherwise, an ‘Aqeedah cannot become entrenched in a person who constantly debates it, nor can the sanctity of a matter endure if debate regarding its sanctification continues.

Muslims rationally perceived that the sanctification of Allah ﷻ is His worship, which is obeying His commands, avoiding His prohibitions, and submitting and yielding to what came in His Speech in the Noble Quran. They perceived rationally that the sanctification of the Prophet Muhammad ﷺ is his veneration and reverence in all situations, in every affair among the affairs of life, and it is the absolute submission and yielding to what came in the authentic Hadith from him, considering it Revelation from Allah ﷻ. Thus, the sanctification of the Noble Quran and the Prophetic Sunnah was by an intellectual motive coupled with feelings provoked by the thought itself. Therefore, their sanctification is imperative, and this sanctification for them must transform into an axiom among the axioms that does not accept debate and does not fall under research among those for whom the establishment of sanctification is complete. If anyone attempts to divert sanctification from the Hadith to the Quran alone, it is disbelief (kufr). Or if he attempts to portray the sanctification of the Noble Quran by kissing it while believing in its invalidity for this era, it is also disbelief. Rather, sanctification must be a comprehensive, general veneration, submission, and yielding,

and it must not accept research and debate except in the case of convincing [others] of the basis of sanctification.

On this basis, human beings, as such, are innately predisposed to sanctification, and sanctification cannot be removed from them, even if it can be suppressed and diverted. The Muslims, whose rational ‘Aqeedah has designated for them whom they sanctify and the matters they must sanctify, are—as people among human beings—innately predisposed to sanctification. As Muslims, for whom the intellect has designated the sanctities and the manner of their sanctification, they cannot abandon sanctification because it is part of the constitution of their creation. Nor is it permissible for them to abandon the sanctification of the sanctities which Islam has obligated them to sanctify, because it is from the requirements of their Islam. However, the enemies of Islam came via fallacies, stripping sanctification from matters Islam commanded to be sanctified, and changing the meaning of the sanctification of matters from which they failed to strip sanctification. Thus, it is binding upon the aware to make sanctification among the Muslims result from the motive of the Islamic ‘Aqeedah rationally, and to transform this sanctification into practice, so that every Muslim becomes capable of being upon a frontier among the frontiers of Islam, such that it is not breached from his or her direction.

The Infallibility (عصمة ‘Ismah) of the Messenger ﷺ

The infallibility (عصمة ‘ismah) of the Prophets (as) and Messengers (as) is a matter dictated by the intellect. This is because his being a Prophet (as) or Messenger (as) mandates that he is infallible in conveying (تبليغ tableegh) from Allah ﷻ. For if a flaw were to penetrate the possibility of non-infallibility in a single matter, the flaw would penetrate every matter, and at that point, the entire Prophethood and Message would collapse. Thus, the establishment that a person is a Prophet of Allah or a Messenger from Allah means that he is infallible in what he conveys from Allah ﷻ. His infallibility in conveying is inevitable, and disbelieving in it is disbelief in the risaalah (رسالة message) he brought and the Prophethood (نبوة nabuwwah) with which he was sent.

As for his infallibility regarding actions that contradict the commands and prohibitions of Allah ﷻ, what is decisively established is that he is inevitably infallible from major sins (كبائر kaba’ir). Thus, he absolutely never commits a major sin, because committing a major sin means committing disobedience (معصية ma’siyah). Obedience is indivisible, and disobedience is indivisible. If disobedience penetrates the action, it penetrates the conveying, and it contradicts the risaalah and nabuwwah. Therefore, the Prophets (as) and Messengers (as) are infallible from major sins just as they are infallible in conveying from Allah the Exalted.

As for infallibility from minor sins (صغائر sagha’ir), the ulema have differed regarding it. Some of them said they are not infallible from them because these minor sins are not disobedience, and some of them said they are infallible because these minor sins are disobedience. The truth is that everything whose undertaking is prohibited and everything whose

undertaking is obligatory —that is, all obligations and prohibitions— they are infallible regarding them. They are infallible from abandoning obligations and from committing prohibitions, whether they are major or minor sins. That is, they are infallible from everything that is called disobedience and to which the term disobedience applies. Whatever is besides that, of that which is contrary to the preferred amongst the permitted (خلاف الأوْلى khilaf al-awla), they are not infallible from it. Thus, it is absolutely permissible for them to commit what is contrary to the preferred amongst the permitted, because in all its aspects it does not fall under the concept of the word disobedience. This is what the intellect mandates and what their being Prophets (as) and Messengers (as) requires.

Our master Muhammad ﷺ is a Prophet (as) and Messenger (as), so he, like the rest of the Prophets and Messengers, is infallible from error in what he conveys from Allah ﷻ with a decisive infallibility evidenced by rational and Shariah evidence. The Messenger ﷺ did not convey rulings except from Revelation (وحيWahy). Allah ﷻ said,

﴿قُلۡ إِنَّمَآ أُنذِرُكُم بِٱلۡوَحۡيِ﴾

"Say, 'I only warn you by revelation'" [Al-Anbiya: 45]. That is, say to them, O Muhammad, I only warn you by the Revelation that was sent down to me; meaning, my warning to you is restricted to Revelation. Allah ﷻ said,

﴿وَمَا يَنطِقُ عَنِ ٱلۡهَوَىٰٓ ۝ إِنۡ هُوَ إِلَّا وَحۡيٞ يُوحَىٰ﴾

"And he does not speak from [his own] inclination. It is not but a revelation revealed" [An-Najm: 3-4]. The phrase,

﴿وَمَا يَنطِقُ﴾

"And he does not speak" is from the forms of generality (صيغة العموم sighat al-'umum), so it is general, encompassing the Noble Quran and other than it, and there is nothing that specifies

it to the Noble Quran alone—neither from the Book nor from the Sunnah. Thus, it remains upon its generality. That is, everything he utters of legislation is a Revelation revealed, and it is not valid to specify it to what he utters of the Noble Quran only. Instead, it must remain general, encompassing both the Noble Quran and the Prophetic Sunnah.

As for specifying it to what the Prophet ﷺ conveys from Allah ﷻ of legislation and other rulings, beliefs, thoughts, and instructive stories, and its non-inclusion of the styles and means for drawing up a battle plan, pollinating palm trees, or other than that, that is because he is a Messenger ﷺ. The speech is about a Messenger, and the research is regarding what he was sent with, not other than that. Thus, the subject of the speech is what specifies it, and the form of generality remains general within the subject for which it came. Therefore, these non-included styles and means ar not considered from the category of specification for His saying,

﴿قُلۡ إِنَّمَآ أُنذِرُكُم بِٱلۡوَحۡيِ﴾

"Say, 'I only warn you by revelation'" [Al-Anbiya: 45], and for His saying,

﴿إِن يُوحَىٰٓ إِلَيَّ إِلَّآ أَنَّمَآ أَنَا۠ نَذِيرٞ مُّبِينٞ﴾

"It has not been revealed to me except that I am a clear warner" [Sad: 70]. For these evidences clarify that the intended meaning is what he ﷺ brought of beliefs and rulings and everything he was commanded to convey and warn with. Therefore, it does not include the use of styles or his innate actions which are from the innate nature of man—that is, from the nature of his creation—such as walking, speaking, eating... and similar. It is specific to what relates to the actions of the servants and their thoughts, not to means, styles, and the like. Thus, everything the Messenger ﷺ brought of what he was

commanded to convey, of everything relating to the actions of the servants and thoughts, is Revelation from Allah.

