CONTEMPORARY MAN AND THE SOCIAL PROBLEM



CONTEMPORARY MAN
and
THE SOCIAL PROBLEM

By:

MUHAMMAD BAQIR AS-SADR

Translated by

Yasin T. Al-Jibouri

WOFIS

WORLD ORGANIZATION FOR ISLAMIC SERVICES
TEHRAN -IRAN

First edition 1401/1980
Second edition 1406/1986


Published by

World Organization for Islamic Services,
P. O. Box No.11365-1545,
Tehran - IRAN.

In the Name of Allah,
The All-compassionate, The All-merciful

Praise belongs to Allah, the Lord of all being;
the All-compassionate, the All-merciful;
the Master of the Day of Judgement;
Thee only we serve, and to Thee alone we pray for succour;
Guide us in the straight path;
the path of those whom Thou hast blessed,
not of those against whom Thou art wrathful,
nor of those who are astray.

O' Allah! send your blessings to the head of your messengers and the last of your prophets,
Muhammad and his pure and cleansed progeny.
Also send your blessings to all your prophets and envoys.



بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

الحمد لله رب العالمين الرحمن الرحيم

مالك يوم الدين إياك نعبد وإياك نستعين

اهدنا الصراط المستقيم صراط الذين

أنعمت عليهم غير المغضوب عليهم

ولا الضالين

اللهم صل على

سيد رسلك وخاتم أنبيائك

محمد وآله الطيبين الطاهرين

وصل على جميع الأنبياء والمرسلين

Dear Reader,

The book you now have in hand is one of the many Islamic publications distributed by this Organization throughout the world in different languages with the aim of conveying the message of Islam to the people of the world.

You may read this book carefully and should you be interested to have further study on such publications you can contact us through a letter. Naturally, if we find you to be a keen and energetic reader we shall give you a deserving response in sending you some other publications of this Organization.

You may express your views on this publication and the subject matter discussed in it, and how far you have benefited from it or which part of the subject matter has proved useful to you and your environment. You will be able, in this manner, to introduce yourself as one of our good and active reader.

Meanwhile, you can keep our address at the disposal of your friends and those individuals interested in Islamic Studies.

Publications Secretary,
WORLD ORGANIZATION FOR ISLAMIC SERVICES,
(WOFIS).

CONTENTS

Page

PUBLISHER'S FOREWORD:
In Arabic..... 15
English translation 17
AUTHOR'S FOREWORD 19

PART ONE

CONTEMPORARY MAN AND HIS CAPABILITY TO SOLVE THE SOCIAL PROBLEM

THE ACTUAL HUMAN PROBLEM 27
HUMANITY AND ITS TREATMENT OF THE PROBLEM 32

THE MARXIST VIEWPOINT 34
THE NON-MARXIST VIEWPOINT 40
THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN A NATURAL EXPERIMENT AND A SOCIAL EXPERIENCE ... 43

PART TWO

CAPITALIST DEMOCRACY

CAPITALIST DEMOCRACY 65
The Materialistic Trend in Capitalism 71
THE POSITION OF **ETHICS IN CAPITALISM .....** 75
TRAGEDIES OF THE CAPITALIST SYSTEM 78

PART THREE

SOCIALISM AND COMMUNISM

SOCIALISM AND COMMUNISM 89
Diversion From Communism 93
Communism Criticised 98

PART FOUR

ISLAM AND THE SOCIAL PROBLEM

THE ACCURATE ANALYSIS OF THE PROBLEM 109
How to treat the Problem 116
The Religious Message 125

PART FIVE

THE POSITION OF ISLAM TOWARDS FREEDOM AND SOCIAL ASSURANCE

FREEDOM ACCORDING TO CAPITALISM AND ISLAM 139
FREEDOM ACCORDING TO THE CAPITALIST CIVILIZATION 143
FREEDOM IN THE PERSONAL SPHERE 155
FREEDOM IN THE SOCIAL SPHERE 165
Insurance in Islam vs. Marxism 179

NOTES: 185

تصدير

نحمد اللهسبحانهان و فقنا لنشر كتاب (الانسان المعاصر والمشكلة الاجتماعية) تاليف سماحة العلامة الكبير الحجة والمفكر الاسلامى اللامع (السيد محمد باقرالصدر) و قام بالترجمة الاستاد (ياسين الجبورى) و هذا ثالث كتبه التى تولت موءسستنا نشرها بعد (المرسل، الرسول ، الرسالة) و (نظرة عامة فى العبادات) .

و قد قمنا ببعض التعريف بسماحة الموءلف فى فاتحة ترجمة (المرسل، الرسول ، الرسالة) و سماحة الموءلف نفسه

قدقام بالتعريف ببحثه هذا (الانسان المعاصر والمشكلة الاجتماعية) في فاتحة هذا الكتاب، فلا نعيد ما قلناه سابقا في التعريف بالمؤلف و ماقاله المؤلف في التعريف بهذا الكتاب.

و من الله سبحانه نستمد العون و التسديد والتوفيق والتأييد، انه نعم المولى و نعم النصير.

المؤسسة العالمية للخدمات الاسلامية
(لجنة التاليف والترجمة والنشر)
طهران ـ ايران

١٤٠٠/١/٦
١٩٧٩/١١/٢٦

PUBLISHER'S FOREWORD

We express our gratitude to Allah, the Glorious, the One Who can grant us success in publishing this book entitled "Contemporary Man and the Social Problem" *(al-Insan al-ma`asir wal'-mushkilah al-ijti-ma`iyyah)* written by the great scholar, witness and Islamic thinker, as-Sayyid Muhammad Bagir as-Sadr, and translated by Mr. Yasin T. al-Jibouri. This is his third book, after "The Revealer, The Messenger, The Message" *(al-Mursil, ar-Rasul, ar-Risalah)* and "A General Look at Rites" *(Nazara `ammah fi 'l-`ibadat),* whose publication and distribution our Organization has undertaken.

In the preface to the translation of *The Revealer, The Messenger, The Message,* we wrote a biography of the eminent author; and in the foreword to this

book - *Contemporary Man and the Social Problem* – the author himself discusses its subject matter. Therefore, there is no need to repeat what we have written before about the author or what the author himself has written (in his foreword) about this book.

And from Allah, the Almighty, we seek help and we rely upon Him for accomplishment, success and support; surely He is the best Lord and the best Helper.

WORLD ORGANIZATION FOR ISLAMIC SERVICES,

(Board of Writing, Translation and Publication).

Muharram 1, 1400 A. H.
November 26, 1979 A. D.
Tehran - IRAN,

AUTHOR'S FOREWORD

Three years ago, we attempted a humble undertaking: studying the deepest bases on which each of Marxism and Islam stands, and the book *Our Philosophy* interpreted our attempt. That was a starting-point for a successive strain of thought trying to study Islam from base to top!

So was *Our Philosophy*, then, published to be succeeded, after about two years, by *Our Economy;* and the two intellectual brothers (meaning books) are still waiting for other brothers to join, so that the whole intellectual series, which we aspire to present to Muslims, may be completed.

From the very beginning, we noticed that - in spite of the unmatchable welcome with which the series was met till the copies of *Our Philosophy* were sold out within only few weeks - there is a

considerable paradox between the high Muslim intellect and the general intellectual atmosphere wherein we, today, have been living. It is even very difficult, for many, to live upto this high standard of Muslim intellect without exerting a great deal of hard effort. It was inevitable, then, to initiate successive series of books whereby the reader ascends higher steps of Muslim intellectualism that may enable him to appreciate its supreme standard.

Thus emerged the idea of *The Islamic School:* an attempt to use a scholastic procedure in introducing the Muslim intellect through successive series parallel to the main series; (i.e., *Our Philosophy* and *Our Economy),* sharing it the burden of carrying the Muslim intellectual message and agreeing with it in mutual and main purpose, although it differs in degree and level.

While we were contemplating upon issuing *The Islamic School,* we difined the characteristics of the Muslim intellect composing the general outlook and intellectual taste of the presumed School.

These characteristics may be summed up thus:

1. The direct aim behind establishing *The Islamic*

School is to supply conviction, more than annovation; therefore, it derives its intellectual topics from *Our Philosophy, Our Economy* and their intellectual brothers, displaying them all within a specific scholastic framework, without confining itself to ideas presented for the first time.

2. *The Islamic School* does not always restrict itself to the proving form of any particular idea. Such form here is less clearly highlighted than in *Our Philosophy* and her sisters - all this according to the degree of simplification expected from scholastic series.

3. *The* Islamic *School* deals with a broader intellectual horizon than that of *Our Philosophy* and her sisters, for it does not only deal with the major aspects of the general Islamic intellect. It deals with the different philosophical, historical or Qur'anic topics which affect the growth of the Islamic awareness, the building and completion of the -Muslim character, from both intellectual and spiritual stand-points.

Allah Almighty has decreed that the idea of The Islamic School meets another idea derived from the Introduction to *Our Philosophy,* and that both ideas get inter-mingled with each other and see the light in the form of this book!

The other idea came out of the dear readers' persistence that we must reprint *Our Philosophy,* and to attempt broadening and simplifying the topics in *Our Philosophy* before we reprint the whole book for the second time, the matter that requires a leisure which I do not possess at present time.

Accordingly, the dear readers' wish started to make a direction towards the Introduction to *Our Philosophy* itself, because reprinting such intro duction would not take as much effort as reprinting the entire book would. The pouring requests left no room to suspect the necessary of responding to them.

There did both ideas meet: why should not the Introduction to *Our Philosophy* be the first series of *The Islamic School?*

So it was!

But we were not satisfied with printing the Introduction only; we also introduced some significant adjustments, giving some of its concepts a

broader explanation, such as the concept of the egoistic instinct. We added to it two important chapters: one is "Contemporary man and his capacity to solve the social problem", which is the first chapter of this book, dealing with the human capacity to establish the social system that guarantees happiness and perfection. The other chapter is "Islam's standpoint regarding freedom and security". It is the last chapter of this book. In it we attempted a comparative study between the standpoint of each of Islam and capitalism towards freedom, and that of Islam and Marxism towards security.

Thus did the Introduction multiply, taking a new name: *Contemporary Man and the Social Problem,* as the first series of *The Islamic School;* verily, only Allah grants success.

Muhammad Baqir as-Sadr,
an-Najaf al-Ashraf - IRAQ.

PART ONE

CONTEMPORARY MAN AND HIS CAPABILITY TO SOLVE THE SOCIAL PROBLEM

THE ACTUAL HUMAN PROBLEM

The world problem that occupies peoples' minds now, affecting the heart of their present existence, is the social-problem which can be summarized by giving the most frank answer to this question:

What is the system that befits humanity, the one whereby humanity achieves a happy social life?

Naturally, this problem occupies a prominent and dangerous position. In its complexity and diversity of suggested resolutions it poses as a source of danger to humanity itself, for system is included in the calculation of the human life, affecting the core of its social entity.

This problem is deeply rooted in the distant epochs of the history of the human existence. Man faced it ever since it had sprung up in his social life. The human social entity sprung up from several individuals tied to each other by common bonds and ties. These bonds, naturally, need general directions and organization. Indeed, it is upon the extent of the harmony between this system and the existing human reality and its benefit that both social stability and happiness depend.

This social problem has pushed humanity, in its intellectual and political arenas, to wage a long battle and engage in a struggle full of different sorts of combat, and by different codes of the human mind, aiming at erecting and engineering the social structure, trying to sketch its plans and lay down its pillars. It was a tiring struggle, crowded with miseries and iniquity, full of laughters and tears, one wherein happiness was espoused to misery. All this occurred because of all the different colours of abnormality and deviation that characterized those social systems. Except for glimpses shone during moments of the history of this planet, the social existence of man would have lived in continuous misery and dived in tumultuous waves . . .

We do not want to display, now, the rounds of the human struggle in the social field, for we do not want, by making such type of research here, to narrate the history of suffering humanity, showing the different spheres through which it revolved since time immemorial; instead, we want to partake in humanity's present living circumstances and in the rounds it reached, so that we may know the destination that a round is expected to reach, and the natural shore towards which a ship should make its way and embark at, so that it reaches peace and goodness, coming back to a stable life of justice and happiness after a long struggle and tiring endeavour, after journeying long in different places and directions.

In fact, contemporary man's awareness of today's social problem is stronger than any past epoch of ancient history. Today, he is more conscious of his relationship to the problem and to its complexity, for modern man has come to realize the fact that the problem is of his own making, and that the social order is not imposed on him from above, the way natural phenomena operate, for these phenomena govern man's relationship to nature. Man now stands contrary to ancient man who

often used to look at the social order as though it were an order of nature, facing it without choice or power. While he could not develop the law of earth gravitation, by the same token, he could not change his social relations. Naturally, when man starts to believe that those relations are but one aspect of behaviour while man himself chooses without losing his own will within their sphere, the social problem then starts to reflect in him - in man that lives it intellectually - a revolutionary bitterness, instead of the bitterness of yielding!

Modern man, on the other hand, started to be contemporary to a tremendous change in man's control over nature, a change that has never been pre ceded. This growing control, terrifying and gigantic, increases the complexity of the social problem and doubles its dangers, for it opens to mankind new and great avenues of utilization; and it doubles the significance of the social order upon which depends the distribution of each individual's share of those tremendous outcomes that nature today bestows on man with generosity.

Man, after all, inherited from his predecessors, along ages, a broader experience, more inclusive and deep, that resulted from the social experiences which

ancient man had had, and in their light he studies the social problem.

* * * * *

HUMANITY AND ITS TREATMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Having acquainted ourselves with the essential question humanity faced ever since it practised its conscious social existence, artistically attempting to answer it along its remote history, we want now to cast a look at what humanity, now and in all other ages, possesses of capacities and essential conditions required for giving an accurate answer to the essential afore-mentioned question, i.e., "What is the system which fits humanity best, whereby it achieves happiness in its social life?"

Can humanity provide the answer?

And what is the required amount - in its intellectual and spiritual makeup - of conditions necessary to succeed in providing the answer?

What sort of assurities can guarantee humanity ultimate success in the test and terseness in providing the answer to the question, in the way it chooses to solve the social problem, in reaching the best system that guarantees humanity's happiness, uplifting it to the highest levels?

In a clearer expression: How can contemporary man perceive, say, that democratic capitalism, dictatorship, social proletarianism, etc., is the best system? If humanity perceived this or that, what are the assurities which guarantee that it is right and correct in its perception?

Even if it secured all that, will it suffice to perceive the best system, knowing it fully well, to put it to practise in order to solve the social problem on its basis? Or will the implementation of the system depend on other elements which may not be available, in spite of the "knowledge" of its practicality and merit?

The points we have raised now are related to a large extent to the common concept of society and cosmos; therefore, the method to deal with them differs among scholars, each according to his respective common concepts; so let us start with Marxism.

THE MARXIST VIEWPOINT

Marxism sees man to be spiritually and intellectually conditioned to the method of production and the type of producing powers. Being independent of these powers, he cannot think in social terms, nor can he know the best system . . .! The producing powers, according to Marxism, dictate to him such knowledge, allowing him to answer the essential question we laid out in our Introduction above, and he, in turn, will recur their echo carefully and faithfully.

The windmill (Marxism argues), for example, inspires man to feel that the feudal system is the best system for him. The steam mill that succeeded it teaches man that capitalism is worthier of implementation. Today's electrical and atomic means of production give the society new intellectual concept, believing that the social system is the fittest . . .

Humanity's capacity to conceive the best system, then, is exactly its own capacity to interpret the social outcome of all producing powers, recurring their echo!

As for the old conventional conception, it is now wrong, since a more modern social conception has been invented!

What secures the Soviet man his view's accuracy is the belief that such view represents the new aspect of the social awareness, expressing a new stage of history; so, it has to be correct, unlike old views!

It is true, though, that some social views may seem to be new - in spite of their falsehood - such as the Nazi view in the first half of this century, as it seemed as if it were expressing a new development in history! But how fast are such veiled views uncovered, proving through experience that they are nothing but an echo to the old views, an interpretation of outworn historical stages, not new views *per se!!*

Thus does Marxism assert: the "modernity" of the social view, i.e., its birth as the outcome of newly-formulated historical circumstances, is the guarantor of its accuracy as long as history is in escalating advancement!

There is something else, and that is: today, for example, humanity's perception of the social system, as being the fittest, is insufficient, according to Marxism, to put it to practise unless and until the class that benefits from it more than others (this, according to this example, is the proletariat), a violent class struggle will take place against the class that benefits from keeping the old system. This mad struggle interacts with the concept of the fittest system; hence, such struggle will get fiercer as long as that concept grows and becomes clearer and, in its turn, it deepens the concept, helping it grow as it gets more strong and prevalent!

* * *

This Marxist viewpoint is based on the materialistic historical ideals which are criticized in our broad study of economical Marxism.'

What we add here is that history itself proves that the social ideals concerning identifying the type of fittest system are not created by the producing powers; rather, man has his own originality and creativity in this sphere, independent of the means of production. Otherwise, how can Marxism explain

to us the ideas of nationalization, socialism, and state ownership during distant and separate periods of history?! If the belief in the idea of nationalization - as the fittest system, according to the Soviet man today - is the result of the sort of today's producing powers, what is the meaning of the appearance of the same idea in remote times when these producing powers were non-existent?!

Did not Plato believe in communism, imagining his ideal city on a communist base?! Was his conception the outcome of modern means of production which the Greeks never possessed?!

What can I say?! . . . But the social ideas two thousand years ago reached a stage of maturity and depth in the minds of some great political thinkers to a degree which paved to them the way of their implementation just as does the Soviet man today, with only few adjustments!

This is Woo-Di, the greatest of China's emperors from the Han family, believed, out of knowledge and experience, in the social system as the fittest. He put it to practise during the period from 140-87 B. C., making all natural resources the property of the nation and nationalizing the industries of salt extraction, iron mining and wine-making! He wanted to

put an end to the authority of commissioners and commercial competitors. He established a special system for transportation and exchange under the auspices of the state, trying thereby to control trade in order to be able to avoid sudden price changes. The state workers themselves used to undertake carrying and delivering goods to the respective owners throughout the country, and the government itself used to stock whatever was left of the nation's need, selling them when their prices rose above the necessary limit and buying them when their prices fell down! He set to establish great common institutions to create jobs for the millions of those who could not be absorbed by the private industries.

Also, in the beginning of the Christian era, Wang Mang ascended the throne and became enthusiastic to the idea of emancipating slaves and of putting an end to both slavery and feudalism, just like what the Europeans believed in doing at the beginning of the capitalist era. He abolished slavery, took the lands from the feudal class, nationalized arable lands and distributed them among the peasants, forbade buying or selling lands in order to avoid repossession. And he nationalized mines and some other major industries, too.

So, could Woo-Di or Wang Mang have derived their social inspiration and political policies from steam power, electricity or the atom, the powers Marxism considers to be the bases of social thinking?!

So do we derive this conclusion: perceiving this system or that - as the fittest - is not the making of this producing power or that . . .!

Also, the advancing movement of history - the one whereby Marxism proves that the "modernity" of thinking guarantees its accuracy - is nothing but another myth of history, for certainly reactionary and melting trends of civilization are numerous indeed . . .!

* * * * *

THE NON-MARXIST VIEWPOINT

As for non-Marxist thinkers, these decide that man's capacity to conceive the fittest system grows with him from the many social experiences he lives.

Therefore, when social man puts to practise a specific social system, embodying it within his own living experience, he can notice from his experience of that system the faults and weak points hiding within the system, for these will be discovered eventually, enabling man to conceive a more terse and informed social system. Thus, man will be enabled to conceive the fittest system, putting his answer to the essential question in the light of his experience and knowledge. The more complete and numerous his experiments or systems he tries, the more know-

ledge and terseness he achieves, becoming more capable of defining the fittest system and making its dimensions.

Our major question: "What is the fittest social system?" is but another way of asking: "What is the best method of home-heating?" This question faced man ever since he felt cold for the first time inside his cave or hideout; so, he engaged himself in thinking of an answer to it, until he was led, through his remarks and numerous experiences, to a way to make a fire. Then he persistently struggled to find a better answer to the question across his prolonged experiences, until he finally discovered electricity for heating.

So was the case with thousands of other problems he faced throughout his life. He found the way to solve those problems through experience, and his perception increased in exactness as his experiments increased in number. Among such problems are: the problem of getting the best medicine for tuberculosis, the easiest method for oil-drilling, the fastest means for transporation and travelling, or the best method for wool-weaving . . ., etc.

Just as man has been able to solve all of these problems, providing answers for all of those question

through experience, so can man answer the question of "What is the fittest social system?" from his social experiences that disclose both advantages and disadvantages of the particular system scrutinized, pointing out the reactions to it on the social level.

* * * * *

THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN A NATURAL EXPERIMENT AND A SOCIAL EXPERIENCE

This is accurate to a certain degree: the social experience allows man to provide the answer to this question: "What is the fittest (social) system?" just as natural experiments enabled him to answer several other questions which encompassed his life ever since it had begun . . .!

But we have to differentiate - if we want to study this issue deeper - between the social experiences that formulate man's perception of the fittest system and the natural experiments from which man acquires his knowledge of nature's secrets and laws and the methods to benefit from these, to find out, for example, the best medicine, the fastest means of travelling, the best method for weaving, the easiest

method for oil-drilling, or even the best way to divide the atom . . . !

For the social experiences - social man's trials of different social systems - do not really reach, in their intellectual output, the same degree like that of natural experiments, i.e., man's experiments of the natural phenomena, for these indeed differ from the first in many points. Such a difference leads to man's variable capacity in benefitting from both natural and social experiments. So; while man is capable of comprehending the secrets of natural phenomena, ascending to the peak of perfection as time passes by, due to his natural and scientific experiments, well, he really cannot help taking a slow pace in his attempt to comprehend the fittest social system, without ever being able to achieve absolute perfection in his social thinking, no matter how much diversified and numerous his social experiences may be . . .

It is mandatory on us, in order to know all this, to study these significant differences between the nature of a social experience and a natural one, so that we may be able to reach the fact we have already decided, that is, the natural experiment may be able to grant mankind, across ages, a complete

image of nature to be used to utilize the natural phenomena and laws. As for the social experience, this cannot guarantee mankind the discovery of such a complete ideology concerning the social issue.

The most significant of these differences may be summarized thus

FIRST: The natural experiment can be initiated and practised by one individual, comprehending it through noticing and observing, directly studying all what may be disclosed of its facts and shortcomings, and coming to a specific idea hinging on that experiment.

As for the social experience, it is but the embodiment of an already practised and implemented system. The experience of the feudal or capitalist system, for example, means the society's implementation of this system during a period of its history; hence, such an experience cannot be done or absorbed by just one person. Rather, the entire community implements the social experience, consuming a life-span of the community's age far wider than does this individual or that. When one wants to benefit from a certain social experience, he cannot be contemporary to all of its events, just like being a

contemporary to an actual natural experiment while-implementing it; rather, he can be contemporary to one side of its events, necessarily depending on his assumption, derivation and (knowledge of) history while scrutinizing all the aspects and consequences of the experience.

SECOND: The thinking crystalized by a natural experiment is much more subjective and accurate than that derived by man from a social experience.

This is a most essentially significant point which forbids the social experience from reaching upto the level of a natural and scientific point; therefore, it has to be thoroughly clarified.

In the natural experiment, the interest of the person performing it is tied to his discovery of the truth, the complete frank truth, without covering anything up, and he most often does not have the least interest in falsifying the truth or discomposing its features which will eventually be found out through experiment. If he, for example, wants to examine the effects of a certain chemical on tuberculosis germs, while putting it in those germs' environment, he will not be then concerned except about knowing its degree of effect, albeit if it is

high or low, and he will not benefit in treating tuberculosis from falsifying the truth, over-estimating or under-estimating such an effect. Accordingly, the trend of the mind of the person experimenting the method will naturally be directed towards subjectivity and accuracy.

As for the social experience, the interest of the person performing an experiment does not always stop at his finding the truth out, discovering the fittest social system for all mankind; but it may be his own personal benefit to even conceal the truth from the eyes of the beholders! The person whose interest hinges on the capitalist system and on monopoly or on the banking interest system, for example, will find out that his benefit lies in the truth which assures that the system of capitalism, monopoly and bank interest is the fittest system, so that the profits such system brings him will continue . . . ! He, therefore, is not being naturally subjective, as long as his personal impulse urges him to discover the truth in the colour which agrees with his own personal interests.

So is the case with the other person whose personal benefit conflicts with interest or monopoly; nothing concerns him more than truth convicting the

interest and monopoly systems. When such person seeks the answer to the social question of "What is the fittest (social) system?", out of his own social research, he always is pushed by an internal power favouring a specific viewpoint. In other words, by no means is he a neutral person *per se.*

And so do we come to know that man's thinking of the social problem cannot usually guarantee subjectivity and selflessness to the degree that ensures the accuracy of man's thinking while treating a natural experiment or dealing with a cosmic question.

THIRD: Suppose that a person has been able to free himself intellectually from his self impulses, reasoning with subjectivity, finding out the fact that this system or that is the fittest one for all humanity, well, who can guarantee this person's concern about all humanity's interest if such interest does not agree with his own?! Who is going to guarantee this person's effort to put the fittest social system for humanity to practise if it does conflict with this person's own interest?!

Is it sufficient reason, for example, for the capitalists who believe that Socialism is the more fitting social system (than Capitalism) to go ahead

and implement it even though it does conflict with their own interests? Is it sufficient that the belief of contemporary man (the man of western civilization) - in the light of the experiences he has lived - in-decency and permissiveness . . ., is his belief in what all these relationships include of moral dangers, decay and disintergration, on man's tomorrow and future, causes him to rush to develop such relationships in the method which guarantees humanity's future, protecting it from sexual and instinctive disinter-gration, as long as he does not feel any contemporary danger to the present that he lives, and as long as such relationships do, indeed, provide him with a plentitude of pleasure and fun?!!!

We, then, in the light of all this, do feel in need not only for finding out the fittest system for all humanity, but also in need for an impulse that makes us concerned about the interest of mankind as a whole, trying to bring such system to reality, even when it conflicts with that portion (of society) we represent out of the whole.

FOURTH: The system that social man estab-lishes, believing in its practicality and effiency, can-not be qualified to bring this man up, i.e., uplifting

him in the human sphere to wider horizons, because the sytstem which social man makes always reflects its maker's present circumstance, his spiritual and psychological degree. So; if the society enjoys a low degree of strength and solidarity of self-will, it indeed has never been capable of growing this will up - by establishing a firm social system which nurtures self-will and increases its solidarity. For so long as it does not possess a solid will, it then is incapable of discovering such system and implementing it; rather, it establishes the system that reflects its disintegration and melting self-will. Otherwise, can we expect a society which does not possess its self-will to oppose the temptation of wine, for example, without enjoying a will up-lifting it above such a cheap desire like this?! Can we expect such society to execute a firm system that bans similar cheap desires, nurturing man's self-will, restoring to him his freedom, emancipating him from the slavery of desire and temptation?! Of course not! We do not expect firmness from a disintegrating society, even when such society realizes the danger of such disintegration and of its consequences. Nor do we expect the society which is enslaved by the desire of wine to free itself from such desire by its own free will, no matter how

conscious of wine's effects such society may be. For consciousness is deepened and focussed by the society if it continues disintegrating itself and satisfying its desires; and the more it continues doing so, the more it becomes incapable of treating the situation and uplifting its humanity to higher degrees.

This is the reason that caused man-made civilizations to be incapable of establishing a system which makes man oppose his slavery to his own desires, up lifting him to a higher human level. Even the United States, which best expresses the greatest of man-made civilizations, has failed to enforce the law that forbids drinking, for it is self-contradictory to expect a society, which gave itself up to its own desires and to their enslavement, to constitute laws uplifting it from the pitch it has willingly chosen for itself. But we do find the Islamic system - brought by Divine Revelation (contrary to man-made) - capable of nurturing humanity, in the system's own way, uplifting it to high pinnacles, banning wines and other evil desires, creating in man a conscious and firm self-will.

* * *

What remains to us - after having explained a portion of the essential differences between the social experience performed by the entire society and the natural experiment performed by the individual himself, is to raise the last question in treating the problem under discussion (the problem of the extent of mankind's capacity in the field of social organization and in selecting the fittest social system), and the question is: "What is the scientific value of organizing the group's life, laying the grounds of social living and the social system on scientific bases derived from natural experiment which are as exact as experiments performed in the spheres of physics and chemistry, getting rid of all the weak points we studied while dealing with the nature of the social experience?"

In other words: Is it possible - while organizing social life and getting acquainted with the fittest social system - to leave aside humanity's history, by passing the experiences human societies performed across ages, those experiences towards which we have nothing to do but glance from a distance, hiding behind curtains of time that separate us from them . . ., can we lay aside all this by building our social life in the light of scientific experiments we ourselves live and practise on this individual or that, so that

we may reach to know the fittest social system?!

Some optimists may tend to answer this question with their affirmative, considering what the western man enjoys today of tremendous potentials; for is it not that the social system is the one that guarantees satisfying man's needs in the best possible way? Is it not that man's needs are realistic matter-of-fact things that can be scientifically measured and tested like all other natural phenomena?! Is it not that the methods of satisfying these needs mean limited measures scientific logic is capable of measuring and subjecting to tests, studying their effects to satisfy the needs and the results they cause? ! So; why cannot the social system be laid on bases of such experiments?! Why cannot we find out, through experiment on one person or many persons, the sum of natural, physiological and psychological effects which play a role in activating intellectual gifts, broadening intelligence, so that if we want to organize our social life in a way that guarantees broadening the mental and intellectual gifts of individuals, we make sure that all such effects will be present in plentitude in the system for all individuals?!

Some amateurs may imagine more than this, reasoning thus: "This is not only possible, but it

also is what modern Europe actually did in its western civilization, after discarding religion, ethics and all intellectual and social axioms, directing itself in building its life towards science, hence, jumping in its modern historical procedure, opening the gates of heavens and possessing the treasures of earth . . ."

But before we answer the question we have raised above (i.e., inquiring about the extent of the possibility of laying the grounds of social life on a scientific experimental basis), we have to discuss this latest image of western civilization and this superficial trend of believing that the social system, which represents the essential facet of this civilization under discussion, is the product of its scientific element. The fact is this: The social system in which Europe believed, the social principles it called for and believed in, did not really result from an experimental scientific study; rather, it was more theoretical than experimental, more of philosophical principles than experimented scientific ideas, the result of a mental understanding and the belief in limited intellectual principles more than a result of a derivative reasoning or an experimental research in man's needs, his psychological, physiological and natural characteristics. That who studies modern

European Renaissance - so-called by the European history - with understanding, he will certainly be able to comprehend that the general trend of the Renaissance in the spheres of the substance did indeed differ from its general trend in both social and organizational spheres. In the sphere of substance it was scientific, for its ideas about the world of substance were indeed based on observation and experiment. Its ideas about the constituency of water and air, about the law of gravitation or atom-dividing, were all scientific ideas derived from observation and experiment.

As in the social field, the modern western mind was based on theoretical, rather than scientific, ideas. For example, he calls for human rights declared in his social revolution, and it is quite obvious that the idea of right is not scientific, for man's right of freedom, for example, is not a substance capable of measurement and experiment, so, it is out of the reach of scientific research; rather, need itself is the substantial phenomenon which can be scientifically studied.