Revelation encompasses the sayings of the Messenger, his actions, and his consenting silence, because we are commanded to follow him. Allah ﷻ said,

﴿وَمَآ ءَاتَىٰكُمُ ٱلرَّسُولُ فَخُذُوهُ وَمَا نَهَىٰكُمۡ عَنۡهُ فَٱنتَهُواْ﴾

"And whatever the Messenger has given you - take; and what he has forbidden you - refrain from" [Al-Hashr: 7]. Allah ﷻ said,

﴿لَّقَدۡ كَانَ لَكُمۡ فِي رَسُولِ ٱللَّهِ أُسۡوَةٌ حَسَنَةٌ﴾

"There has certainly been for you in the Messenger of Allah an excellent pattern" [Al-Ahzab: 21]. Thus, the speech of the Messenger ﷺ, his action, and his approving silence are a Shariah evidence, and they are all revelation from Allah ﷻ. The Messenger of Allah ﷺ used to receive Revelation and convey what it brought him from Allah ﷻ, and he treated matters according to the revelation and did not depart from the revelation absolutely. Allah ﷻ said in Surat Al-Ahqaf,

﴿إِنۡ أَتَّبِعُ إِلَّا مَا يُوحَىٰٓ إِلَيَّ﴾

"I only follow what is revealed to me" [Al-Ahqaf: 9]. Allah ﷻ said in Surat Al-A'raf,

﴿إِنَّمَآ أَتَّبِعُ مَا يُوحَىٰٓ إِلَيَّ مِن رَّبِّي﴾

"I only follow what is revealed to me from my Lord" [Al-A'raf: 203]. That is, I do not follow except what is revealed to me from my Lord, thus restricting his following to what is revealed to him from his Lord. All of this is explicit, clear, and apparent in generality, and that everything related to him ﷺ of what he is commanded to convey is solely Revelation.

The legislative life of the Messenger ﷺ in clarifying the rulings to people proceeded upon that. The Prophet ﷺ used to

wait for revelation in many of the rulings, such as Dhihar, Li'an, and others. He ﷺ would not utter a ruling regarding an issue, nor perform a legislative action, nor remain legislatively silent except from a revelation from Allah ﷻ. Sometimes, the ruling regarding an action among the actions of the servants would become confused for the Sahabah (ra) with a worldly opinion regarding a matter, a means, or a style. So, they would ask the Messenger ﷺ by saying, "Is that revelation, O Messenger of Allah, or is it opinion and consultation?" If he ﷺ said to them it is Revelation, they fell silent because they knew it was not from himself. If he said to them, it is worldly opinion and consultation, they debated with him ﷺ and perhaps he ﷺ followed their opinion, as in Badr, Al-Khandaq, and Uhud. He ﷺ used to tell them regarding what he does not convey from Allah ﷻ that, «**أَنْتُمْ أَدْرَى بِأُمورِ دُنْيَاكُمْ**» **"You are more knowledgeable about the affairs of your worldly life,"** as mentioned in the Hadith of pollinating the palm trees. Had he been speaking in legislation from other than Revelation, he would not have waited for Revelation to state the ruling, and the Sahabah would not have asked him about the speech whether it is Revelation or opinion, since he would have answered from himself or they would have debated him without asking.

Accordingly, he ﷺ did not issue his saying, his action, or his approving silence except from a Revelation from Allah ﷻ, not from an opinion from himself. The Messenger ﷺ is infallible from error in everything he conveys from Allah ﷻ.

It Is Not Permissible Regarding the Messenger ﷺ to Be a Mujtahid

The Messenger ﷺ never performed Ijtihad (اجتهاد Shariah deduction), and Ijtihad is not permissible for the Messenger both by Shariah and rationally. As for legislatively (Shar'), due to the explicit verses that indicate the restriction of everything he utters, warns with, and follows to Revelation (وحي wahy),

﴿قُل إِنَّمَآ أُنذِرُكُم بِٱلۡوَحۡيِ﴾

"Say, 'I only warn you by revelation'" [Al-Anbiya: 45],

﴿إِنۡ أَتَّبِعُ إِلَّا مَا يُوحَىٰٓ إِلَيَّ﴾

"I only follow what is revealed to me" [Al-Ahqaf: 9],

﴿وَمَا يَنطِقُ عَنِ ٱلۡهَوَىٰٓ﴾

"And he does not speak from his own inclination" [An-Najm: 3]. As for rationally, he ﷺ used to wait for Revelation in many of the rulings despite the dire need to clarify the ruling of Allah ﷻ. Had Ijtihad been permissible for him, he would not have delayed the ruling. Instead, he ﷺ would have performed Ijtihad, in which error is possible. Since it is established that he ﷺ used to delay the ruling until Revelation descended, it evidences that Ijtihad is not permissible for him ﷺ and he did not perform Ijtihad. Furthermore, it is obligatory to follow him ﷺ. If he performed Ijtihad, error would be permissible for him, and if he erred, it would be obligatory upon us to follow him. This necessitates the command to follow error, which is invalid. The permissibility of error upon the Messenger contradicts the risaalah (رسالة message) and nubuwwah (نبوة Prophethood). Thus, acknowledging the risaalah and nubuwwah dictates the impermissibility of error upon the Messenger and Prophet, and mandates the impossibility of error upon him in what he conveys from Allah ﷻ. Accordingly, Ijtihad is absolutely not

permissible regarding him ﷺ, and everything he conveyed of the rules by his saying, action, or approving silence is Revelation from Allah ﷻ and nothing else.

It is not said that Allah ﷻ does not approve him upon error and that He ﷻ clarifies it to him quickly. This is because when an error in Ijtihad occurs from the Messenger ﷺ, it becomes an obligation upon the Muslims to follow him until the clarification occurs. Thus, this clarification would have renewed another ruling different from the first, which the Muslims were commanded to follow, and to abandon the first ruling which was an error. This is invalid and is not permissible regarding Allah ﷻ nor regarding the Messenger ﷺ.

Moreover, no Ijtihad occurred from the Messenger ﷺ in what he conveyed from Allah ﷻ in any ruling among the rulings of Allah absolutely. Instead, what is established by the text of the Quran and the authenticated Sunnah is that he ﷺ used to convey from Revelation, and did not convey from other than the path of Revelation. When Revelation did not descend regarding an incident, he ﷺ would wait for it until it descended regarding it.

As for the verses they cited, claiming that he ﷺ performed Ijtihad in them, such as His ﷻ saying,

﴿مَا كَانَ لِنَبِيٍّ أَن يَكُونَ لَهُۥٓ أَسۡرَىٰ حَتَّىٰ يُثۡخِنَ فِي ٱلۡأَرۡضِ﴾

"It is not for a Prophet to have captives of war until he inflicts bloodshed upon Allah's enemies in the land" [Al-Anfal: 67], and His ﷻ saying,

﴿عَفَا ٱللَّهُ عَنكَ لِمَ أَذِنتَ لَهُمۡ﴾

"Allah has forgiven you, O Muhammad. Why did you give them permission to remain behind?" [At-Tawbah: 43], and His ﷻ saying:

﴿وَلَا تُصَلِّ عَلَىٰٓ أَحَدٖ مِّنۡهُم مَّاتَ أَبَدٗا وَلَا تَقُمۡ عَلَىٰ قَبۡرِهِۦٓ﴾

"And do not pray the funeral prayer, O Muhammad, over any of them who has died - ever - or stand at his grave" [At-Tawbah: 84], and similar verses and Hadiths; that was not from the category of Ijtihad in a ruling, conveying it to people, then retracting it and correcting it with another ruling. Instead, it is from the category of admonishment for undertaking actions. The Messenger ﷺ did not convey a specific ruling, then the verse came clarifying the error of the first ruling he conveyed and in which his Ijtihad erred. Instead, the Messenger ﷺ undertook an action in application of the rulings of Allah ﷻ which the revelation descended with and which he ﷺ conveyed to people. Thus, the ruling was legislated, it was commanded, and the Messenger had conveyed it. In this incident, the Messenger ﷺ undertook the action according to what Allah ﷻ commanded him. However, his undertaking of it was in a manner contrary to the preferred within the permitted (خلاف الأولى khilaf al-awla), so he was admonished for that with an admonishment. Thus, the verses are verses of admonishment for the Messenger ﷺ undertaking what is contrary to the preferred within the permitting, and they are not a correction of an Ijtihad, nor a legislation of another ruling contradicting a ruling in which the Messenger ﷺ had performed Ijtihad.

The literal meaning (منطوق mantuq) of the verses and their implied meaning (مفهوم mafhum) evidence that. His ﷻ saying,

﴿مَا كَانَ لِنَبِيٍّ أَن يَكُونَ لَهُۥٓ أَسۡرَىٰ حَتَّىٰ يُثۡخِنَ فِي ٱلۡأَرۡضِ﴾

"It is not for a prophet to have captives [of war] until he inflicts a massacre upon Allah's enemies in the land" [Al-Anfal: 67] evidences that taking captives was legislated on the condition of prior infliction of a massacre in the land. This is supported by the verse,

﴿حَتَّىٰٓ إِذَآ أَثۡخَنتُمُوهُمۡ فَشُدُّواْ ٱلۡوَثَاقَ﴾

"Until, when you have inflicted a massacre upon them, then secure their bonds" [Muhammad: 4]. The intended meaning of Ithkhan (إثخان) is killing and severe intimidation. There is no doubt that the Sahabah (ra) killed a great multitude on the day of Badr, until they crushed their enemy completely, and it is not a condition of Ithkhan (إثخان) in the land to kill all people. Then, after the extensive killing, they took a group as captives. The verse itself evidences that after Ithkhan (إثخان), taking captives is permissible. Thus, this verse became a clear evidencing that taking those captives was permissible by the ruling of this verse. Therefore, the Messenger did not perform Ijtihad regarding the ruling of the captives, nor was taking captives at Badr a sin contradicting the ruling with which the verse descended. However, it evidence that in applying the rule of captives to this particular incident, it was preferable for the killing to be more, so that the Ithkhan would be more prominent. So, the verse descended admonishing the application in a manner contrary to the preferred amongst the permitted. That is, it is a verse of admonishment for an action among the actions of the Messenger ﷺ in an incident whose ruling was known, where he did it contrary to what is preferable to do. Thus, it is an admonishment for the preferred amongst permitted (خلاف الأوْلى khilaf al-awla). The prophets are not infallible from committing what is contrary to the preferable, so it is permissible regarding them to commit it, and when they commit it, Allah admonishes them for it. Thus, this is an admonishment for the Messenger.

As for His ﷻ saying,

﴿عَفَا ٱللَّهُ عَنكَ لِمَ أَذِنتَ لَهُمۡ حَتَّىٰ يَتَبَيَّنَ لَكَ ٱلَّذِينَ صَدَقُواْ وَتَعۡلَمَ ٱلۡكَٰذِبِينَ﴾

"Allah has forgiven you, O Muhammad. Why did you give them permission to remain behind? You should not have until it was evident to you who were truthful and you knew who were the liars" [At-Tawbah: 43], it does not evidence any Ijtihad. It is permissible for the Messenger ﷺ to grant permission, evidenced by His saying in Surat An-Nur:

﴿فَإِذَا ٱسۡتَـٔۡذَنُوكَ لِبَعۡضِ شَأۡنِهِمۡ فَأۡذَن لِّمَن شِئۡتَ مِنۡهُمۡ﴾

"So when they ask your permission for something of their affairs, then give permission to whom you will among them" [An-Nur: 62]. This is explicit and indicates that it is permissible for the Messenger ﷺ to grant them permission. However, in that incident, which was the expedition of Tabuk and the equipping of the Army of Hardship, it was preferable that the Messenger ﷺ not grant permission to the hypocrites to remain behind. When he ﷺ granted them permission in that specific incident, Allah ﷻ admonished him for that—that is, He admonished him for undertaking what is contrary to the preferred amongst permitted (خلاف الأوْلى khilaf al-awla). The verse is not a correction of an Ijtihad, nor a legislation of a rule contradicting a ruling in which the Messenger had performed Ijtihad in the incident itself. Instead, it is an admonishment for what is contrary to the preferred amongst permitted (خلاف الأوْلى khilaf al-awla).

As for His ﷻ saying,

﴿وَلَا تُصَلِّ عَلَىٰٓ أَحَدٖ مِّنۡهُم مَّاتَ أَبَدٗا وَلَا تَقُمۡ عَلَىٰ قَبۡرِهِۦٓۖ إِنَّهُمۡ كَفَرُواْ بِٱللَّهِ وَرَسُولِهِۦ وَمَاتُواْ وَهُمۡ فَٰسِقُونَ﴾

"And do not pray the funeral prayer, O Muhammad, over any of them who has died - ever - or stand at his grave. Indeed, they disbelieved in Allah and His Messenger and died while they were defiantly disobedient" [At-Tawbah: 84], it came after His saying,

﴿فَإِن رَّجَعَكَ ٱللَّهُ إِلَىٰ طَآئِفَةٖ مِّنۡهُمۡ فَٱسۡتَـٔۡذَنُوكَ لِلۡخُرُوجِ فَقُل لَّن تَخۡرُجُواْ مَعِيَ أَبَدٗا﴾

"If Allah should return you to a faction of them and they ask your permission to go out [to battle], say, 'You will not go out with me, ever'"[At-Tawbah: 83]. He clarified in the Quranic verse,

﴿فَإِن رَّجَعَكَ ٱللَّهُ﴾

"If Allah should return you..." that the Messenger should not let them accompany him in his expeditions, due to their demoralizing and frightening the believers. He ﷻ clarified in the verse after it, which is

﴿وَلَا تُصَلِّ عَلَىٰٓ أَحَدٍ مِّنْهُم﴾

"And do not pray over any of them...", another matter regarding their humiliation. That was during the campaign against the hypocrites to eliminate them. There is nothing in the verse evidencing that the Messenger performed Ijtihad in a rule and the verse came indicating its contrary. Rather, it is an initial legislation regarding the hypocrites, and it is consistent with the repeated verses about the hypocrites in the same Surah. It does not appear in it—neither explicitly (صراحة sarahatan), nor by evidencing (دلالة dalaalatan), nor by literal meaning (منطوقا mantooqan), nor by implied meaning (مفهوما mafhuman)—that it is a correction of an Ijtihad and an alert to an error. It was revealed in the ninth year of Hijrah after Tabuk when Abu Bakr (ra) led the people in Hajj. As for what was narrated regarding the Revelation of this verse and the previous verses of reports about the cause of revelation (سبب النزول sabab al-nuzul) and their incidents, many of these reports are not authentic (صحيح sahih). What is authentic among them of Hadiths about the cause of Revelation are singular reports (أخبار آحاد akhbar ahad) that are speculative (ظنية dhanniyyah), and they do not contradict the decisive (قطعي qat'i) which restricts the Messenger's conveying of the rulings to Revelation alone, and that he ﷺ only follows Revelation and only speaks by Revelation,

﴿إِنْ أَتَّبِعُ إِلَّا مَا يُوحَىٰٓ إِلَيَّ﴾

"I only follow what is revealed to me" [Al-Ahqaf: 9].