If we observe the principle of equality among all members of the society - this principle is regarded theoretically as one of the basic requirements of a

modern social life - we will find out that this principle was not derived scientifically from closer observation, for people are not equal in the scientific criteria except in their general human quality. After that, they all differ in their natural, physiological, psychological and intellectual qualities. The principle of (social) equity expresses an ethical value which is a mental, rather than experimental, conclusion!

So do we clearly distinguish between the stamp of the social system in modern western civilization and the scientific one. And so do we realize that the scientific trend of thinking in which modern Europe excelled did not include the field of social principle in the spheres of politics, econmy and sociology.

By this we declare but the truth, and we do not want to blame western civilization for its negligence of the value of scientific knowledge, in the field of social organization, or for not building such system on the bases of natural scientific experiments, for indeed such scientific experiments can never be suitable as bases for social organization . . .!

It is true, though, that man's needs can be subjected to experiment on many occasions, and also the methods of satisfying these needs. But the basic problem in social organization is not to satisfy

the needs of this individual or that; rather, it is to find out a fair equilibrium between the needs of all individuals, and to define their relations within the framework which allows them to satisfy these needs. Obviously, the scientific experiment on this individual and that does not allow discovering such a framework, the nature of such relationships and the method of finding such equilibrium out. Instead, all this can be found out during the whole society's implementation of a (particular) social system, for all the points of weakness and strength in the system will eventually be found out. Accordingly, what must be followed in order to find the needed fair equilibrium, which guarantees the happiness of all, will also be discovered.

Add to this the fact that the same needs, or their consequences, cannot be discovered in one scientific experiment. Take this example: The person who gets used to committing adultery, as a happy person, you may not be able to discover what he really lacks or what grieves him, but you will possibly find out that the society that lived, as did this same person, a large span of its lifetime, allowing itself to go after its sexual desires, you may find it after a period of its social experience falling down, its

spiritual entity cracked, its moral courage, free-will and intellectual spark all gone . . .

So, not all the results which have to be known, while establishing the fittest social system, can be discovered in a scientific experiment we perform inside natural and physiological laboratories, or even inside psychological laboratories on this person or that; rather, their discovery depends on long-termed social experiences.

After this, using a natural scientific experiment in the field of social organization is sure to be motivated by the same personal inclination which threat ens our use of social experiences. For as long as the individual has his own personal interests - that may or may not agree with the fact decided by the experience -, the possibility will always be there that this individual's mind is self-motivated, losing the subjectivity which characterizes scientific ideas, in all other areas as well.

* * *

Now, having known man's capacity to solve the social problem and answer its essential question, we exhibit the social doctrines which occupy

humanity's mind today, among which an intellectual or political combat is going on, according to the extent of their social existence in man's life. These doctrines are four

1. The Democratic System
2. The Social System
3. The Communist System
4. The Islamic System

The first three of these doctrines represent three human viewpoints attempting to answer the essential question: "What is the fittest (social) system?" They are answers mankind put for this question, according to his potentials and limited capacity, the extent of which we have explained a short while ago.

As for the Islamic System, it offers itself on the social level as a religion based on Divine Revelation and Endowment, not an experimental ideology springing out of mankind's capacity and potentials.

The world today is sharing two of these four systems: the democratic capitalist system is the basis of government in a large portion of the earth, while the socialist system is prevalent in another large portion. Each of these systems possesses a great political structure, protecting it in its struggle with

the other, arming it in its gigantic battle waged by its heroes for leading the world and uniting the social system in it.

As for the communist and Islamic systems, their actual existence is purely intellectual. The Islamic system, however, went through one of the most glorious and successful experiences of all social systems; then tempests blew on it when the field was - or was almost - empty of principled leaders. Hence, the experience remained at the mercy of people in whose hearts Islam had not yet matured, nor were their souls filled by its spirit and essence. Consequently; these souls were incapable of resisting and withstanding. So; the Islamic structure crumbled, and the Islamic system lingered as an idea in the mind of the Muslim nation, a creed in the hearts of Muslims, and a hope its striving sons try to bring to reality . . .

As for the communist system, it still is an experience which has not been fully tried; yet, the leadership of the social camp is directing its mind today towards preparing a social environment for it, having failed to put it to practise when it took the reins of government and declared the implementation of the social system, practising it as a step towards "true communism"!

Therefore, what is our position (as Muslims) from these systems?!

And what is our case for which we have to dedicate our lives and towards whose shore we have to lead our ship?!

* * * * *

PART TWO

CAPITALIST DEMOCRACY

CAPITALIST DEMOCRACY

So let us start with the capitalist democratic system, the stystem which cast a sort of injustice in the economic life, a dictatorship in the political, a stagnation in the intellectual life of the Church and whatever is related to it, preparing the reins of government and influence to a new ruling group which substituted its predecessors yet played their very social role only in a new manner . . . .!

Capitalist democracy has been based upon a limitless belief in the individual, and that his personal interests by themselves guarantee, naturally, the society's interest in different fields . . ., and that the idea of government is but for the protection of individuals and their personal interests; therefore, the government must not go beyond this objective in its activities and actual scopes.

Capitalist democracy may be summarized in declaring the four norms of freedom: political, economic, intellectual and individual.

Political freedom allows every individual's speech to be heard and opinion to be respected in determining the nation's general well-being, planning, construction and appointing the authorities for her protection. For the nation's general system and ruling organ are a matter directly linked to the life of each of her individuals, affectively touching his happiness or misery; so, it is natural, then, that each individual has the right to participate in and build both system and organ.

Had the social issue been as we said before, a matter of life or death, happiness or misery of the natives upon whom general laws and regulations are enforced, it equally is natural not to let an individual or group, whatever the circumstances may be, take her responsibility as long as there is no individual whose purity of purpose and wisdom of mind rise above inclinations and mistakes.

Therefore, there has to be a complete equity in the political rights of all natives, for they all are equal in bearing the results of the social issue and obeying the demands of constituting and executing

authorities. Upon this basis stands the right of voting and the principle of general election which guarantee that the ruling organ, in all its authorities and offices, represents the majority of natives.

Economic freedom hinges upon the belief in free economy, whereupon the policy of open door has been erected, determining to open all doors and prepare all fields before the native in the economic field. So, everyone is free to possess for the sake of both consumption and production. Such productive possession, which makes the mass capital without a limit or restriction, is equally allowed for everyone. Each individual, then, possesses an absolute freedom to produce, in any norm or method, accumulate, increase and multiply wealth in the light of his own personal interests and benefits.

According to the allegation of some defenders of this "economic freedom", the laws of political economy, which naturally are based on general principles, can guarantee the society's happiness and keep an economic equilibrium in it . . ., and that the personal interest, which is the strong motif and real goal of the individual in his work and activity, is the best to guarantee the general social interest, and that the competition which takes place in the

free market is solely sufficient to create the spirit of justice and equity in different accords and contracts. The natural laws of economy, for example, interfere in keeping the natural level of price in a manner which can almost be mechanical, for if the price rises above its fair natural limits, demand will decrease, according to the natural law which rules that "The rise of a price causes a decrease in demand", and the decrease in demand causes in turn lowering the price, according to another natural law, and it does not leave price until it lowers it to its previous level, thereby removing exceptions.

The personal interest always imposes upon the individual to think of the way to increase and improve production, while decreasing its expense and cost. This (according to the same theory) brings forth the society's interest at the same time when it is regarded as a private issue which also concerns the individual . . .!

Competition naturally demands restricting prices of goods and fair wages to workers and labourers without injustice or inequity, for each seller or producer fears raising his prices or lowering the wages of his labourers because of the competition of other sellers and producers.

Intellectual freedom means that people must live free in their doctrines and beliefs according to their reasoning or whatever their liking and incli nation inspire to them without obstacles from the authority. The government must not rob any individual of this freedom, nor must she forbid him from practising his right in it, the proclamation of his ideals and beliefs, and the defence of his viewpoints and reasoning.

Personal freedom expresses: the emancipation of man in his behaviour from different kinds of pressure and restriction. Therefore, he possesses his will and (the freedom to) improve it according to his personal desires, regardless of whatever happens as a result of applying such control over his personal conduct of consequences and results, unless they clash with the control of others over their own conduct. The deadline at which the personal freedom of any individual stops is: the freedom of others. As long as the individual does not harm this freedom, there is no problem in conditioning his life in the manner he likes, following different customs, traditions, rituals and rites they find palatable, for this is a private matter which is linked to his being, present and future. As long as he possesses such being,

he is capable of faring with it however he pleases.

Religious freedom, according to the capitalism it calls for, is but an expression of the individual freedom in its doctrinal aspect, and of the personal freedom in the practical aspect which is related to doctrines and conduct . . .!

From this exposition we can reach this summary: the wide intellectual line of such system, as we hinted to it, is:

> Society's interests are linked to those of the individual; for the individual is the base whereupon the social system must be placed. A good government is the apparatus which is utilized for the service and benefit of the individual and the strong instrument to keep and protect his interests.

Such is the capitalist democracy in its basic principles for the sake of which several revolutions broke up and many peoples and nations strove to achieve under the leadership of leaders who, when describing such new system and counting its merits, describe paradise in its blessing and happiness and what it contains of aspiration, bliss, dignity and fortune, and upon which several amendments were

made, but such amendments never touched its heart's essence; rather, it stayed maintaining the most significant of its principles and bases.

THE MATERIALISTIC TREND IN CAPITALISM

It is obvious that this social system is a purely materialistic one which mankind has followed separated from both his beginning and end, limited to the utilitarian aspect of his materialistic life, placing his assumptions thereupon. But this system, while being saturated with a domineering materialistic spirit, has never been based upon a materialistic philosophy of life or a detailed study thereof. Life within the social atomosphere of this system has been separated from every relationship outside the materialistic and utilitarian limits, but there has been no complete philosophical comprehension prepared for the establishment of this system for the purpose of such separating operation. I do not mean that the world did not contain schools for philosophical materialism and its adherents; rather, it contained popularity of the materialistic inclination as the result of the experimental mentality which was wide-

spread since the beginning of the Industrial Revolution,' and by the spirit of doubt and intellectual upheaval brought forth by the intellectual revolution which befell a group of notions used to be considered among the most clear and accurate facts, 3 and by the spirit of rebellion and anger against the alleged "religion" which was freezing the minds and intellects, flattering tyranny and iniquity, supporting the social corruption in every battle it waged against the weak and the oppressed . . .[4]

These three factors helped promote materialism in the minds of many a western mentality.

All of this is true, but the materialistic system has never been based upon a philosophical comprehension of life, and this is its contradiction and incapacity, for the social aspect of life is linked to the reality of life: it is not crystalized in a correct form except when it is based upon a central base which explains life, its reality and limits. The materialistic system lacks such a base, for it implies deception and cheating, speed and little consideration when the realistic aspect of life is frozen and the social issue is studied in separation from it, although the continuation of the intellectual balance of a system is its restriction of attitude, from the beginning, to

the reality of life which attitude provides society with the social ingredient: the mutual relationships among the people, and his method in understanding it and discovering its secrets and values . . . ! Had mankind in this planet been the making of a managing and overwhelming Power that knows his secrets and obscurities, appearances and peculiarities, organizing and directing him ... ., then he would have naturally submitted, in his direction and life-conditioning, to such Creating Power, for that is wiser than him regarding his own affairs, more knowledgeable about his reality, more righteous in faring and more moderate than he is . . . !

Also, had this limited life been the beginning of a perpetual one that will spring out of it, taking its hue therefrom, with its balances depending upon the extent of the first one's moderation and righteousness . . ., then it would have been natural to organize the present life, since it is the beginning of an immortal one based upon both materialistic and non-materialistic principles.

Therefore, the issue of belief in God and in life to have sprung from Him is not a purely idealistic matter detached from life, so that it would be separated from life's spheres, for which speical codes

and laws would have to be legislated, while by passing that matter and separating it . . .! Rather, it is a matter linked to the mind, the heart and life altogether . . . !

The proof for its closer link to life than democratic capitalism itself is that its idea is based upon the belief that there has been no individual or group of individuals whose infallibility of objective, intellectual inclination and discretion are of the degree which allows entrusting the social issue to it and the dependability thereupon for the establishment of a righteous life of the nation . . . ! This very basis has neither position nor meaning except when built upon a purely materialistic philosophy which does not recognize the establishment of a system except by a limited human mind . . . !

The capitalist system is materialistic in all the sense the world implies; it either implies materialism, without daring to declare its link to it and depend ence thereupon, or it may be ignorant of the extent of the natural linkage between the realistic matter of life and its social aspect. Therefore, it lacks the philosophy every social system has to hinge upon. It simply is materialistic even though it has never been based upon a mterialistic philosophy with clear outlines.

THE POSITION OF ETHICS IN CAPITALISM

The result of such materialism with whose spirit the system has been overwhelmed is that ethics have been left out of all calculations, without win ning any existence in that system, or say their concepts and ideals have been altered, and the personal benefit has been declared as a supermost priority and all types of freedom as means towards achieving this priority . . . ! Resulting from that are all what the modern world has complained of calamities and catastrophes, troubles and tribulations.

Advocates of democratic capitalism may defend its attitude towards the individual and his personal interests by saying

> The personal interest by itself brings forth the social interest, and the results achieved by ethics in their spiritual values are also achieved in the democratic capitalist society, not through "ethics" but through the special "motifs" and their service! When man performs a social service, he, too, achieves a personal benefit, being part of the society he works for. When he saves someone's endangered life, he also benefits his own self, for that person's life will serve the social body a portion of which service will be his own. Therefore, the personal motif and the utilitarian sense suffice to guarantee and ensure the social interests since they, when analysed, amount to personal interests and individual benefits.

Such an apology is closer to vast imagination than to reasoning! Imagine if the practical criterion in the life of every individual in the nation had been the achievement of his personal benefits and interests, to the widest possible range, and had the State been providing for the individual his freedom, sanctifying him without reservation or limitation, then what would the position of social work have been in the

dictionary of such an individual?! How can the link between the social interest and the individual one be sufficient to direct the individual towards the occupations called forth by ethical codes, knowing that many of such occupations do not bring him any profit?! If it happens that they do contain some benefit to him, since he is a member of the community, it often happens, too, that such minute benefit (which cannot be conceived except analytically) would be counteracted by transient benefits or individual intersts which find in freedom a guarantee to their achievement, so much so that the individual would trample over all systems of ethics and spiritual conscience . . . !

* * * * *

TRAGEDIES OF THE CAPITALIST SYSTEM

If we wish to discern the consequent series of social tragedies resulting from this system which does not stand on a studied philosophical base . . ., this research's scope will only be too narrow for that; therefore, we would like to just allude to them thus:

The first of such series is the minority ruling the majority, controlling its interests and essential affairs. Political freedom has meant that the establishment of systems and codes as well as their execution is the right of the majority. Let us suppose that the group which represents the majority of the nation has possessed the reins of government and legislation while having the democratic capitalist mentality, which is a mentality purely materialistic

in its trend, inclinations and objectives, what will be the fate of the other group?! Or, say, what can the minority expect in the shade of laws legislated for the benefit of the majority, to protect its interests?! Will it be strange then if the majority legislates the laws in the light of its own interests, neglecting the minority's interests, following an unjust trend to achieve its desires that may harm the interests of others?! Who will maintain this monority's existing entity and defend it against injustice, as long as the personal benefit is the issue of every individual, and as long as the majority does not know, in its social concept, any values for the spiritual and intellectual principles . . .?! Naturally, sovereignty will stay under the system as it did before, and the symptoms of monopoly and trespassing on the rights and interests of others will linger in the social atmosphere of this system as it did in the old social systems! The only difference is that degrading the human dignity used to be done by the individual to his nation; now in this system it comes from the majorities to the minorities, the first composing a huge number of humans!

This is not the whole story! The tragedy would then be simple! But the stage displays more laughters

than tears! The case has worsened and become more severe when the economic issue resulted from this system later on; therefore, the economic freedom was decided in the fashion we described above, sanctioning all the ways and means of getting rich; no matter how outrageous or queer in method or manner, guaranteeing what it had advertised when the world was busy in a big industrial revolution and science giving birth to the machine which overturned the face of industry and wiped out manual industries and the like. The field was clear then for an outrageous wealth for the nation's minority. Opportunities enabled the latter to benefit from the modern means of production, provided by limitless capitalist liberties with sufficient assurities for their utilization and use to the furthermost limit, annihilating thereby many groups of the nation whose industries were wiped out by the machine that shook their livelihoods without finding a way to withstand the torrent, since the promoters of the modern industries were armed with "economic freedom " and all other "sacred " liberties. Thus does the field remain vacant except of that elite group of the promoters of industry and production, while the middle class is being reduced to the generally

low level, and this crushed majority falling at the mercy of that elite group that does not think or calculate except according to the "democratic capitalist " mode . . . ! ! ! Naturally, then, it would not extend its kind and assisting aid to them in order to get them out of the pit and give them a share of its tremendous profits . . .! Why should it, since its "ethical" criterion is benefit and pleasure, as long as the State guarantees absolute freedom in whatever it does, so long as the democratic capitalist system is too narrow for the intellectual philosophy of life with all its related concepts?!

The matter, therefore, has to be studied in the manner inspired by this system, which is: These important men utilize the majority's need for them and their living standards to oblige those who are capable of working in their occupations and factories for a limited time and for wages enough only to sustain them. . .! This is the "logic" of pure utilitarianism which they would naturally adopt, dividing the nation consequently to a group in the peak of wealth and a majority in a bottomless pit . . .!

Here, the nation's political right is crystalized in a new form. As for equality in the citizens' political rights, even though it is not wiped out of the

system's record, it has survived these turmoils only as a shadow and pure ideology: for when the economic freedom records the results we exposed above, it will come to the conclusion of the deep division we have explicated, taking control of the situation and holding the reins, conquering the political freedom before it . . . ! Because of its economic status in the society and capacity of using all means of propaganda, and because of its capability of purchasing supporters and helpers. . ., the capitalist group controls the reins of government in the nation, seizing power in order to use it for its own interests and to guard its objectives, and both legislative and social systems will be controlled by the capital, after it has already been supposed by the democratic concepts to be the right of all the nation! Thus does democratic capitalism become in the end an authority monopolized by the minority, a means whereby several individuals protect their own existence at the expense of others, according to the utilitarian mentality inspired by the democratic capitalist "education" . . . !

Here we reach the worst series enacted by this system. Those people in whose hands the democratic capitalist system has placed all sorts of influence,

providing them with every kind of power and potential, will direct their attention, inspired by this system's mentality, towards the horizons and feel - inspired by their interests and objectives - that they are in need of even new areas of influence for two reasons:

First: The abundace of production depends on the extent of abundance and availability of essential materials; therefore, whosoever's share of such materials is larger, his producing capacities will be stronger and more plentiful. These materials are spread in God's vast lands. It it is necessary to obtain them, then the lands which contain them have to be seized for absorption and utilization!

Second: The strength of the producing speed and its power, motivated by the anxiety for plentitude of profit on one hand, and the low standard of living of many nations, due to the materialistic greed of the capitalist group and its competition with the public through its utilitarian means, on the other, make the public unable to purchase products and consume them. All of this makes the big producers in dire need of new markets to sell their surplus pro-

ducts therein. Finding such markets means thinking of seizing new lands. . . !

Thus is the matter studied in a purely materialistic mentality. Naturally, such mentality, whose system has never been based on spiritual or ethical principles and whose social system admits nothing but filling this limited life with different sorts of pleasures and desires, finds in these two reasons a justification and a "logical" appetizer to transgress on peaceful countries, trespass on their dignity, control their provisions and potential natural resources, utilizing their wealth for marketing its surplus products . . . !

All of this is a "reasonable" and "permissible" matter, according to the "ideals" of individual interests upon whose bases do both capitalist system and "free economy" stand . . . !

From here is the giant of materialism set free to invade and wage wars, scaffling and tying, colonizing and exploiting in order to satisfy the mania of wills and whims . . . !

Look into the tragedies humanity has suffered because of such system which is materialistic in spirit, form, manner and aim, even though it has never been

based upon a certain philosophy in agreement with that spirit and form, in harmony with such manners and objectives, as we have pointed out above.

Judge for yourself the share of hapiness and stability of a society based on the principles of this system and ideals. . ., one which lacks self-denial and mutual trust, true compassion and love, and all the good spiritual trends, so much so that the individual lives in it while feeling that he is responsible only for his own self, that he is in danger because of each and every interest of others that may clash with his own, as if he is living in a continuous struggle and race, unarmed except by his own powers, aiming thereby at none except his own personal interest ... !

* * * * *

PART THREE

SOCIALISM AND COMMUMISM

SOCIALISM AND COMMUNISM

In socialism there are many creeds the most famous of which is the socialist creed, which is based on the Marxist theory, and the argumentative materi alism, which is a certain philosophy of life and a materialistic comprehension of it according to the dialectical method. Dialectical materialists have applied this dialectical materialism to history, sociology and economy. So, it has become a philosophical creed in world affairs, a method to study history and sociology, a creed in economy and a plan in politics. . . ! In other words, it formulates all of mankind into a particular structure as regarding his way of thinking, his attitude towards life and his practical method therein.

There is no doubt that the materialistic philosophy and the dialectical method have never been

innovations or creations of the Marxist creed. The materialistic trend has lived within the philosophical field for thousands of years, once in the open and once hidden behind sophistication and absolute denial. Also, the dialectical method of reasoning is deeply rooted in the lines of human thinking. Its lines were perfected at the hands of Hagel, the well-known idealistic philosopher. Carl Marx only adopted such "reasoning" and philosophy. He tried to apply it in all fields of life; so, he made two researches:

One of them is his purely materialistic, in a dialectical method, interpretation of history.

The other is his claim therein that he found out the contradictions within the capital and surplus value which the capitalist steals in his creed from the labourer.'

Upon these "achievements" has he erected his belief in the necessity of abolishing the communist and socialist societies which he considered to be a step for mankind to completely apply communism.

The social field in this philosophy is one of battling contradictions, and every social situation which prevails upon such field is but a purely materi alistic phenomenon which harmonizes with the other phenomena and materialistic climes and is affected

thereby. But he spontaneously carries his own self-contradiction in the essence, and a battle of contradictions will then be waged within its content until all contradictions assemble to cause a change in that situation and prepare for another one. Thus does the battle linger until all mankind form one single class, and the interests of every individual will be represented in the interests of that unified class. At that moment will harmony prevail and peace become a reality, and all bad effects of the democratic capitalist system will be completely removed, for they resulted only from the existence of many classes within one society, and such numerousness resulted from dividing the society to a producer and a labourer. Therefore, such division has to be stopped by abolishing (private) ownership. Here, communism differs from socialism in the main economic outlines, for the communist economy hinges upon:

First: Abolishing private ownership and its complete eradication from the society, giving wealth to the public and placing it in the hands of the State since the latter is the legal representative of the society in managing and utilizing it for the common welfare. The communist belief in the necessity of

this absolute nationalization is due to the natural reaction of the consequences of private ownership in the democratic capitalist system. This nationalization has thus been justified: It is meant to abolish the capitalist class and unite the society into one class in order to put an end to that struggle and in order to forbid the individual from utilizing different - means and methods to accumulate his wealth in order to satisfy his greed, motivated by his own selfish interest.

Second: Distribution of products according to the consuming need of individuals. It can be summed up thus: From everyone according to his capacity, and for everyone according to his need. This is so because every individual has natural needs without which he cannot live. So, he gives the society all of his endeavour so that the society provides him with his living necessities and takes care of his livelihood . . .

Third: An economic procedure planned by the State, wherein it combines the society's need with production in its volume, diversity and limitation, so that the society will not be inflicted with the same

line in the communist economy, that is, the abolishment of private ownership, has been substituted with a moderate solution: nationalization of heavy industries, foreign trade and domestic trades, putting all of them under government monopoly; in other words, abolishing large mass capital by setting free the simple industries and trades, leaving them to the individuals, for the wide line of communist economy collapsed with the reality of the human nature, to which we referred above, for the individuals started neglecting the performance of their duties and of being active in their jobs, running away from their social obligations, for the system is supposed to guarantee their livelihood and the fulfillment of their needs. Also, it is supposed not to exert any further effort; therefore, why should the individual exert himself and sweat as long as the result is already in his calculation, the result of both states of laziness and activity?! Why should he rush to provide happiness for others, trading the convenience of others for his own sweat, tears, life and energy, since he does not believe in any principle in life except that a purely materialistic nature?! Therefore, the advocates of such creed were forced to freeze absolute nationalization! They were also forced to adjust the other line in the communist

line in the communist economy, that is, the abolishment of private ownership, has been substituted with a moderate solution: nationalization of heavy industries, foreign trade and domestic trades, putting all of them under government monopoly; in other words, abolishing large mass capital by setting free the simple industries and trades, leaving them to the individuals, for the wide line of communist economy collapsed with the reality of the human nature, to which we referred above, for the individuals started neglecting the performance of their duties and of being active in their jobs, running away from their social obligations, for the system is supposed to guarantee their livelihood and the fulfillment of their needs. Also, it is supposed not to exert any further effort; therefore, why should the individual exert himself and sweat as long as the result is already in his calculation, the result of both states of laziness and activity?! Why should he rush to provide happiness for others, trading the convenience of others for his own sweat, tears, life and energy, since he does not believe in any principle in life except that a purely materialistic nature?! Therefore, the advocates of such creed were forced to freeze absolute nationalization! They were also forced to adjust the other line in the communist

economy by allowing wages to vary in order to push the labourers to be active and perfect in their jobs, making the excuse that these variations are only temporary, and that they will disappear once the capitalist mentality is crushed and man created anew! For this purpose, they continuously make changes in their economic methods and socialist modes in order to follow the failure of an old method by trying a new one! They have not yet succeeded in getting rid of all basic corner-stones of the capitalist economy. For example, the interest loans have not been totally abolished, although they are, in fact, the basis of social corruption in the capitalist economy . . . !

All of this, however, does not mean that those advocates have had shortcomings, or that they have not been serious in their creed or faithful to their doctrine . . . ; rather, it means that they have clashed with reality while trying to put them to practise, finding their path full of obstacles and contradictions put forth by the human nature before the revolutionary method of the "social reform" they have been promising. Reality, then, forced them to go back on their word in the hope that a miracle would sooner or later take place!

As regarding the political aspect, communism,

in its long run, aims in the end at erasing the "state" from the society when the miracle takes place and the "social mentality" prevails upon all humans. . ., so much so that all people will be thinking of nothing but the materialistic social welfare. Prior to that, as long as the miracle has not taken place yet and people are not unified into one "class", when the society is still divided to capitalist and proletariat forces . . ., it is necessary that the government should be purely proletariat; so, it is a demorcratic rule within the circle of labour and also a dictatorship regarding the masses . . . ! They have reasoned thus: Proletariat dictatorship of government is necessary in all stages passed by mankind, using the individual mentality for the protection of the interests of the working class, strangling capitalism and forbidding it from coming to the field again.

In fact, this creed, represented by Marxist socialism then Marxist communism, is distinguished from the democratic capitalist system in its reliance on a particular materialistic philosophy which adopts a particular concept of life to which all idealistic principles and values are not ascribed and which is analysed in a certain sort of analysis which does not leave room for a Creator above the natural limits,

nor to an anticipated compensation beyond the borders of this limited materialistic life. This contrasts democratic capitalism, for although it is a materialistic system, it has never been based upon a precise philosophical foundation. Accurate linkage between the realistic understanding of life and the social issue as accepted by materialistic communism, whereas democratic capitalism has neither believed in it, nor has it tried to explain it!

Hence, the communist creed is worthy of a philosophical study and of a test through tackling the philosophy upon which it has hinged and from which it has been derived, for judging any system is dependent upon the extent of the success of its philosophical concept in portraying and comprehending life. . . !

It is easy to comprehend, when we cast the first glance at the simplified or "accomplished" communist system, that its general nature is the dissolution of the individual into the society, making him a tool for the achievement of the general criteria it enforces. It completely contradicts the free capitalist system which puts the society in the service of the individual for the achievement of the latter's interests. It seems that it has been predestined for

the individual and social personalities, according to the precepts of both systems, to clash and combat with each other! The individual personality has become victorious in one of them, the one based upon the individual and his own personal benefits, inflicting the society thereby with economic catastrophes which have shaken its existence and mutilated life in all its sectors. The social personality has won in the other, which has come to correct the mistakes of the previous one, assisting the society and reducing the individual personality to dissolution and annihilation, inflicting the individuals with severe dilemmas which ruined their freedom, personal existence and natural rights of selecting and reasoning.

COMMUNISM CRITICIZED

In fact, although the communist system has treated several inflictions of free capitalism, by abolishing private ownership, such treatment has had some natural consequences which have made such treatment very costly and the method to put it to use very exerting and cannot be used except when all other ways and methods fail. On the other hand,

it is an incomplete treatment which does not guarantee the eradication of social corruption, for it has not really been successful in its diagnosis of the ailment and the discovery of the point wherefrom evil has set out to subjugate the world to the capitalist system, keeping that point maintaining its position in the social life of the communist creed . . . ! Therefore, mankind has not won a definite solution to his greatest problem, nor has he obtained the medicine to medicate his ailments and uproot his sickening symptoms.

As regarding the consequences of this treatment, they are, indeed, great: for they can put an end to the freedom of individuals for the sake of substituting communist ownership for private ownership. The case is so because this tremendous social change contradicts the general human nature upto, at least, the present time, as its promoters admit, since materialistic man still thinks subjectively, calculating his interests through his own limited individualistic eyes. Establishing a new structure for the society wherein the individuals dissolve completely, a structure which totally puts an end to personal motifs, requires a strong power to hold the society's reins with iron hands, suppressing any resisting voice, strangling

any opposition, monopolizing all means of media and publications, enforcing a belt around the nation nobody can by any means go beyond, and becoming habituated to charging and doubting, so that the rein of authority may not suddenly get out of its hands. . . !

This is natural in every system desired to be enforced on the nation before the mentality of such system ripens in it and its spirit prevails . . . !

Yes! If materialistic man starts reasoning socially, realizing his interests in a social mentality, with his own personal feelings, desires and inclinations melting through his own self; then a system wherein individuals "melt" can be established, leaving in the arena none but the huge social giant! But the achievement of this in the materialistic man, who does not believe except in a limited life without knowing any meaning for it except the materialistic pleasure, needs a miracle to create paradise on earth, bringing it down from heaven! The communists promise us such paradise, waiting for that day when the factory changes the human nature, creating him anew with idealistic thoughts and deeds even if he does not believe the weight of an atom in ideal values or ethical principles! If such a miracle happens, then we will have a talk with them!

As for the time being, the position of the social structure they' desire calls for the confinement of individuals within the limits of this structure's idea and its guarantee for protection by the group that believes in it and using caution concerning it by suppressing the human nature and the psychological emotions, forbidding them by all possible means from setting themselves free.

Even when he wins a total assurance and a social guarantee of his livelihood and needs, for the social wealth provides him with all of these during the time of need, the individual who lives in the shade of a system like this will be better off if he can get such assurance without losing the pleasure of breathing the fresh air of cultivated freedom rather than being forced to melt his personality in fire and drown himself in the tumultuous social sea!