Accordingly, there is no evidencing in the mentioned verses of the occurrence of Ijtihad from the Messenger ﷺ. There is no legislation of a new ruling in them, nor a correction of an

old ruling. Instead, there is an admonishment in them for the Messenger regarding actions he undertook whose ruling was known by Revelation prior to his ﷺ undertaking them. The Messenger being a Mujtahid, or Ijtihad being permissible for him, is prohibited rationally and legislatively (Shariah-wise). Thus, it is not permissible regarding the Messenger ﷺ to perform Ijtihad in the ruling he conveys from his Lord, whether the conveying is by saying, silence, or action. The verses are decisive in transmission and decisive in meaning that he does not speak, follow, or warn except by Revelation. From this premise, it is impermissible regarding the Messenger ﷺ and regarding the rest of the Messengers (as) to err in what they convey from Allah ﷻ, whether the error is from Ijtihad, forgetfulness, or intention, because it contradicts the infallibility obligatory regarding them (as).

Psychology, Sociology, and Educational Sciences

There exists among people a confusion between deductive thoughts resulting from the intellectual method and scientific thoughts resulting from the scientific method. Based on this confusion, they consider what is called psychology, sociology, and educational sciences as sciences, and they consider their thoughts as scientific thoughts. This is because they came based on observations that were tracked on children in different circumstances and different ages; or tracked on different groups in different circumstances; or on different actions of different persons in different circumstances, so they called the repetition of these observations "experiments."

The truth is that the thoughts of psychology, sociology, and educational sciences are not scientific thoughts. Instead, they are intellectual thoughts. It is because scientific experiments are the subjection of matter to circumstances and factors other than its original circumstances and factors, and observing the effect of this subjection—that is, conducting experiments on the matter itself, like the experiments of physics and chemistry. As for observing a thing in different times and situations, it is not scientific experiments. Accordingly, observing a child in different situations and different ages, observing groups in different countries and different circumstances, and observing actions from different persons and in different situations—all of that does not fall under the research of scientific experiments, so it is not considered a scientific method. Instead, it is merely observation, repetition of observation, and deduction. Thus, it is an intellectual method and not a scientific one. Accordingly, the thoughts of what is called psychology, sociology, and educational sciences are intellectual thoughts, and they fall under culture and do not fall under science.

Moreover, psychology, sociology, and educational sciences are speculative matters prone to error, and they are not from the decisive matters. Thus, it is not valid for them to be taken as a basis for judging matters, nor is it permissible to use them as evidence for the correctness or incorrectness of matters. Because they are not of the category of scientific facts or scientific laws such that it is said they are correct until their error is proven. Instead, they are speculative knowledge (Ma'arif Zanniyyah) that came via speculation. Even if they were arrived at via the intellectual method, they are not of the category of judging the existence of matters. Instead, they are of the category of judging the reality of a matter, regarding what it is in essence. This judgment is decisively speculative, containing the possibility of error. Furthermore, these three fields of knowledge—psychology, sociology, and educational sciences—are built upon erroneous foundations, and this is what made many of the thoughts they contained erroneous thoughts.

This is because psychology is built in its entirety upon its view of the instincts and its view of the brain. It views that in man there are many instincts, some of which have been discovered and some of which have not been discovered. Psychologists built erroneous theories upon this view of the instincts, and that was among the causes that led to error in many of the thoughts existing in psychology. As for the view of the brain, psychology considers the brain divided into regions, and that every region has a specific capability, and that in some brains there are capabilities that do not exist in other brains. Based on this, some people have the capability to understand languages and do not have the capability to understand mathematics, and there are persons, on the contrary, who have the capability to understand mathematics and do not have the capability to understand languages. Thus, erroneous theories were built upon this erroneous view. This was also among the causes that led to error in many of the thoughts existing in psychology.

The truth in all of this is: what is observed by sensation from inductively studying the response or reaction is that man has a vital energy that has two manifestations. One of them demands inevitable satisfaction, and if it is not satisfied, man dies. The second demands satisfaction, and if it is not satisfied, man remains alive but he suffers and is disturbed by the lack of satisfaction. The first manifestation is represented in the organic needs such as hunger, thirst, and relieving oneself. The second manifestation is represented in the instincts, which are the instinct of religiosity, the procreation instinct, and the survival instinct. These instincts are the feeling of weakness, the feeling of the survival of the species, and the feeling of the survival of the self, and there is nothing other than that. Whatever is besides these three instincts are manifestations of the instincts. Thus, fear, dominance, and ownership are manifestations of the survival instinct; veneration of heroes and worship are manifestations of the instinct of religiosity; and sexual inclination, fatherhood, motherhood, and brotherhood are manifestations of the procreation instinct. Thus, every manifestation among the manifestations returns to one of these instincts.

This is from the perspective of the instincts. As for the perspective of the brain, the truth is that the brain is one, and that the disparity and difference in thoughts stems from the disparity and difference in the sensed objects and previous information, and is subordinate to the disparity in the strength of linking. There does not exist in one brain a capability that does not exist in another. Instead, all brains contain the capability of thought regarding everything, whenever the tangible reality, the senses, previous information, and the brain are available. Brains only differ in the strength of linking and in the strength of sensation, just as eyes differ in the strength and weakness of vision, and just as ears differ in the strength and weakness of hearing. Therefore, it is possible to give every individual any

information, and he possesses the capability to digest it. There is no basis for what came in psychology regarding the capabilities of brains or of a single brain.

On this basis, psychology's consideration of the instincts as an erroneous consideration, and its consideration of the brain as an erroneous consideration, led to the error of the theories that were built upon their basis.

As for sociology, it is built in its entirety upon its view of the individual and society. It is built upon the individualistic view. For this reason, its view transitions from the individual to the family, to the group, and to the society, on the consideration that society is composed of individuals. For this reason, it considers societies to be separate, and that what is suitable for one society is not suitable for another society. Sociologists built erroneous theories upon this view, and that was the primary cause that led to the error in the ideas of sociology.

The truth is that society is absolutely not composed of individuals. For an individual with an individual with an individual form a group, not a society. A group does not constitute a society unless permanent relationships arise among its individuals; if relationships do not arise, they remain a group. Hence, the existence of ten thousand persons traveling on a ship does not make them a society. Instead, they remain a group. However, the existence of two hundred persons in a village constitutes a society due to the permanent relationships between them. Thus, the existence of a permanent relationship among the group is what makes them a society. Therefore, the research into society must be a research into relationships, not a research into the group.

However, that which brings this relationship into existence among individuals is solely the interest they have. If there is an interest for them, a relationship arises between them, and if there is no interest, relationships do not arise. An

interest does not bring a relationship into existence unless three matters combine within it:

One of them is that the thought of both parties unites on the consideration that this is an interest. If one of them views it as an interest and the other views it as a harm, a relationship does not arise between them. For the relationship to arise, each of them must view it as an interest.

The second is that the feelings unify upon the interest. If both parties are pleased with it or angered by it, a relationship is formed. As for if one of them is pleased with it and the other is angered by it, a relationship does not arise from it. The third is that the system that organizes this interest unites. If one of the two parties organizes the interest upon a system and the other rejects this system and organizes it upon another system, a relationship does not arise between them. Thus, the two parties must agree upon the manner of organizing the interest for them.

By unifying the thoughts, feelings, and systems among individuals, the society arises. However, these individuals bring into existence a specific society particular to them. If they want to annex others to them from other societies, they would have to replace the thoughts, feelings, and systems of both parties with other thoughts, feelings, and systems for everyone so that they form a society. Therefore, defining society by individuals does not apply to the ideological society. Instead, it applies to a specific society.

As for society in its correct meaning, it is composed of the human being, thoughts, feelings, and systems. Whatever thoughts and treatments are suitable for the human being in one place are suitable for the human being in every place, and transform multiple societies into a single society, rectified by the thoughts, feelings, and systems.

The difference between the human being and the individual is that when you research Muhammad, Khalid, and Hasan, according to the traits each of them possesses, which no other human being naturally shares with him, you have researched him in his capacity as an individual. If you research Muhammad, Khalid, and Hasan according to what he possesses of natural, innate matters existing naturally in human beings, you have researched him in his capacity as a human being, even if you are researching specific persons. From this premise, the radical reform of society only occurs by researching society, considering it as a human being, thoughts, feelings, and systems, not considering it as an individual. Thus, the view is a human view, not an individualistic view, even if it is researched in a specific individual.

This is the definition of society, and this is the correct view of it. And this is the reality of society, the reality of the group, and the reality of the individual. By this, it becomes evident that the error in the view of society resulted in the error of the theories, and resulted in the error of sociology in its entirety.

As for what came in sociology regarding the group in terms of its general weakness in perceiving matters compared to a single individual, and in terms of it being closer to provoking feelings than the individual, the correctness in it does not come from the perspective of the view of society. Rather, it comes from the perspective of the dominance of the many, repeated information over the individual information, thus controlling the judgment upon the reality. And it comes from the perspective that the herd manifestation that appears in the group provokes feelings because it is among the manifestations of the survival instinct.

Accordingly, everything built upon the view of society in sociology is corrupt. Whatever is correct in it, its correctness comes from it resulting from another cause, not from the view of society. On this basis, sociology is corrupt because it is built upon a corrupt view, which is the view of society and the individual.

As for educational sciences, they are built upon psychology and influenced by the theories of sociology, and result from observing the actions of individuals and the situations of children. This makes educational sciences a mixture of the correct (saheeh) and the fallacious (fasad). Thus, whatever is built upon psychology and influenced by sociology is corrupt. This corruption of it led to falling into corrupt educational thoughts that led to the fallacy of educational curricula and its methods. Considering the child incapable of some sciences and capable of others is a fallacious consideration. Therefore, dividing education into scientific and literary streams, and leaving the person to choose according to his readiness, is among the most fallacious matters. It contradicts the reality and is harmful to the interest of the Ummah. Considering the person incapable of learning some sciences, and capable of others, is also a fallacious consideration. It has led to depriving many from learning some sciences and depriving many from continuing education.

As for what is built in educational sciences upon observing children and observing the actions of individuals in different circumstances and situations, whatever among it is in agreement with the reality and correct in deduction, such as fatigue, rest, mental activity, and the like, is correct in its entirety. Whatever among it is not in agreement with the reality, such as dividing the year into three terms and giving the student a four-month holiday, and such as examinations and the like, is an error in its entirety. From here came the error of educational theories and the corruption of educational sciences in their entirety, especially in what was built upon psychology and influenced by sociology.

The Scientific Method and the Intellectual Method

The scientific method is a specific method of research undertaken to arrive at the knowledge of the reality of the thing being researched via conducting experiments on the matter. It does not occur except in the research of tangible matter, and its existence is impossible in the research of thoughts/ideas. It occurs by subjecting matter to circumstances and factors other than its original circumstances and factors, and observing the matter and the original circumstances and factors to which it was subjected, then deducing from this process upon the matter a tangible material reality, as is the case in laboratories.

This method imposes the abandonment of all previous information about the matter being researched and treating it as non-existent, then beginning with the observation and experimentation of the matter. It requires you, if you desire research, to erase from yourself every opinion and every previous belief you have regarding this research, and to begin with observation and experiment, then with balancing and arrangement, then with deduction based on these scientific premises. If you arrive at a result from that, it is a scientific result subject, by its nature, to research and scrutiny. However, it remains scientific, as long as scientific research does not prove the penetration of error into any of its aspects.

Thus, the result that the researcher arrives at via the scientific method—even if named a scientific fact or a scientific law—is not decisive. Instead, it is speculative, containing the possibility of error. This possibility of error in the scientific method is a foundation among the foundations that must be observed within it, according to what is established in scientific research. Error has indeed occurred in its results, and that appeared in much of the scientific knowledge whose corruption became evident after it had been termed scientific facts. For

example, the atom used to be described as the smallest part of matter and indivisible, then the error of that appeared, and it became evident by the scientific method itself that it is divisible.

On this basis, the scientific method is specific to matter, because among its primary foundations is experimentation upon matter by subjecting it to circumstances and factors other than its original circumstances and factors. This cannot occur in thought, since it is impossible to conduct an experiment upon it. On this basis also, the results arrived at in the scientific method are speculative results and not decisive, and they contain the possibility of error.

As for the intellectual method, it is a specific method of research undertaken to arrive at the knowledge of the reality of the thing being researched via the transfer of the sensation of the reality via the senses to the brain, and the existence of previous information by which the reality is explained, so the brain issues its judgment upon it. This judgment is thought or rational perception. It occurs in the research of tangible matter and in the research of thoughts. It is the natural method in arriving at perception as such, and its process is that by which the rationalizing of matters—that is, their perception—is formed. It is itself the definition of the intellect, and upon its method, man, in his capacity as a human being, arrives at the perception of anything he previously perceived or desires to perceive.

However, the result that the researcher arrives at via the intellectual method is examined: If this result is the judgment upon the existence of the matter, it is decisive; it is absolutely impossible for error to penetrate it under any circumstance. This is because this judgment came via the sensation of the reality, and sensation cannot err regarding the existence of the reality, since the sensation of the senses regarding the existence of the reality is decisive. Thus, the judgment issued by the intellect regarding the existence of the reality in this method is decisive.

As for the errors that occur where sensation errs, such as seeing a mirage and assuming it is water, and seeing a sound, straight pen while it is in a cup of water as broken or bent, this is not an error in the existence of the reality. Instead, it is an error in the attributes of the reality. It did not err in the existence of a matter, which is the mirage or the pen. Instead, it erred in the attribute of the matter, so it said about the mirage that it is water, and regarding sound, a straight pen that it is broken or bent.

Thus, it is in all matters, no matter what errors occur in them: sensation cannot err in their existence. When it senses the existence of a matter, this matter exists decisively, and the judgment upon its existence is decisive. As for if the result is the judgment upon the reality of the matter or its attribute, it is a speculative result containing the possibility of error. It is because this judgment came via information or analyses of the tangible reality with information, and error can penetrate these. However, it remains a correct thought until its error becomes evident, and only at that point is it judged as erroneous. Prior to that, it remains a correct result and a sound thought.

As for logical research, it is not a method of thinking. Instead, it is a style among the styles of research built upon the intellectual method. This is because logical research is building a thought upon a thought such that it ends at sensation, and arriving via this building at a specific result. For example: the writing board is wood, and all wood burns; thus, the result is that the writing board burns. For example: had there been life in the slaughtered sheep, it would have moved, but it did not move; thus, the result is that there is no life in the slaughtered sheep, and so forth. In the first example, the thought that all wood burns was contextualized with the thought that the writing board is wood, so it resulted from this contextualization that the writing board burns. In the second example, the fact that the slaughtered sheep did not move was contextualization with the

thought that life in the sheep makes it move, so it results from this contextualization that there is certainly no life in the slaughtered sheep.

Thus, regarding this logical research, if its premises which contain the thoughts that were coupled are truthful, the result is truthful, and if they are false, the result is false. The condition for the premises is that every premise among them must end at sensation. Therefore, it returns to the intellectual method, and sensation arbitrates over it so that its truthfulness is understood. From this premise, it is a style among the styles built upon the intellectual method, and it contains the possibility of falsehood and the possibility of fallacy. Instead of testing the truthfulness of logic by returning to the intellectual method, it is preferable to use the intellectual method in research initially, and not to resort to the logical style. Even though it is possible to use it if its premises are correct by returning them to the intellectual method of thinking.