How can he have a desire for freedom, in any field, when he is deprived of freedom in livelihood, while sustaining his life is totally tied to a particu lar "committee", although economic and sustaining freedom is the basis of all other norms of freedom . . .?!

The advocates answer this question by yet asking: "What can man do with freedom and enjoy-

ment of his right to criticize and publicize his opinions while moaning under a horrible social burden?! What benefit can his discussion and opposition bring him when he needs accurate nutrition and guaranteed life more than opposition or the fuss freedom brings him?!"

Those who ask such questions look only at capitalist democracy as if it is the only social issue which competes with their own in the field; therefore, they underestimate the value of the individual dignity and its rights, for they saw it as a menace to the general social torrent. . ., but humanity has the right not to sacrifice any of its principles or privileges, as long as it does not have to. It has but to choose either a dignity which is an ideal privilege of humanity, and a need which is its materialistic privilege . . ., only if it lacks the system which can combine both aspects and succeed in solving both problems . . . !

The man whose energy is being squeezed by others, without finding a good and comfortable life or a fair salary and an assurance during the time of need, is indeed one deprived of enjoying life, separated from a stable and quiet life. Also, a man threatened every moment, questioned about every movement, apt to be arrested without trial

and be imprisoned, banished or even killed for any reason. . ., is indeed one who lives in fear and terror; horror forbids him from enjoying the pleasures of this life . . .

The third man: the one whose life is comfortable, feeling assured of preserving his dignity and safety, is indeed humanity's sweet dream . . . ! So, how can such dream become a reality?! When will it become an existing actuality?!

We have said above that the communist solution to the social problem is incomplete, in addition to its consequences to which we have also referred. For, he, although human emotions and feelings breathe within him, evoked by the general social pressure which caused some thinkers to resort to the new solution, but they did not put their hands on the causes of corruption so that they could eradicate it; rather, they eradicated something else; therefore, they were not successful in their medication. . . !

The concept of private ownership is not the one responsible for the sins of absolute capitalism which shook the world and its felicity. . ., so much so that it is not the one that forces millions of labourers to be idle for the sake of the investment of a new machine which put an end to their industry,

as it happened at the dawn of the Industrial Revolution, nor is it the one that forces the capitalist to destroy large quantities of his products in order to maintain their price and in preference of extravagance to satisfy the need of the poor thereby . . . ! Nor is it the one that invites him to make his wealth a gaining capital multiplied by usury, absorbing the civilians' endeavour without production or toil! Nor is it the one that pushes him to buy all consumption goods from the market in order to monopolize them and raise their prices! Nor is it the one that forces him to open new markets, even when the freedom and rights of nations would be violated thereby, and their prestige and freedom weakened. . . !

All of these terrifying calamities have not resulted from private ownership; rather, they are the breed of the materialistic individual interest which has been made the criterion of life in the capitalist system and the absolute reason for all acts and dealings. When a society is based upon such individual criterion which is self-advocate, nothing can be expected from it except what has already befallen. It is from the nature of this criterion that all curses and calamities befall the entire human race, not from the principle of private ownership. For if the

criterion is changed, and a new cultivated objective for life is put, one that harmonizes within the human nature. . ., only then will the real remedy of the greatest human problem become a reality. . .!



PART FOUR

ISLAM AND THE SOCIAL PROBLEM

THE ACCURATE ANALYSIS OF THE PROBLEM

In order to reach the first circle in analysing the social problem, we have to question that materialistic individualistic interest established by the capitalist system as a criterion, a pretext, a goal and an objective, and ask: "What is the idea which made such criterion seem to be correct according to the democratic capitalist mentality which inspired it?" This very idea is the real basis of the social tribulation and the failure of democratic capitalism in bringing about man's happiness and security his dignity. If we can abolish such an idea, we will put a definite end to all conspiracies against social welfare and intrigues against the society's rights and accurate freedom, and be successful in utilizing the private ownership for humanity's good, upliftment and advancement in the industrial spheres and production fields.

So, what is this idea?!

This idea is summarized according to the limited materialistic interpretation of life upon which the West has erected the colossal monument of capital ism. If every member of the society believes that his only field in this great universe is his personal materialistic life, believing also in his freedom in using and utilizing this life, and that he can gain nothing from this life except the pleasure made available to him through materialism, adding these materialistic creeds to his egoism, which is essentially inherent within him, then he will choose the path of materialists and execute all of their methods, unless a mighty power deprives him of his freedom and stops him!

Egoism is the instinct more general or ancient than any other one we have come to know. All other instincts are its own branches and divisions, including the instinct of suvival. Man's love for his own self, which means his love for pleasure and happiness for his own person, and his hatred of pain and suffering, is the motif which pushes him to make a living and provide himself with his nutritious and materialistic needs. Therefore, he may put an end to his own life by committing suicide if he finds out that the pain

of dying is easier than tolerating the pains his life is full of.

The natural reality, that is, that which hides behind every human life, directing it with its fingers, is egoism which we call "loving pleasure and hating pain". Man cannot be required to willingly tolerate bitterness of pain without enjoying some pleasure simply in order that others may get their own pleasure and felicity except when he is robbed of his humanity and is given a new nature which neither loves pleasure nor hates pain . . . !

Even the marvellous norms of self-denial, which we see in mankind and hear about in history, are, in fact, subject to the same principal motivating power: egoism! Man may be influenced by his son or friend, and he may sacrifice himself for the sake of some ideals and principles. . ., but he would never perform such heroism unless he derives a particular pleasure therefrom and a benefit which exceeds the loss he suffers by preferring his son's or friend's benefit to his own, or by sacrificing himself for the sake of a principle he believes in.

Thus can we interpret the general behaviour of man, in the spheres of egoism and sacrifice alike. Man has an inherent readiness to enjoy different

things: materialistic, like enjoying eating, drinking, sexual pleasures, etc. ; or non-materialistic like behavioural and emotional pleasures; that is, enjoying ethical principles and a spiritual companion, or a particular faith, when man finds such principles or that companion or this faith to be part of his own entity. Such readiness which prepares man to enjoy such different sorts of pleasure differs in degrees among individuals and varies in effectiveness according to the variations in man's circumstances, natural elements and the upbringing which affects him. When we find out that such readiness matures naturally in man, such as his readiness to enjoy sex, for example, we find out that the other kinds of readiness may not appear during one's lifetime, and that they remain waiting for the natural elements to help their maturity and blossoming. Behind all such readiness is the egoistic instinct which outlines man's behaviour according to the degree of maturity of such readiness. It pushes a person to prefer one kind of food to another when he is hungry, and it pushes some other person to even give his own food to others. This is so because the first person's readiness to enjoy the ethical and emotional principles, which pushes him to self-denial, is hidden: the auxiliary

elements of upbringing have neither centralized nor matured such readiness! The other person has won such sort of upbringing; therefore, he enjoys ethical and emotional principles, sacrificing his own self for their achievement.

When we want to make a change in someone's behaviour, we have to change his concept of pleasure and benefit, including the suggested behaviour in the general framework of the egoistic instinct.

If the egoistic instinct occupies such position in man's world, and the "self" means nothing but a limited materialistic energy, and pleasure is nothing but whatever fun and felicity materialism brings. . ., it would be natural for man then to feel that his sphere of gaining is limited, his scope is short, and his objective in it is to get an amount of materialistic pleasure. The way to get that is, of course, confined to life's vein: wealth, which opens the door to man to achieve all of his purposes and desires!

This is the natural sequence of materialistic reasoning which leads to a complete capitalist mentality.

Can you see if the problem can be totally solved if we refuse the principle of private ownership, while maintaining such materialistic concepts of life as

those thinkers have tried?! Can society be saved from the tragedy of such principles by only abolishing private ownership so that it would gain a guarantee for its happiness and stability?! The only guarantee for man's happiness and stability depends to a large extent upon ensuring that those charged with responsibility will not deviate from their scopes and reform plans in the field of action and execution. Such responsible persons are supposed to embrace the same purely materialistic concepts of life whereupon capitalism stands. The only difference is that they have shaped such concepts in new philosophical structures. Reason would suppose that the personal interest quite often stands in the face of the common interest, and that the individual has to choose between either a loss and pain he suffers for the sake of others, or a gain and pleasure he enjoys at their own expense! So, what guarantees would the nation and its rights, the doctrine and its objectives, will have during such critical moments the rulers go through?! The individual interest is not represented in private ownership only, so that we would rule out our supposition to abolish the principle of private ownership; rather, it is represented in many different manners and forms. A proof for that is the treason of many past rulers

discovered today by the advocates of communism who have revealed how those rulers deviated from the same principles they had professed to adopt!

The wealth controlled by the capitalist group, under the shade of absolute economic and individual liberties, dealing with it according to its materialistic mentality, is given, when the state nationalizes all sorts of wealth and abolishes private ownership, to the state apparatus itself which is composed of a group controlled by the same materialistic concepts of life which oblige them to give priority to their own individualistic interests, according to the egoistic instinct, refusing that man gives up his pleasure and interest without a compensation. So long as the materialistic interest is the dominating power, according to the materialistic concepts of life, new fields for struggle and competition will be reserved, and the society will be exposed to different dangers and exploitation.

Danger to humanity is all hidden within such materialistic concepts and whatever spring therefrom of goals and deeds. Unifying capitalist norms of wealth, the small or the big, into one huge wealth to be taken care of by the state, without any new development of the human intellect, does not curb

such danger; rather, it turns the entire nation to labourers in one company, trying their life and prestige to the promoters and owners of that company. . . !

Yes! This company differs from the capitalist company: the owners of the capitalist company are the ones who own its profits, spending them according to their own inclinations, while the owners of the other company do not possess any of that, as the system assumes. But the fields of individualistic interest are still open, and the materialistic concept of life, the one that makes such an interest a goal and a justification, still remains!

HOW TO TREAT THE PROBLEM

The world has two ways to avoid the danger and establish the pillars of a stable society:

One: Mankind has to be changed, or a new nature be created within him that would make him sacrifice his personal interests and limited materialistic achievements for the sake of the society and its interests, in spite of his own belief that there are no principles except those materialistic ones, and

no gains except those of this limited life . . . ! This could be accomplished if egoism were uprooted from his nature's essence and substituted for loving the group; therefore, man will be born not loving his own self except as being part of the society, feeling no pleasure for his own happiness and benefits except as they represent part of the general happiness and common interest . . . ! The "instinct" of loving the group will then guarantee its running after its own interests and the achievement of its own objectives in a mechanical manner and mode . . . !

The other, the one the advocates of communism dream of bringing to man's future, promising the world that they would create it anew, a creation which would make it move mechanically to serve the group and its interests, is this: so that such great feat is accomplished, we have to trust the world leadership to them, just as the patient is entrusted to the surgeon for surgery and to chop off his bad parts and adjust the crooked ones! Nobody knows how long will such surgical operation, which puts man at the mercy of the surgeon, last! Man's submission to that is but the greatest proof of the extent of injustice he has suffered in the democratic capitalist system which has deceived him with the alleged

"freedoms", robbing him finally of even his own dignity, sucking his blood in order to present him as an easy drink to the pampered group represented by the rulers . . .!

The idea of such opinion which advocates treating the problem by "modernizing" man and creating him anew, hinges upon the Marxist interpretation of egoism. Marxism believes that self-love (egoism) is neither a natural inclination nor an instinctive phenomenon within man's entity but a result of the social condition which is based upon private ownership, for the social status of private ownership is what formulates the spiritual and innate make-up of man, creating in the individual his own love for his personal interests and individual benefits. . . ! If a revolution occurs in the bases upon which the social structure stands, and general ownership and socialism substitute private ownership, then the revolution will be reflected in all corners of the society and in the inner context of man; so much so that his personal feelings will change to common feelings, and his love for his own interests and individualistic benefits changes to loving the common interest and benefit, according to the equilibrium law between the status of Islamic ownership

and the totality of the overall phenomenon according to which they condition themselves.

In fact, this Marxist interpretation of egoism judges the relationship between the self's reality (the egoistic instinct) and the social circumstances in an upside-down manner. Otherwise, how can we believe that the personal motif is the outcome of private ownership and all the class contradictions resulting therefrom?! If mankind did not have, before hand, the personal motif, he would not have caused such contradictions, nor could he have thought of private ownership and personal monopoly . . . ! Why should man monopolize the system's achievements, placing it in such a way that protects his own interests at the expense of others, if he does not feel the personal motif within the depths of his own self?! The fact is that the social appearances of egoism in the economic and political field are but the result of the personal motif, of the egoistic instinct. This motif is deeper than it is in man's entity; therefore, it cannot vanish, nor can its roots be pulled out by simply removing such effects, for an operation like this is not more than substituting effects for others different than the first in shape or appearance yet similar to them in essence and reality.

Add to this, if we interpret the personal motif (the egoistic instinct) subjectively, as a reflection of the phenomena of individualism within the social system, such as the phenomenon of private ownership, as Marxism has done, would this not mean that the personal motif will lose its subjective and causing factor from the social system by abolishing private ownership because, although it is a phenomenon of an individualistic nature, it still is not unique in kind, as there is, for example, the phenomenon of private management which is kept even by the socialist system! Although it abolishes private ownership of the means of production, the socialist system does not abolish their private management by the ruling apparatus which practises proletariat dictatorship and monopolizes the supervision over all means of production and their management. It is not logical to manage the means of production at the moment of their nationalization by a social common management of all the individuals of the society! The socialist system, then, maintains distinguished individualistic phenomena, and it is natural that such phenomena maintain the personal motif, continuously reflecting it in the inner context of man, just as the phenomenon of private ownership used to do.

Thus do we come to know the value of the first way to solve the problem: the communist way which regards abolishing the legislation of private ownership and wiping it out of the law as the only guarantee to solve the problem and "modernize" man...!

As regarding the other way, stated above, it is the one followed by Islam because of its belief that the only solution to the problem is to develop man's materialistic concept of life. It has not started with abolishing the concept of private ownership; rather, it assaulted the materialistic concept of life and put for life a new concept, basing thereupon a system wherein the individual is not treated as a machine in the social apparatus, nor is the society a group ready to serve the individual. Rather, it has given each his rights, and has guaranteed the individual his dignity, spiritual and materialistic. Islam has placed its hand upon the real cause of sickness in the democratic social system, and whatever systems branch therefrom, wiping them out in a manner which harmonizes with the human nature. The basic hinging point to what the human life has suffered of different sorts of miseries and calamities is the materialistic outlook of life which may be summed

up thus: the supposition that only man's life on earth is worthy of all consideration. It establishes the individualistic interest as the criterion to each action and activity. According to Islam, democratic capitalism is a system doomed to collapse and will certainly fail not because of the allegations of the advocates of communist economy, the self-contradictions of capitalism and the elements of destruction carried inherently by private ownership, for Islam differs in its logical approach, political economy and social philosophy from the concepts of such allegations and their argumentative manner, as I have clarified in my works *Our Philosophy* and *Our Economy*, and it guarantees the position of private ownership within a social framework, free of such alleged contradictions.

The reason for the failure and aggravating situation with which democratic capitalism is inflicted, according to Islam, goes to the purely materialistic concepts of democratic capitalism which cannot make people happy in a system that learns its essence therefrom, deriving its general outlines from its essence and direction.

There has to be, thereupon, some other source, other than the materialistic ideas about the universe,

from which the social system quenches its thirst, and there has to be an accurate political awareness springing out of true concepts of life, adopting the greatest of man's issues, attempting to achieve that on the basis of such concepts and studying the world affairs from that angle. When such political awareness matures in the world, wiping away any other political awareness, the world will then be able to enter a new life shining with light, full of happiness.

This deep political awareness is the true message of Islam in the world, and such a delivering message is, indeed, the eternal message of Islam which has derived its social system, which differs from all the systems we have so far explicated, from a new intellectual base for life and the universe . . . !