On this basis, there are only two methods for thinking: the scientific method and the intellectual method. The first imposes the abandonment of previous information, and the second dictates the existence of previous information. The intellectual method is the basis in thinking, and by it alone does thought arise. Without it, thought does not arise, nor is it possible for the scientific method, the logical style, or other than that to exist. So, via the intellectual method, the perception of scientific facts exists through observation, experimentation, and deduction; via the intellectual method, the perception of logical facts exists in logic and the like; via the intellectual method, the perception of the facts of history and the discrimination of error from correctness in them exists; and via the intellectual method, the comprehensive thought about the universe, man, and life, and about the realities of the universe, man, and life exists in man.

As for the scientific method, it cannot exist nor is it possible to be unless it is built upon the intellectual method and upon what is established by the intellectual method. Thus, it is natural, and it is imperative, that it is not the basis for thinking. Moreover, the scientific method dictates that everything that is not materially touched has no existence, in the view of the scientific method. Therefore, logic, history, and others have no existence, because that has not been established scientifically—that is, it has not been established via the observation of matter, its experimentation, and the material deduction of tangible things. This is the gross error, because the natural sciences are a branch among the branches of knowledge, and a thought among the thoughts, while the rest of the knowledge of life is abundant, and it is not established by the scientific method, but instead it is established by the intellectual method. Therefore, it is not permissible to take the scientific method as a basis for thinking. That which must be taken as a basis for thinking is the intellectual method alone.

However, this does not mean that the scientific method is an erroneous method; rather, the error is making it the basis for thinking. It is because making it a basis is impossible, since it is not an origin upon which matters are built. Instead, it is a branch built upon an origin. This is because making it a basis excludes most knowledge and facts from research, and leads to judging the non-existence of much of the knowledge that is studied and which contains facts, even though they actually exist and are tangible by sensation and reality.

Furthermore, the scientific method is speculative, and the possibility of error in it is a foundation among the foundations that must be observed within it, so it is not permissible to be taken as a basis for thinking. This is because the scientific method brings about a speculative result regarding the existence of the thing and regarding its attribute. As for the intellectual

method, it gives a decisive result regarding the existence of the thing and regarding the existence of specific attributes for it. Even if it gives a speculative result regarding the essence of the matter and the reality of its attribute, it is—in terms of its judgment upon the existence of the thing and the existence of specific attributes for it—decisive and certain. Thus, it must be taken as the basis for research on the consideration that its results are decisive. On this basis, if a rational result contradicts a scientific result regarding the existence of a matter and regarding the existence of a specific attribute for it, the rational result is inevitably taken, and the scientific result that contradicts the rational result is discarded, because the decisive is what is taken, not the speculative.

From this premise, the error existing in the world is its taking of the scientific method as a basis for thinking, and making it an arbitrator in judging things. This error must be corrected, and the intellectual method must become the basis of thinking, and it is what is returned to in judging things.

Political Awareness (الوعي السياسي)

Awareness of political situations, the international scenario, or political events is different from political awareness. This is because awareness of political situations, the international scenario, or political events is the contemplation of them, whereas political awareness is man's contemplation of looking after his affairs. Political awareness is looking at the world from a specific angle. Looking at the world from other than a specific angle is considered superficiality and is not political awareness. Looking at the local, regional sphere alone is triviality and is not political awareness. The existence of political awareness is not complete unless two elements are available within it: one of them is that the view must be towards the entire world, and the second is that this view must emanate from a specific, defined angle, whatever this angle may be, whether it is a specific ideology or a specific thought. However, if the specific angle is an ideology, it makes the political awareness constant, taking its path in the direction of all its objectives towards a single objective from which it does not deviate, and it acquires deep-rootedness and concentration in the soul of the Ummah, not just in the souls of individuals.

Political awareness naturally dictates engaging in the struggle for the sake of forming a specific concept about life in man, in his capacity as a human being, in every place. The formation of this concept is the primary responsibility placed upon the shoulders of the politically aware person, who does not attain rest except by exerting hardship to fulfill it.

It is imperative upon the politically aware person to engage in the struggle against all directions that contradict his direction, and against all concepts that contradict his concepts, at the same time he engages in the struggle to concentrate his concepts and implant his directions. For one does not separate from the other in the struggle by a hair's breadth. Included in

that is the struggle against the attacks that target his concept about life, against the deep-seated concepts that came from the eras of decline, against the Capitalist influence that takes hold through the fulfillment of immediate demands, and against the reduction of sublime objectives to partial objectives.

Political awareness does not mean encompassing everything in the world, nor possessing all knowledge of the ideology or what must be taken as a specific angle for looking at the world. Instead, it merely means that the view is towards the world, regardless of whether his knowledge about it is little or much, and that this view is from a specific angle, regardless of whether his knowledge of this angle is little or great. Thus, the mere existence of the view towards the world from a specific angle indicates the existence of political awareness, even if this awareness varies in strength and weakness, according to the variation in knowledge of the world and the angle. This is because the intent of looking at the world is concentrated in looking at the human being who lives in the world, and the intent of looking from a specific angle is concentrated in his concept about life, which he took as a specific angle. On this basis, political awareness is not specific to politicians and thinkers. Instead, it is general and possible to bring about in the commoners and the illiterate, just as it is possible to bring about in the ulema and the educated. Indeed, it must be brought about, even if generally, in the Ummah in its entirety. This is because without this political awareness in the Ummah, and indeed in any individual, it is impossible to perceive the value of the thoughts he possesses in the life of the Ummah.

Political awareness is the urgent need whose fulfillment and securing within the Islamic Ummah is indispensable. Without this political awareness, it is impossible to perceive the value of Islam in the life of individuals and society, and it is impossible to guarantee the progression of the Ummah alongside the carriers of the Dawah — who struggle against

disbelief and struggle against colonialism — with a permanent progression in all circumstances, in victory and defeat alike.

Without political awareness, the virtues of Islam are suspended. Without political awareness, the condition of the Ummah worsens, the causes of elevation are cut off from it, and all the efforts exerted in reviving it are wasted. Without political awareness among Muslims in their capacity as Muslims, extinction hastens towards Islam, the danger of annihilation for Muslims increases, and the methods and means that enable the resumption of the Islamic way of life and the carrying of the Islamic Dawah vanish. Thus, the existence of political awareness is a matter of utmost necessity for the Islamic Ummah, and it is, without exaggeration, a matter of life or death.

The existence of individuals in the Ummah who enjoy political awareness cannot spare the Ummah from disaster, nor protect it from slipping, no matter how numerous the aware individuals in the Ummah are, as long as they remain individuals, individualistically. Instead, the disaster will inevitably sweep them away along with the Ummah, and they will witness its slipping into and burning within the fire of this slide. Thus, awareness must exist in the Ummah as a whole, even if it is not necessary for it to exist in every single Muslim.

Therefore, the utmost limit of effort must be expended in bringing about political awareness in the Ummah, equivalent to the effort expended in bringing about Islamic concepts and igniting Islamic sentiments. Thus, bringing about the feeling of the world's need for Islam to guide it, must emanate from the sentiments of the Ummah's need for Islam, and this must be nourished by making people understand Islam and provoking their feelings for it. That is, effort must be expended so that the Ummah looks at the world from the angle of Islam, until this view is concentrated, even if generally, in the masses of people, and this basis must be observed when expending effort to make Islam understood and to provoke longing for it.

The first thing that must be observed is that the awareness that bears fruit is distinguished by a comprehensive view towards the interest of the world from the angle of Islam. The Ummah as a whole must believe that saving the world without Islam is impossible, and the Ummah must perceive, even if generally, that bringing Islam into existence in the arena of life in society without the Islamic state is a fantasy. It must be clear to those in whom political awareness has grown and blossomed that achieving the Islamic state without the Islamic Ummah is an illusion, and that making the Ummah achieve the Islamic state without political awareness is indeed more fantastical and a greater illusion.

Political awareness appears in the Ummah if its view towards the world from the angle of Islam appears. However, political awareness does not appear within the individual unless this awareness grows and blossoms. From here, you find it difficult to perceive that a person is politically aware, if such awareness is not represented in him in an apparent manner. The politically aware person cannot be taken in by words, names, or titles, and he constantly guards against his mind falling prey to propaganda and advertisements. He avoids losing sight of the realities or going astray in investigating the truth, regarding the objective for which the striving is undertaken.

The distinguishing feature enjoyed by the politically aware person is caution in receiving news and opinions, lest anything attaches to them, no matter how trivial it may be. That is, he takes everything in a state of awareness, thinking about its reality and its position relative to the objective for which striving is undertaken.

Let the politically aware person beware of the domination of his inclinations over opinions and news. For the desires of the self for something personal, partisan, or ideological may interpret the opinion or the news, or may add to it that which

makes the observer imagine it is truth while it is falsehood, or imagine it is falsehood while it is truth. Therefore, the aware person must verify the speech that is said, and the action that is done. It is not sufficient for him alone to perceive that. Instead, the politically aware person is the one who perceives matters and announces them to the people so that they are placed on the table of research and discussion, and so that he works to bring about awareness in the Ummah as a whole. Thus, the Ummah becomes accustomed to not being taken in by words, and becomes accustomed to scrutinizing opinions and news.

It is not valid to consider a person politically aware if he says something and acts contrary to it, or holds an opinion and does not strive to apply it. The aware person's belief in an ideology or a thought with political awareness is represented in his actions, not in his speeches and writings, nor in his conversations and discussions. If his thoughts do not materialize into actions and effects, he and others have the right to doubt his awareness, or at least the correctness of his awareness. Thus, the aware ones—whether individuals, groups, or a kutlah (كتلة structure) —their awareness is not confirmed except by action, and their truthfulness does not appear except through boldness and sacrifice. This is the distinguishing mark of correct political awareness, because the meaning of it being awareness is its being contemplation, and the meaning of it being political is his looking after all his affairs, and the affairs of his Ummah on the basis of this awareness.

Therefore, the clashing of the aware ones with issues during their friction with reality, people, and the direct problems of life is an inevitable matter. There is no difference in that between the internal local regional level and the global international level. In this clash, the ability emerges to make the message he carries, or the specific angle from which he looks at the world, the basis, the arbitrator, and the objective he strives

towards. There is no difference in that between individuals and the Ummah. The Ummah's action, according to whatever the specific angle from which it views the world dictates, is an inevitable matter like the action of the individual. Its belief in it is an inevitable matter like the individual. Its clashing with issues and friction with problems is also an inevitable matter, like the individual, so that the existence of political awareness within it can be validly considered. For this reason, three traits must become deeply rooted in the souls of the entire Ummah:

Firstly: Complete concern for the interests of the Ummah in an automatic, reflexive manner. Thus, the Muslim says in his supplication, "O Allah, have mercy on the Islamic Ummah," just as he says, "O Allah, have mercy on me." And he asks, "Has the army been victorious?" before he asks about his son in the army.

Secondly: Unity of opinion and organization towards what must be eliminated, and towards what must be supported of thoughts, actions, and persons. That is, towards what must be built and towards what must be destroyed.

Thirdly: Making obedience a natural disposition among the natural dispositions, and rebellion a despised and condemned vice. Submission to the enemy is not called obedience, nor is standing in the face of tyranny, rebellion. Instead, obedience is the execution of the command of the one in authority with submission, desire, contentment, and tranquility, and rebellion is its opposite.

Spiritual Power Is the Most Influential of Strengths

The human being is driven to undertake action according to the amount of strengths he possesses; the more his strengths, the greater his drive. The amount of actions he achieves is according to the amount of powers he possesses. However, man possesses multiple strengths. He possesses materialistic strengths represented in his body and the means he uses to satisfy his desires. He possesses moral strengths represented in the moral attributes he aims to be characterized by. He possesses spiritual strengths represented in his perception of his connection to Allah ﷻ, or his feeling of it, or both together. Every strength among these three powers has an effect on the undertaking of action by the human being. However, these strengths are not equal in influencing man. Instead, they vary in influence upon man. Materialistic strengths are the weakest of them in influence, and moral strengths are more influential than materialistic strengths. As for spiritual strengths, they are the most influential of them and the most intensely effective.

This is because materialistic strengths, whether bodily or a means, drive to satisfy the desire of their possessor towards action according to his estimation of it, and nothing more. They may not drive him to action absolutely, despite their availability because he finds no need for this action. On this basis, they are strengths of limited drive, and their mere existence does not dictate the drive to action. When man wants to fight his enemy, he weighs his bodily powers and examines his material means. If he finds in them sufficiency to fight his enemy, he advances; otherwise, he refrains and retreats. He may find his strengths sufficient to crush his enemy, but he imagines that someone stronger than him might be victorious over him, so he acts cowardly. Or he views that expending his strengths in his own

luxury, or raising his standard of living is better, so he holds back. Fighting the enemy is an action man wants to undertake, but since he wants to be driven to that according to the amount of materialistic powers he possesses, his drive becomes limited by them, and he becomes hesitant in undertaking the action despite their availability, when obstacles present themselves to him that evoke cowardice or holding back in him.

This is contrary to moral strengths, for they evoke in the soul the current of undertaking the action first, then strive to obtain the sufficient powers to undertake it, without stopping at the limit of its existing strengths. It may be driven by more than what it usually possesses of materialistic strengths, and it may stop at the limit of what it has managed to gather of strengths. In any case, it undertakes more than what it possesses of materialistic strengths. This is like the one who wants to fight his enemy to liberate himself from his domination, or to take revenge, or for fame, or in support of the weak, or the like. He is driven more than the one who fights his enemy for booty, or for colonialism, or for mere domination, or the like. The reason for this is that moral strengths are an internal motive linked to concepts higher than instinctive concepts, and they demand a specific satisfaction. Thus, the strengths are driven to bring about the means for this satisfaction, so they dominate the instinctive concepts and harness the materialistic strengths. By this, they acquire this power that indeed surpasses all materialistic strengths.

From this premise, the states of the entire world are keen to bring about moral strengths in their armies, alongside the completion of materialistic powers.

As for spiritual strengths, they are stronger in influence upon the human being than moral strengths and materialistic strengths. This is because spiritual strengths emanate from man’s perception of his connection to Allah ﷻ, the Creator of

existence and the Creator of strengths. This rational perception or sentimental feeling of this connection to Allah ﷻ makes man's drive according to the amount of what the Creator demands of him, not according to the amount of strengths he possesses, nor according to the amount of strengths he can gather. Instead, it is according to the amount of what is demanded of him, whatever this demand may be, whether it is equivalent to his strengths, more, or less. The demand may be to offer his life explicitly, or it may lead to offering his life. Thus, he undertakes the action even if it is more than the strengths he possesses and more than the strengths he gathers. From this premise, spiritual strengths are more influential than all the strengths that man possesses.

However, if these spiritual strengths result from a sentimental feeling only, it is feared for them to decline and change due to the overcoming of other feelings over them, or their diversion via fallacy to actions other than those they were driven towards. Therefore, it was imperative that spiritual strengths result from a certainly truthful perception and feeling of the connection of the human being to Allah ﷻ. At that point, these strengths become firm, and their current remains driven according to the amount of what is demanded of them without hesitation. If spiritual strengths exist, there remains no effect for moral strengths, because man at that point does not undertake the action by their motive, but rather by the motive of spiritual strengths alone. For he does not fight his enemy to take material booty, nor for the moral pride of victors. Instead, he fights him because Allah ﷻ demanded that of him, whether he attains booty or does not attain it, whether he achieves the pride of victory or no one knows of him, because he did not undertake the action except because Allah ﷻ demanded that of him. As for materialist strengths, they become means for the action, not driving strengths for it.