Through such an intellectual base, Islam has defined the proper outlook of man at his life. It has made him believe that his life springs from the principle of absolute perfection, that it is but a preparation for a world free of toil and suffering, hence providing him with a new ethical criterion in his steps and stages. This criterion is: the pleasure of Allah Almighty . . . ! For not everything the individual interest enforces is permissible, yet everything causing an individual loss is prohibited and undesirable . . .

Rather, the goal Islam has drawn for mankind in his life is Divine Pleasure, and the ethical criterion whereby all deeds are weighed is the amount he can obtain of such sacred goal. The straight man is that who achieves such goal. The complete Islamic character is the one which has made all of its various paces along the guidance of such goal and the light of such criterion and within its general framework.

This change in the ethical concepts, criteria and objectives does not mean changing the human nature and create it anew, as the communist idea meant. Egoism, that is, man's love for his own self and for the achievement of his personal desires, is natural in mankind, and we do not know of any research in any experimental field more clear than that of humanity in its long history which proves the "self" of egoism! If egoism had not been natural and inherent within man, early man would not have rushed, before forming his social entity, to achieve his needs and defend himself against the dangers and try in his primitive ways whereby he protected his life and maintained his existence to get what he desired and in the end enter the social life and assimilate in relations with others for the purpose of achieving such needs and avoiding such dangers. Since egoism

occupies such- a position in the human nature, any definite solution to the great human problem must be based upon the belief in such reality. If it is based upon the idea of developing or overcoming it, then it would be an idealistic solution which does not have a place in the reality of the practical life man has been leading . . .!

THE RELIGIOUS MESSAGE

Here, religion performs its great message whose burdens no one else can bear, nor its constructive goals and wise objectives can be achieved, except up on its bases and principles, joining the ethical criteria put by man with the egoistic instinct centered within his nature.

In other words, religion unites the instinctive criteria of working and living; that is, egoism, and the criterion which ought to be the basis for working and living, in order to guarantee (for mankind) happiness, prosperity and justice.

The instinctive criterion demands that man must give preference to his own personal interests over those of the society and the factors which maintain

its unity; and the criterion which must preside and prevail is that in whose estimation all interests equate, and according to whose concepts all individual and social principles balance . . .!

How is it possible, then, to co-ordinate both criteria and unite both balances so that the human nature might return in the individual to be a factor of goodness and happiness for everyone, after it had been for a long time a factor that caused tragedies which developed selfishness, as it pleases?!

The co-ordination and unification occur in a manner guaranteed by religion for the strayed humanity, and this has two styles:

The first style is to concentrate on the realistic interpretation of life, propagating its comprehension in its accurate hue, as introductory prelude to an everlasting life wherein man achieves an amount of happiness which depends on his endeavour during this limited life, hoping to achieve the Pleasure of Allah. The ethical criterion, that is, achieving Allah's Pleasure, while achieving its great social objectives, it spontaneously ensures achieving the individual interest! Religion, therefore, leads man to participate in the construction of a happy society and the maintenance of its just issues which, all in all, achieve

the Pleasure of Allah Almighty, for that is included in the estimation of his personal gain, so long as every deed and activity in this field will be very greatly rewarded.

The society's issue is also the individual's, according to the precepts and concepts of religion regarding life and its comprehension. Such a style of co-ordination cannot be achieved under the shade of a materialistic comprehension of life, for the materialistic comprehension of life makes man naturally looking at none but his present scope and limited life-span, contrary to the realistic interpretation of life presented by Islam. The latter expands man's scope, enforcing upon him a deeper outlook at his own interests and benefits, turning quick loss to a real gain within such deep sight, and the quick gain a real loss in the end

مَنْ عَمِلَ صَالِحًا فَلِنَفْسِهِ وَمَنْ أَسَاءَ فَعَلَيْهَا . . . .

(فصّلت، ٤١/٤٦)

Whoever does a good deed, it is for his own self, and whoever does wrong, it is against his own self . . . (Qur'an, 41:46)

. . . وَمَنْ عَمِلَ صَالِحًا مِنْ ذَكَرٍ اَوْ اُنْثٰى وَ هُوَ مُؤْمِنٌ
فَاُولٰٓئِكَ يَدْخُلُوْنَ الْجَنَّةَ يُرْزَقُوْنَ فِيهَا بِغَيْرِ حِسَابٍ *

(المؤمن، ٤٠/٤٠)

. . . *And whoever, male or female, does a good deed, while truly believing, shall certainly enter Paradise wherein to be sustained without a limit.* (Qur'an, 40:40)

يَوْمَئِذٍ يَصْدُرُ النَّاسُ اَشْتَاتًا لِيُرَوْا اَعْمَالَهُمْ * فَمَنْ يَعْمَلْ
مِثْقَالَ ذَرَّةٍ خَيْرًا يَرَهُ * وَ مَنْ يَعْمَلْ مِثْقَالَ ذَرَّةٍ شَرًّا
يَرَهُ. (الزلزال، ٩٩/٦–٨)

On that Day (of Judgement) *shall people be presented in numerous numbers in order to be shown their deeds; whoever does good even the weight of an atom shall receive its reward, and whoever does wrong even the weight of an atom shall receive its punishment.* (Qur'an, 99:6-8)

... ذٰلِكَ بِأَنَّهُمْ لَا يُصِيبُهُمْ ظَمَأٌ وَلَا نَصَبٌ وَلَا مَخْمَصَةٌ
فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ وَلَا يَطَئُونَ مَوْطِئًا يَغِيظُ الْكُفَّارَ وَلَا
يَنَالُونَ مِنْ عَدُوٍّ نَيْلًا إِلَّا كُتِبَ لَهُمْ بِهِ عَمَلٌ صَالِحٌ
إِنَّ اللَّهَ لَا يُضِيعُ أَجْرَ الْمُحْسِنِينَ * وَلَا يُنْفِقُونَ نَفَقَةً
صَغِيرَةً وَلَا كَبِيرَةً وَلَا يَقْطَعُونَ وَادِيًا إِلَّا كُتِبَ لَهُمْ
لِيَجْزِيَهُمُ اللَّهُ أَحْسَنَ مَا كَانُوا يَعْمَلُونَ.

(التوبة، ٩/ ١٢٠–١٢١)

. . . *For they shall never suffer thirst, hardship, hunger in the way of Allah, go where they would anger the unbelievers, or win a victory over an enemy, but it shall be written as a good deed for them, for Allah does not suffer the good deed of a doer to loss. Nor shall they spend a little or much, or cross a valley, but it will be written to be rewarded by Allah with the rewards of their best deeds. (Qur'an, 9:120-121)*

These are but some magnificent portraits religion presents as an example for the first style, the one it follows for the purpose of co-ordinating both criteria and the unification of both balances, joining the personal motifs with the ways of goodness in life and developing the indivdual's interest in a manner that would make him believe that his personal interests and the general matter-of-fact interest, outlined by Islam, are inter-related.[6]

As regarding the other method followed by religion to collaborate the personal motif with the principles or interests of the society, it is to guarantee to nourish man spiritually and help the growth of humane feelings and ethical inclinations within him. For within the human nature, as we have pointed out before, there are energies and capabilities of different inclinations. Some of them are materialistic, whose appetites open naturally, such as the appetite for food, drink and sex, while others are intellectual inclinations which blossom and grow through cultivation and care. Therefore, it is natural for man, if left for himself, to be controlled by the materialistic inclinations, for these blossom naturally, while the intellectual inclinations and their innate readiness

remain veiled within the soul. Religion, believing in an infallible leadership supported by God, entrusts the task of cultivating humanity and nurturing the intellectual inclinations therein to this leadership and its branches, creating thereby a group of righteous emotions and feelings, and man starts loving the ethical principles and ideals religion brings him up to respect and die for, and it removes from his path all obstacles composed of his own interests and benefits. This does not mean that egoism is obliterated from the human nature. Rather, it means that the action geared towards the achievement of such principles and ideals is a complete execution of the will of egoism, for the principles, because of religious upbringing, become loved by man as means of depriving a "special" pleasure therefrom.

These, then, are the two ways from which results the joining of the ethical issue to the personal matter. One of them may be summarized thus: providing a realistic interpretation of an everlasting life not for the purpose of man turning away from this life, nor is it for his submission to injustice and acceptance of iniquity . . . No! It is for the sake of checking man through the accurate ethical criterion provided by that interpretation with sufficient assurance.

The other way may be summarized thus: the ethical education resulting in various feelings and emotions within man which guarantee the imple mentation of the ethical criterion according to the inspiration of the soul.

The spiritual comprehension and ethical education of the soul, according to the Message of Islam, are the co-ordinating factors in treating the deeper cause behind the human tragedy.

Let us describe the comprehension of life as a prelude for a perpetual one, according to the spiritual comprehension of life, and let us describe the emotions and feelings, nurtured by the ethical education, as "the ethical feelings of life".

The spiritual comprehension of life and the ethical feeling thereof are the two bases whereupon stands the new ethical criterion put by Islam for humanity and that (criterion) is: achieving the Pleasure of Allah. This Pleasure, the one put forth by Islam as a general criterion for life, is the one which leads the barge towards the shores of righteousness, goodness and justice.

The basic characteristic in the Islamic system is represented through its erection upon a spiritual comprehension of life and an ethical feeling thereof,

and the wide line in this system is: the regard for both individual and society, and ensuring the equilibrium between the individual and the social life. For the individual is not the central base in the legislation and government, nor is the big social being the only thing the State looks at or for whose sake she legislates . . .!

Every social system which does not spring out of this comprehension and feeling is either a system which follows the individual in his egoistic inclination, thus exposing the social life to the most severe consequences and dire dangers; or it is a system which suppresses the individual's instincts and paralyses in him his own nature for the sake of "protecting" the society and its interests, hence an everlasting bitter struggle starts between the system and its legislations, and the individuals and their inclinations! Nay! The social existence of the system will always be exposed to failure at the hands of its own promoters, as long as they, too, have their own personal inclinations and instincts, and so long as these instincts find, through suppressing the other "individualistic" instincts and taking charge of strict leadership, a wide scope and a field unmatchable for setting out and utilization.

Both spiritual comprehension of life and the ethical feeling thereof do not only result in a complete system of life wherein there is the estimation for each part of the society, each individual will be granted his liberty which has been cultivated by that comprehension and feeling and which the State restricts when there is any deviation therefrom . . . I say: Every doctrine which does not produce for mankind this sort of system can never be other than cooling the air off and alleviating woes rather than providing a remedy and a definite eradication of social desires and vices. The intact social structure is erected upon none but a spiritual comprehension of life and an ethical feeling thereof, from which both a system is set forth to fill life with the spirit of this feeling and the essence of that comprehension . . .

This is Islam in the most precise and wonderful expression: a spiritual and ethical doctrine from which springs a perfect system for mankind which portrays the clearly marked scope, determining his goal to be even higher than that scope, acquainting him with his achievements therefrom.

As for its abolishment of the spiritual comprehension of life, stripping man of his ethical feeling thereof, considering the ethical concepts as pure

whims created by the materialistic interests, and that only the economic factor is the criterion for all values and ethics, hoping from all this to achieve man's happiness and social stability . . . This, indeed, is but a hope which can never be achieved until mankind is changed into a mechanical apparatus organized by few technical engineers.

Basing man upon the basis of that spiritual comprehension of life and the ethical feeling thereof is not a hard or impossible task, for religions during man's history have performed their great message in this respect, and all what the world today contains of spiritual values, ethical awareness, virtuous feelings and emotions do not have an explanation more clear and logical in their pillars and bases other than the great endeavours undertaken by religions to cultivate humanity and its natural motifs and whatever required for living and working.

Islam has borne the torch of bursting light after mankind had reached a certain degree of awareness. It preached the spiritual and ethical base on the widest scales and furthermost scopes, raising thereupon the banner of humanity. It established an intellectual State which ruled the world for quarter of a century, aiming at the unity of all mankind into one

intellectual base which portrays the mode and manner of life. The Islamic State, therefore, has two functions: One to lift mankind through the intellectual base, stamping his inclination and feelings with its stamp. The other is watching him externally and bringing him back to the base if he practically deviates from it.

Therefore, the political awareness of Islam is not only an awareness of the structural aspect of the social life, but it also is a profound political awareness which springs from an entirely complete outlook towards life, the cosmos, sociology, politics, economics and ethics. This inclusive outlook is the complete Islamic awareness . . . !

Any other sort of political awareness can either be a superficial political awareness which does not look at the world except from a particular angle without basing its concepts except on one particular hinging point . . . Or it may be a political awareness which studies the world from the purely materialistic angle which provides mankind with combating and suffering of all various shapes and hues . . . !

* * * * *

PART FIVE

THE POSITION OF ISLAM TOWARDS FREEDOM AND SOCIAL ASSURANCE

FREEDOM ACCORING TO CAPITALISM AND ISLAM

We have come to know, from the above contents, that freedom is the central point in the capitalist thinking, and the concept of "insurance" (assur ance) is the basic revolving point in the socialist and communist sytstems.

For this purpose we will be studying, comparatively, the position of Islam and capitalism from freedom, comparing thereafter between the "insurance" according to Islam and according to the Marxist creed.

When we say "freedom", we mean thereby its general meaning; that is, rejection of others' domination, for this concept is the one we can find in both civilizations, even when its frame and intellectual base vary in both.'

When we start comparing freedom according to Islam with freedom according to the democratic capitalist system, basic differences appear to us between the freedom which has been lived by the capitalist society and advocated by capitalism, and the freedom whose banner Islam has borne and adopted by the society which Islam has created, providing its own experience on history's stage. Each of these norms of freedom bears the stamp of civilization to which it belongs and with whose concepts of the cosmos and life it agrees, expressing the intellectual and psychological state that civilization created in history.

Freedom, in the capitalist civilization, has started as a bitterly overwhelming doubt, and this doubt changed, in its revolutionary expansion, to a doctrinal belief in freedom. Contrary to this is freedom in the Islamic civilization, for here it is but an expression of a firm central conviction (i.e., belief in God) from which freedom derives its revolution. According to the firmness of this conviction and the depth of its implication in man's life do the revolutionary powers in that freedom multiply.

Capitalist freedom has a positive connotation. It considers man to possess his own self, faring with

it as he pleases, without submitting in that to any external authority. For this purpose, all social institutions, which affect man's life, derive their legal right to control every individual from the individuals themselves! Freedom, according to Islam, maintains the revolutionary aspect of freedom, to liberate man from the idols' control, all idols from whose yoke humanity has been suffering across history. But it erects this great task of liberation upon the basis of a submission purely for Allah, and for Allah alone. Therefore, man's submission to God in Islam (instead of possessing his own self, according to capitalism) is the tool whereby man breaks all other norms of submission or slavery, for this sort of submission, in its sublime meaning, makes him feel that he, together with all other sorts of power with which he coexists, stands on the same grounds before one Lord. Therefore, no power on earth has the right to fare with his destiny as it pleases or controls his existence and life . . .

Freedom, according to the precepts of the capitalist civilization, is a natural right for man, and he may give his right up whenever he wills. But it is not so according to Islam! Freedom according to Islam is essentially tied to submission to Allah!

Islam does not permit man to yield, be enslaved or give his freedom up:

> Do not be a slave of others, since Allah created you free. *(Nahj al-balaghah* - `Ali ibn Abi Talib)

Man, according to Islam, is to be accounted for the use of his freedom, and freedom is not a state of irresponsibility.

This is the difference between both norms of freedom in their general features, and now we explain with more detail:

* * * * *

FREEDOM ACCORDING TO THE CAPITALIST CIVILIZATION

Freedom was initiated in the capitalist civilization under the shades of an overwhelmingly bitter doubt which dominated the torrents of the entire European thought as a result of the intellectual revolutions which succeeded each other at the dawn of modern Europe, shaking all the western intellectual pillars!