Islam was keen to make the driving strengths for the Muslim spiritual strengths, even if their manifestations were materialistic or moral. Islam made the spiritual basis the sole basis for the entire worldly life. Thus, it made the Islamic ‘Aqeedah the basis of his life, the Halal and the Haram, the criterion of his actions, and the attainment of the Ridwan Allah the ultimate objective he strives towards. It mandated upon him to undertake all his actions, small and large, according to the commands and prohibitions of Allah ﷻ, based on the perception of his connection to Allah ﷻ. Thus, the perception of the connection to Allah ﷻ and the feeling of it — with a certain perception and feeling — is the basis upon which the life of the Muslim is established, and it is the strength that drives him to undertake any action, whether small or large. It is the spirit by which his worldly life is established in all his actions. The amount of spiritual strengths he possesses is according to the amount he possesses of this perception and feeling. Therefore, it is obligatory upon the Muslim to make his strengths the spiritual strengths, for they are his inexhaustible treasure and the secret of his success and victory.

The Intellectual Style and the Literary Style

The style of writing is meanings arranged in coordinated words, or it is the method of expression to portray the meanings within the soul of the speaker via linguistic phrases. The verbal depiction, even though it is what is apparent in the style, cannot live independent of the meanings. Instead, the basis for its apparent linguistic order refers back another order of meanings that was organized and composed, within the soul of the writer or speaker, thus forming a specific style. Then, the verbal composition was formed upon its pattern and became the garment it wore.

The style requires the writer or speaker to understand what he wants to convey with a precise, clear understanding, then to be keen on conveying it exactly as it is. Therefore, it has a profound effect on the value of the style. After that comes the linguistic expression, which requires the originator to have linguistic wealth, and the ability to maneuver structures, phrases, and the manner in which he wants to convey the thoughts. The style also requires the speaker himself to be affected and moved, having perceived the realities and being keen on conveying them. Thus, he must awaken his intellect, feelings, and imagination to perceive the meanings with strength. Then, after that, comes the strength of expression by choosing words that convey the meanings in a way that suits the meaning. A delicate meaning is given a delicate word, and a grand meaning is given a grand word, and so forth. Moreover, the style requires the writer or speaker to perceive the depth and enlightenment within the meanings, and the beautiful secrets connected to them, with a sharp, magnificent perception. Then, after that, he chooses the purest phrases, and the most appropriate, for this beautiful imagination or exquisite meaning, distancing himself from harsh and discordant words, that offend sensation and taste.

This is the style and this is what it requires. From it, it becomes evident that the intent of writing or speaking is solely the conveying of the meanings, possessed by the writer and speaker to the reader and listener. From this premise, the origin in expression is the meanings, then after that come the words that convey these meanings exactly as they are with the writer or speaker. Thus, the matter is restricted to two matters: the meanings, and the words by which these meanings are conveyed. From here, the carefulness of writers and speakers regarding meanings and words differed. Among them are those who directed their care to the meanings first, and subjected the words to precision in conveying them. Among them are those who directed their care to the words first, and were lenient in the precision of conveying the meanings for the sake of the words. Therefore, the style in writing and speaking is divided into two parts: one of them is intellectual, and the other is literary, and each of them has a specific fabric that differs from the other.

As for the intellectual style, the writer or speaker chooses the thoughts he wants to convey for their novelty, their value, or their suitability to the requirement of the situation. Then he arranges these thoughts with a rational arrangement so that it is more conducive to their understanding, and their sound linkage in the mind of the reader. Finally, he expresses them with words appropriate for them. In the intellectual style, emotion is natural and basic, emanating from a truthful soul, and rational knowledge is the primary basis in its construction. No trace of the fabrication of emotion appears in it, and its care is solely in the thorough investigation of thoughts. It is the language of the intellect. Its purpose is conveying facts with the intent of education, serving knowledge, and enlightening intellects. Its phrases are characterized by precision, definition, and thorough investigation. The origin in it is its establishment upon the intellect and the dissemination of intellectual facts and

knowledge whose attainment requires effort and depth. In its entirety, it is composed of two basic elements: one of them is thoughts, and the second is phrases.

As for the literary style, we find the writer or speaker in it does not stop at the limit of facts and knowledge, nor does he make his intent the feeding of the intellect with thoughts. Instead, he brings these facts closer and chooses the most important and prominent of them in which he can find a manifestation of apparent or hidden beauty, or a subject for admonition and lesson, or a prompt for thinking or influence. Then he interprets what he chose with his own specific interpretation, projecting onto it from his own amazed, admonished, pleased, or indignant soul. Then he attempts to transfer this emotion, or provoke the likes of it, into the souls of the readers and listeners, so that they become amazed or delighted, pleased or indignant.

The literary style contains the fabrication of emotion and care in manifesting this emotion in the meanings and words by which he conveys his thoughts. The focus in it is poured upon the strength of emotion, and it is the language of sentiment and feelings. The objective in it is the provocation of readers and listeners, by presenting facts as magnificent and beautiful as the writer conceptualizes them, or as the listeners and readers should conceptualize them. It is intended in the style that its phrases be characterized by exaggeration, generalization, and pausing upon the places of beauty and influence. It is distinguished by the strength of sentiment that influences its phrases with a clear influence appearing in the words, images, and structures. In its entirety, it is composed of three elements: one of them is thoughts, the second is the depictions he composes, and the third is the phrases by which he molds the thoughts and images.

As for the strength of the style, its clarity, and its beauty, they exist in the intellectual style, just as they exist in the literary style, and are not specific to a specific style. They are an attribute of style as such, whether it is literary or intellectual.

From this premise, we find that many intellectual styles have reached a level of clarity, beauty, and strength of style that made them far surpass many literary styles in influence. The intellectual style is imperative in teaching people thoughts, making them understand them, and bringing about belief in them within them. That is not conveyed except by the intellectual style. It also benefits in inciting feelings to act upon the thoughts they have understood, but its incitement is slow and requires the existence of perception of the thought, so that the feelings are incited. However, the feelings that exist in this style are permanent feelings that do not fade, unless the belief in the thought that incites them is lost.

This is contrary to the literary style, for it does not benefit except in inciting feelings, and it is imperative for inciting people to action. Even if it teaches the listener and reader facts, it teaches superficial facts and trivial knowledge, and it has no capability to convey deep thoughts. If it wants to convey them, it simplifies them, exaggerates and manipulates them, so their depth and meanings depart from them, and they become absurd.

Therefore, the thoughts of ideologies, philosophy, legislation, empirical sciences, and the like cannot be conveyed except by the intellectual style. Poetry, oratory, and the like cannot be conveyed except by the literary style. Thus, the intellectual style is imperative for the conveying of thought, and the literary style is imperative for provoking people and inciting them to the action desired from them.

From here, you find the intellectual style spreading in the Ummah while it is in a state of revival, and the prime of its

upward progression; and the literary style spreading in the Ummah while it is superficial in thinking, or in a state of luxury. For this reason, we find the era in which our master Muhammad ﷺ was sent, poetry weakened and literary prose decreased, and the intellectual style spread in the speeches and Hadiths. The Noble Quran was the most magnificent example of the intellectual style, and the majority of it was of this style, even though it contained the most magnificent of what is in the literary style, but it adheres to what is adhered to in the intellectual style in terms of precision and definition.

The Islamic Ummah in this era has had the feelings of revival creep into it, so it is in need of the intellectual style to convey facts to people and make their feelings — incited to act upon them — permanent. Even though we cannot dispense with the literary style in inciting people to action, but only after placing the thought we want them to act upon in their minds and concentrating their belief in it.