The idols of European thinking started falling down one after the other due to the revolutionary discoveries in the world of science which shone at the western man with new concepts of the world and life, and with theories completely in contradiction to the accepted precepts of the past, those which formed the corner stone of his intellectual entity, intellectual and religious life.

Western man started, across those successive in-intellectual revolutions, to look at the cosmos through new eyes, and at the intellectual heritage humanity had left him since the dawn of history with looks of doubt and suspicion. For he started to feel that the world of Copernicus, who proved that the earth is but a planet of the sun, differs a great deal from the conventional world Ptolemy speaks of, and that nature which started revealing its secrets to Galileo and his peers among the scientists, is a new thing compared to the portrait inherited down from the saints and former thinkers like Saint Thomas Acquinas, Dante and others. Thus does he suddenly, and with a trembling hand, throw his former precepts, trying to be relieved of the frame in which he lived thousands of years . . .!

In its escalating revolutionary torrent, doubt did not stop there! Rather, it wiped out all values and precepts common to humanity and upon which it depended to check the behaviour and regulate relationships. So long as the new cosmos contradicts the old concepts of the world, and as long as man keeeps looking at his reality and environment from a scientific angle, rather than from mythology, then there has to be a reassessment of the religious concept

and likewise of all goals and principles man has lived, before his new outlook of himself and his world crystalizes.

Upon this basis has the religion of western man faced the dilemma of "modern" doubt, and it does not really hinge except upon an emotional basis which soon started drying up because of the Church's tyranny and might. It was natural, then, that all of these ethical bases melted at the conclusion of this defeat. So were the principles and ideals which check man's behaviour and tolerate his extremism, for ethics are linked to religion throughout humanity's existence. When they lose their religious source which provides them with true values and links them to the world of the unknown and of the rewards, they become then an empty ruin and an unjustifiable tax! History always highlights this fact! Greek advocates of sophystry disbelieved in deism because of their dependence upon a "sophisticated" doubt! So, they rejected the ethical restrictions, rebelling thereupon, and western man repeated the story anew when "modern" doubt engulfed his religious creed. He revolted against all sorts of disciplinary manners and ethical codes. Such manners and ethics seemed to him to be linked to an ancient stage of man's history.

Western man set out as he willed to behave as he liked, filling his lungs with the fresh air wherein "modern" doubt occupied the position of principles and standards, when they used to restrict the internal inclination of man and his behaviour.

Here were the ideas of the intellectual freedom and the personal liberty born: For the idea of intellectual freedom has come as a result of a revolution ary doubt and a mental disturbance which blew up all intellectual precepts. So much so that there remain no more sublime facts whose denial is not permissible, as long as doubt extends itself to all spheres . . . ! And the idea of personal liberty comes as an expression of the negative results reached by "modern" doubt in its intellectual combat against faith and ethics, for it is natural that the man who conquers his own faith and ethics is to believe in his own personal liberty and rejects any authority to check his behaviour and control his will. According to such sequence, modern man reaches doubt, intellectual freedom, and finally "personal liberty" . . .!

Here comes the role of economic freedom to form a new series of this "civilized" sequence: Having believed in his personal liberty, modern man strats placing his goals and criteria upon this basis.

Having practically disbelieved in the religious outlook of life and the cosmos, and their respective relationship to the Creator and to whatever reward or punishment man awaits, life starts to him to seem as a chance to win the largest possible portion of pleasure and materialistic enjoyment which cannot be achieved except through wealth . . . Therefore, wealth returns as the magic key and the goal towards which modern man labours, the man who enjoys complete freedom in his behaviour. It becomes necessary to establish the basis of economic freedom and open all fields before this free being to work for the achievement of this new goal: wealth, which western civilization puts up as a new idol for mankind, and every sacrifice mankind offers in this respect is now an honest deed and an accepted scape-goat. The economic motif becomes dominating as long as the march of modern civilization becomes more distant from the spiritual and intellectual principles which he has refused in the beginning of the march. The mania for wealth increases to dominate the situation, and the precepts of goodness, virtue and religion disappear. . ., so much so that Marxism, during one of the western civilization's dilemmas, imagines that the economic motif is the impetus which directs

the human history in all ages.

It is not possible that the idea of economic freedom can be separate from another idea, which is the idea of political freedom, for the essential condition for practising a free activity on the economic stage is the removal of the political obstacles and the conquest of the difficulties put forth by the ruling authority through the possession and nationalization of the governing apparatus, so that the individual may rest assured that there is no power which can separate him from his achievements and desired goals ... !

Thus were the general outlooks or basic series, of which western man composed his civilization, completed. He worked sincerely to establish his life on their basic and adopt a world call thereof. . .!

In this light can we clearly see this "civilization" in its characteristics to which we have pointed out at the beginning of this chapter, for it is a civilized phenomenon which started as a bitter and distrubing doubt and ended as a doctrinal belief in freedom. It is an expression of the belief of western man in his control over himself and his possession of his will after he has refused to submit to any authority. Freedom, according to capitalist democracy, does not only mean the denial of others' control; rather,

it means much more than this; it means man's control over himself and the practical separation between himself and his own Creator and destiny.

* * *

As for Islam: its position from freedom essentially differs from that of western civilization, for it takes care of freedom in its negative implication or, rather, in its revolutionary output which liberates mankind from the control of others, breaking the chains and shackles which hand-cuff him. It considers the achievement of this negative implication of freedom as one of the greatest goals of the Divine Message Itself

. . . وَيَضَعُ عَنْهُمْ إِصْرَهُمْ وَالْأَغْلَالَ الَّتِي كَانَتْ عَلَيْهِمْ . . .

(الاعراف، ٧/١٥٧)

. . . *And He releases them from their heavy burdens and from the yokes that are upon them . . .* (Qur'an, 7:157)

But it does not link this concept to its positive implication according to the concepts of western

civilization, for it does not consider man's right to be liberated from others' control and standing by their side on par as a result of man's control over himself and his right to determine his behaviour and conduct in life; that is, what we would label "the positive implication of freedom according to the concepts of western civilization". Rather, it links freedom and liberation from all idols and artificial shackles to sincere submission to Allah. For man is, above all, a servant of Allah who does not recognize any submission except to Him, or yields to any idolatrous relationship of any colour or shape. Instead, he stands on equal footing in his own sincere submission to Allah with the rest of cosmic creation.

The essential basis of freedom in Islam, therefore, is unity and belief in sincere submission to Allah, before Whose hands all idolatrous powers are crushed, the powers which trampled on man's dignity across history.

قُلْ يَا أَهْلَ الْكِتَابِ تَعَالَوْا إِلَىٰ كَلِمَةٍ سَوَاءٍ بَيْنَنَا وَبَيْنَكُمْ
أَلَّا نَعْبُدَ إِلَّا اللَّهَ وَلَا نُشْرِكَ بِهِ شَيْئًا وَلَا يَتَّخِذَ بَعْضُنَا بَعْضًا

أَرْبَابًا مِنْ دُوْنِ اللّٰهِ . . . (آل عمرٰان، ٣/٦٤)

Say: "O People of the Book! Come to common terms as between us and you: that we worship none but Allah; that we associate no partners with Him; that we erect not, from among ourselves, lords and patrons other than Allah . . . " (Qur'an, 3:64)

قَالَ أَتَعْبُدُوْنَ مَا تَنْحِتُوْنَ * وَاللّٰهُ خَلَقَكُمْ وَمَا تَعْمَلُوْنَ *

(الصّافات، ٣٧/٩٥–٩٦)

He said: "Worship ye that which ye have (yourselves) carved?! But Allah has created you and your handiwork!" (Qur'an, 37:95-96)

إِنَّ الَّذِيْنَ تَدْعُوْنَ مِنْ دُوْنِ اللّٰهِ عِبَادٌ أَمْثَالُكُمْ . . .

(الأعراف، ٧/١٩٤)

Verily those whom ye call upon besides Allah are servants like unto you. . . . (Qur'an, 7:194)

. . . ءَ أَرْبَابٌ مُتَفَرِّقُونَ خَيْرٌ أَمِ اللَّهُ الْوَاحِدُ الْقَهَّارُ

(يوسف، ١٢/٣٩)

. . . *Are many lords differing among themselves better, or the one Allah, Supreme and Irresistible?!* (Qur'an, 12:39)

Thus does Islam base the liberation from all kins of slavery upon the principle of admitting an absolute submission to Allah, making the relation ship between man and his Lord the firmly-rooted basis for his liberation in dealing with all people and with all natural things in the cosmos.

Islam and western civilization, although both practising the operation of man's liberation, differ in the intellectual basis upon which this liberation stands. Islam bases it upon the belief in man alone and in his control over his self which has doubted all principles and facts lying behind the materialistic dimensions of man's existence.

For this purpose has the idea of freedom in Islam been rendered to a believing doctrine which be-

lieves in the Unity of Allah, and to a firm conviction in His control over the cosmos. The deeper this belief goes into the Muslim's heart, and the more centralized his unifying outlook to Allah is, the more elevated his soul will be and the deeper his feeling of dignity and liberty, and the more stiff his will to stand in the face of tyranny, corruption and enslaving others:

وَٱلَّذِينَ إِذَآ أَصَابَهُمُ ٱلْبَغْىُ هُمْ يَنتَصِرُونَ ﴿٣٩﴾

(الشورىٰ، ٤٢/٣٩)

And those who, when an oppressive wrong is inflicted on them, (are not cowed but) *help and defend themselves.* (Qur'an, 42:39)

Contrary to this is the idea of freedom according to western civilization: for this is the product of doubt, unbelief and the result of disturbance and rebellion, not of conviction or stability, as we have already come to know.

* * *

We can classify the democratic capitalist norms of freedom, for the purpose of comparing them with Islam, to two kinds:

i) One of them is freedom in the personal sphere of man, which is what democracy labels "Personal Freedom".

ii) The other is freedom in the social sphere. This includes the intellectual, political and economic norms of freedom.

Personal freedom treats man's conduct as an individual, albeit if he lives independently or as part of the society. As for the three other norms of free dom, these treat man as an individual living among the group, permitting him to voice his ideas to others as he likes and granting him the right to choose the kind of ruling authority he favours, and opening before him the way to all various kinds of economic activity according to his capacity and inclination.

* * * * *

FREEDOM IN THE PERSONAL SPHERE

Modern western civilization has tried hard to get the largest possible share of freedom for each individual in his personal conduct, the share which does not harm other people's freedom.

It is not important, after making this freedom available for all individuals, how they would use it, the outcomes resulting therefrom, the psychological and intellectual reactions thereof . . ., as long as each individual is free in his behaviour and conduct, capable of executing his own will in his personal spheres. The drunkard, for example, is allowed to drink as much liquor as he wants and sacrifice the last particle of his consciousness and awareness as long as he does not bother others or become a menace to their lives in this way or the other.

Mankind has become intoxicated with the tones of this "freedom" and slept therein for sometime, feeling for the first time that he has ruined all the chains and that this giant, who has been suppressed within his depths for thousands of years, has set out for the first time and has been permitted to do whatever he willed in the light, without fear or worry.

But this sweet dream did not last for a long time! Man started waking up slowly to gradually realize that he is disturbed, that this freedom has chained him with huge chains, destroying his hopes for a free humane setting out . . ., for he found himself being pushed in a carriage running on a planned path without being able to change or improve its course. All of his consolation and solace, while looking at his destiny on his planned path, is that there is someone who has said that this carriage is the carriage of freedom, in spite of these cuffs and chains in his hands!

But when did freedom change into a chain? And how did setting out lead to those cuffs which pull the carriage along its planned destiny, and in the end man woke up to witness such bitter reality?! This, indeed, is what Islam had predicted fourteen centuries ago when it did not satisfy itself with pro-

viding such superficial meaning for freedom for man who has been inflicted with all these contradictions in the modern living experience of western man. Rather, it went to further than that and brought forth a much deeper concept of freedom. It declared a revolution not only against the chains and shackles as they appear, but, rather, against their psychological and intellectual roots. Thus has it guaranteed man the highest and purest norms of freedom people have ever tasted across the passage of history . . .!

If freedom, according to western civilization, starts from "liberation" to end in hues of slavery and chains, as we shall explain, . . . then vast free dom, according to Islam, is quite the opposite, for this starts from pure submission to Allah Almighty to end with liberation from all norms of humiliating slavery.

Islam starts its operation to liberate man from the inner content of man himself, for it sees that granting man freedom is not by saying to him: "This is the path! We have cleared it for you; so, walk on it in peace! " Rather, man becomes truly free when he can control his path and maintain for his humanity the right to determine his path and portray its characteristics and directions. This depends, above all,

on man's liberation from the slavery of the desires which occupy his mind so that the desire may change to a tool which attracts man to what he likes, not a pushing power to exhaust man's will without being able to practise towards it any potential or capacity, for if it has been so, man would have lost his freedom in the first place! It does not change the reality when his hands are free as long as his mind and all his human concepts, which distinguish him from the animal kingdom, are chained and frozen! We all know that the essential thing which distinguishes man's freedom from that of the animals is generally the fact that, although they both act according to their respective will, man's will is always subservient to his desires and instinctive inclinations . . . As for man, he is equipped with the capacity to control his desires, using his mental logic in their respect. The secret of his freedom, as a human being, then, is confined within this capacity. If we freeze it within him, being satisfied with granting him the superficial freedom in his ractical behaviour, providing him with all capabilities and temptations to respond favourably to his desires, as the "modern" western civilization has already done . . . then we would gradually destroy his human freedom in exchange of the desires

of the animal confined within his depths, making him a tool to satisfy those desires, so much so that when he looks upon himself, during his passage, he will find himself the indicted one, rather than the indicting, one whose affairs and will are overcome . . .

Contrariwise: If we start with that capacity wherein the secret of human freedom is confined, giving it growth and nourishment, remaking man as a human being, not a beast, making him aware of the fact that his message in life is much more sublime than that abhorred beastly destiny driven to him by those desires, and that his high principle for the purpose of whose achievement he is made, is much, much more elevated than these trivial objectives and cheap gains he gets through his materialistic pleasures . . . I say: If we do all this until man is liberated from the slavery of his own desires, emancipating himself from their captivating influence, possessing his own will . . ., the free man will then be created who can say "Yes" or "No" without his mouth being suppressed or hand chained by this temporary desire or that cheap pleasure . . . !

This is exactly what the Qur'an has said when it put for the Muslim individual his particular spiri-

tual stamp, developing his criteria and principles, pulling him out of earth and its limited goals to vaster horizons and more sublime objectives:

زُيِّنَ لِلنَّاسِ حُبُّ الشَّهَوَاتِ مِنَ النِّسَآءِ وَالْبَنِينَ وَالْقَنَاطِيرِ
الْمُقَنْطَرَةِ مِنَ الذَّهَبِ وَالْفِضَّةِ وَالْخَيْلِ الْمُسَوَّمَةِ وَالْأَنْعَامِ
وَالْحَرْثِ ذَلِكَ مَتَاعُ الْحَيٰوةِ الدُّنْيَا وَاللّٰهُ عِنْدَهُ حُسْنُ
الْمَآبِ * قُلْ أَؤُنَبِّئُكُمْ بِخَيْرٍ مِنْ ذَلِكُمْ لِلَّذِينَ اتَّقَوْا
عِنْدَ رَبِّهِمْ جَنَّاتٌ تَجْرِي مِنْ تَحْتِهَا الْأَنْهَارُ خَالِدِينَ فِيهَا
وَأَزْوَاجٌ مُطَهَّرَةٌ وَرِضْوَانٌ مِنَ اللّٰهِ وَاللّٰهُ بَصِيرٌ بِالْعِبَادِ *

(آل عمران، ٣/١٤ – ١٥)

Fair in the eyes of men is the love of things they covet: women and sons; heaped-up hoards of gold and silver; horses branded (for blood and excellence); *and* (wealth of) *cattle and well-tilled land. Such are the possessions of this world's life; but in nearness to Allah is the best*

of the goals (to return to). *Say: "Shall I give you glad tidings of things far better than those?" For the righteous are gardens in nearness to their Lord, with rivers flowing beneath; therein is their eternal home; with companions pure* (and holy) ; *and the good pleasure of Allah. For in Allah's sight are* (all) His *servants.* (Qur'an, 3:14-15)

This is but the war of liberation in its internal content of man, and it spontaneously is the first basis and the head-start to liberate mankind according to Islam. Without it, all norms of freedom would become falsehood and deception, and in the end a captivity and a chain . . . !

We see, in the light of this Qur'anic guidance, that the method the Qur'an uses to deliver mankind from the yoke of desires and the slavery of pleasure is the general method Islam always uses to cultivate humanity in all fields: the method *tawhid* (Unity of God). Islam, when it liberates man from earth slavery and its vanishing pleasures, connects him with heavens and its gardens, the similitude of which is the Pleasure of Allah, for *tawhid* in Islam is the aid for man's inner liberation from all norms of slavery,

and it is the aid for the human liberation in all fields.

Suffices us here to mention one example which we have passed in a previous chapter, in order to know the glorious results of this liberation and the extent of the difference between the true freedom of the Qur'anic man and those artificial norms of freedom advocated by the modern nations of the western civilization. The nation the Qur'an liberated, when it called her in one word to renounce wine, has been able to say "No" to wine and erase it from its dictionary after it used to be part of its entity and an article of its necessities, for it was in possession of its will, free in facing its desires and animal impulses. In short, it enjoyed a true freedom which allowed it to control its conduct.

As for that nation modern civilization has created, granting it its individual freedom according to its particular method . . ., in spite of this artificial mask of freedom, it really does not possess any of its own will, nor can it control its own existence, for it has never liberated its inner content . . . Rather, it yielded to its pleasures and desires under the cover of individual freedom, until it lost its freedom while satisfying such desires and pleasures. The strongest propaganda campaign against liquor conducted by

the government of the United States has not been able to liberate the American nation from the slavery to liquor, in spite of the huge materialistic and spiritual potentials the ruling authority and various social institutes used for this purpose. This fearful failure is but the result of western man losing his real freedom, for he cannot say "No", whenever convinced, as does the man of the Qur'an . . . ! Instead, he says the word his desire forces him to articulate! For this reason, he has not been able to free himself from liquor's entanglement, for he has not, under the shade of the western civilization, won a real emancipation within his spiritual and intellectual content. [8]

This internal emancipation, or inner-building of man's entity, is, according to Islam, the cornerstone in the establishment of a free and happy society. As long as man does not possess his will, unable to control his inner situation or maintain for his cultivated humanity the upper word in determining his conduct, he can never truly free himself socially in order to resist temptation, nor can he wage the battle of an external liberation with merits and bravery

. . . إِنَّ اللَّهَ لَا يُغَيِّرُ مَا بِقَوْمٍ حَتَّىٰ يُغَيِّرُوا مَا بِأَنفُسِهِمْ . . .

(الرعد، ١١/١٣)

. . . *Verily, never will Allah change the condition of a people until they change it themselves* (with their own souls) . . . (Qur'an, *13:11)*

وَإِذَا أَرَدْنَا أَن نُّهْلِكَ قَرْيَةً أَمَرْنَا مُتْرَفِيهَا فَفَسَقُوا فِيهَا فَحَقَّ عَلَيْهَا الْقَوْلُ فَدَمَّرْنَاهَا تَدْمِيرًا ﴿

(الاسراء، ١٦/١٧)

If We will to perish a village, We would order its rich who would make corruption therein; then it would be opportune for Our call, and we would totally ruin it. (Qur'an, 17:16)

* * * * *

FREEDOM IN THE SOCIAL SPHERE

While waging the war of humanity's inner liberation, Islam likewise wages another war to liberate man socially. It ruins, in the internal content of man, the idols of desire which rob him of his human freedom. It smashes, in the field of exchanged relations among individuals, the social idols as well. It emancipates humanity from its slavery. It puts an end to man worshipping man:

> *Say: "O People of the Book! Come to common terms as between us and you: that we worship none but Allah; that we associate no partners with Him; that we erect not, from among ourselves, lords and patrons other than Allah . . . "* (Qur'an, 3:64)

Man's submission to Allah makes all people stand on equal footing before the Hands of the worshipped Creator; there is no nation that has the right to colcaize and enslave another nation, nor is there a group of the society allowed to rob another group or violate its freedom, nor is there one human being who has the right to pose himself as an idol to be worshipped by others.

Once more do we find out that the second Qur'anic war for the purpose of liberation uses the same method it used in the first war; that is, the war to liberate man internally from the control of his desires, and it is used in all other Islamic epics, which is: tawhid. As long as man acknowledges submission to Allah alone, he would naturally reject any idol or fake worship of any person or being. He would lift his head up high with dignity, and he will not feel the humiliation of slavery and submissiveness to any power on earth or any idol. The phenomenon of idol-worship in man's life has been initiated for two reasons:

One of them is his slavery to his own desire which makes him yield his freedom to the human idol which can satisfy and guarantee the fulfilment of that desire. The other is his ignorance of what lie

behind those idolatrous masks professing deism of points of weakness and incapacity.

Islam has emancipated man from slavery to desire, as we have come to know above, and from the fakery of those deceitful idolatrous masks:

> *Those whom you call as gods other than Allah are but His servants like your own selves . . . !* (Qur'an, 7:194)

It naturally follows that he conquers idol-worship and wipes out from the Muslim minds idolatry in all its various shapes and hues.

In the light of the bases upon which stands the liberation of man from the slaveries of desire in the personal field, and his emancipation from idol-worship in the social, albeit if the idol is a nation, a group, or an individual . . ., can we know the individual's sphere of practical conduct in Islam. Islam is different from the modern western civilizations which does not restrict this practical freedom of the individual but those of others. Islam takes care, first of all, as we have already come to know, of emancipating the individual from the slavery of desires and idols, allowing him to behave as he pleases as long as he

does not go beyond Allah's limits. The Qur'an says:

هُوَالَّذِى خَلَقَ لَكُمْ مَا فِى ٱلْأَرْضِ جَمِيعًا . .

(البقرة ، ٢٩/٢)

It is He Who hath created for you all things that are on earth . . . (Qur'an, 2:29)

وَ سَخَّرَ لَكُمْ مَا فِى ٱلسَّمٰوَاتِ وَ مَا فِى الْأَرْضِ جَمِيعًا مِنْهُ . . . (الجاثية، ١٣/٤٥)

And He has subjected to you, as from him, all that is in the heavens and on earth . . . (Qur'an, 45:13)

Hence, Islam puts the cosmos in its entirity at the disposal of man of his freedom, but it is confined freedom to the limits which make it congenial with his internal liberation from the slavery of desire and his external liberation from the slavery of idols. As regarding practical freedom in adoring the desire and clinging to earth and all what this implies, renouncing human freedom in its true meaning. . .,

as regarding practical freedom in remaining silent about injustice and relinquishing right, worshipping idols and getting closer to them, persuing their own interests and giving up the real great and true message of man in this life . . ., all of this is not permitted in Islam, for it is nothing but the destruction of the deepest meanings of freedom in man; rather, Islam understands it to be part of a perfect intellectual and spiritual programme upon whose basis humanity must stand.

* * *

When we highlight this liberating and revolutionary facet of Islam in the social sphere, we do not imply thereby that it agrees with the democratic social norms of freedom in their particular western framework. While differing from the western civilization in its concept of the personal freedom, as we have come to know a short while ago, Islam also differs from it in its concept of the political, economic and intellectual freedom.

The western concept of political freedom expresses the basic idea of the western civilization which claims that man possesses himself, and nobody

has the right to give him directions. Political freedom has been a result of practising such basic idea in the political field, for as long as the structure, colour and laws of the social life affect all members of the society directly, then everybody has to participate in the operation of social construction as he pleases, and no individual may force another to do what he does not like or subject him by force to a system he does not accept.

Political freedom starts conflicting with the basic idea as soon as it faces the reality of life, for it is natural that the society contains numerous dif ferent views, and adopting some people's view means depriving others of their right to possess their own will and control their destiny. Here has the idea to adopt the majority's view come as a collaboration between the basic idea and political freedom. But it is an incomplete collaboration because the minority enjoys its rights of freedom and will just like the majority, and the majority's view deprives it from using its right . . . ; therefore, the principle of the majority is not more than a system whereby one group plays havoc with another group's rights, with only a numerical difference . . . !

We do not deny that the majority principle

maybe one accepted by all people; therefore, the minority tries hard to execute the view of the majority as being the one with more adherents, even though it spontaneously believes in another viewpoint and tries to attract the majority to it. But this is an assumption whose validity cannot be ascertained in all societies. There are many minorities that do not accept any view other than their own even if it opposes the majority view.

From this we can come to this summary: The basic idea of the western civilization, as soon as it functions in the political field, starts contradicting itself and facting the reality, turning to a norm of despotism and individualism in government shown in the best way by the majority ruling the minority.

Islam does not believe in this "basic idea" of the western civilization, for it is based on man worshipping Allah, and that Allah alone is man's Master and Sustainer, the only One Who has the right to arrange his life-style

. . . أَأَرْبَابٌ مُتَفَرِّقُونَ خَيْرٌ أَمِ اللَّهُ الْوَاحِدُ الْقَهَّارُ * . . .

إِنِ الْحُكْمُ إِلَّا لِلَّهِ أَمَرَ أَلَّا تَعْبُدُوا إِلَّا إِيَّاهُ . . .

(يوسف، ١٢/٣٩ – ٤٠)

. . . Are many lords differing among themselves better, or the One Allah, Supreme and Irresistible? . . ., the Command is for none but Allah. He hath commanded that ye worship none but Him: . . . (Qur'an, 12:39-40)

And it blames those individuals who yield themselves to others, granting them the right of Imamate in life and Divine upbringing

اتَّخَذُوا أَحْبَارَهُمْ وَرُهْبَانَهُمْ أَرْبَابًا مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ . . .

(التوبة ، ٩/٣١)

They take their priests and their anchorites to be their lords in derogation of Allah . . . (Qur'an, 9:31)

Therefore, neither the individual nor all the individuals together have the right to monopolize authority other than Allah, directing the social life and establishing its durricula and constitutions . . . !

Among the outcomes of such "equality" in this life we come to know that man's liberation politically is based upon the belief in the equality

of all society members in bearing the burdens of the Divine Trust and their cooperation in enacting Almighty Allah's commandments: "Everyone of you is in charge, and is responsible for those he is in charge of." Political equality in Islam differs in shape from its western counter-part. It is equality in bearing responsibility, not in ruling.

Among the results of this equality is man's emancipation in the political field from the control of others and the eradication of all norms of political exploitation, individualistic and class government.

For this reason do we find the glorious Qur'an renouncing Pharaoh's rule as well as the society he used to rule, for he symbolized the control of the individual over the government and the domination of one class over all other classes:

إِنَّ فِرْعَوْنَ عَلَا فِي الْأَرْضِ وَجَعَلَ أَهْلَهَا شِيَعًا يَسْتَضْعِفُ طَائِفَةً مِنْهُمْ... (القصص، ٢٨/٤)

Truly Pharaoh elated himself in the land and broke up its people into sections, depressing a small group among them... (Qur'an, 28:4)

Any political structure which allows an individual or class to exploit and subjugate other individuals or classes is not accepted in Islam, for it opposes the equality among the society members in bearing responsibility in their absolute submission to Allah Almighty.

As for the economic freedom, it is, in its capitalist concept, only a freedom in appearance which may be summarized thus: allowing every individual to behave as he pleases in the economic field without the interference or pressure of the ruling apparatus. Having permitted the individual to behave as he pleases, capitalism is not further concerned about securing anything he wants! In other words, it is not concerned with allowing him to want anything! For this purpose do we find out that economic freedom, in its materialistic concept, does not bear any meaning to those who were not allowed by opportunities to live, nor were the circumstances of competition and economic racing prepared for him! Thus does freedom become merely a mirage without being able to grant these people of its meaning except according to the amount of freedom it grants the individuals who are incapable of, say, swimming when we say to them: "You are free to swim as you please, wher-

ever you please! " If we really want to let them swim freely as they choose, giving them a chance to enjoy this sport as those who can swim enjoy it, we would have secured their safety during that and asked the expert swimmers to protect them, watch them and not abandon them while swimming else they should get drowned; hence, we would have really promoted true freedom and the capability to swim for all in reality, even though we may have restricted a little bit the activity of the expert swimmers for the sake of protecting the life of others.

This is exactly what Islam has done in the economic field: It called for both economic freedom and assurance, mingling them in a unified structure, for all are free in the economic field, but within certain limits. The individual is not free when the security of other individuals and the maintenance of the general welfare demand that he gives up some of his freedom.

Thus have the ideas of freedom and security been co-ordinated in Islam. [9]

As for intellectual freedom, this, according to western civilization, is permitting any individual to think, declare and propagate his ideas as he pleases, as long as he does not harm the concept of freedom

and the bases whereupon it hinges. For this reason, democratic societies try hard to oppose fascist ideas, limiting their freedom or annihilating them altogether, for such ideas fight the very same basic idea and intellectual base whereupon the concept of freedom and the democratic bases stand.

Islam differs from democratic capitalism in this situation as a result of its being different from it in the nature of the intellectual base it adopts which is tawhid and linking the cosmos to One Lord. It allows the human mind to set out and declare itself as long as it does not revolt against its intellectual base which is the true basis of the availability of freedom for mankind according to Islam, granting him his free and glorious character which does not dissolve before temptations, nor does it kneel down before idols. Both western civilization and Islam allow the intellectual freedom as long as there is no danger resulting therefrom against the essential base and freedom itself.

Among the fruits of the intellectual freedom in Islam is the war it wages against imitation and stagnant thinking, against mental submission to myths or to ideas of others without consciousness or scrutinization. Islam aims thereby towards the

creation of an analytical mind or an experimental one in man. It is not enough to establish the free mind in man by just saying to him: "You may think as you please", as has the western civilization done, for this expansion of freedom will be at the expense of freedom itself, and it quite often leads to hues of intellectual slavery symbolized in imitation, fanaticism and the glorification of superstitions. Rather, in order to create the free mind, according to Islam, man has to nurture the analytical or experimental mind which does not accept an idea without scrutinization, nor does it believe in a doctrine unless it is proved, so that this conscious mind may ensure the intellectual freedom and protect man from misusing it because of imitation, fanaticism or scruples. In fact, this is but the share of the Islamic struggle for the internal liberation of man. Just as it emancipated man's will from the slavery of temptation, as we have come to know before, so has it, liberated the human consciousness from the slavery of imitation, fanaticism and superstitions. In both this and that has man become free indeed in his mind and will.

. . . فَبَشِّرْ عِبَادِ * ٱلَّذِينَ يَسْتَمِعُونَ ٱلْقَوْلَ فَيَتَّبِعُونَ
أَحْسَنَهُ أُوْلَٰئِكَ ٱلَّذِينَ هَدَىٰهُمُ ٱللَّهُ وَأُوْلَٰئِكَ هُمْ أُولُوا
ٱلْأَلْبَابِ * (الزّمر، ٣٩/١٧ – ١٨)

. . . *So announce the god tidings to My servants, those who listen to the word, and follow the best* (meaning) *of it. Those are they whom Allah has guided; those - they are men possessed of mind.* (Qur'an, 39:17 -18)

. . . وَأَنزَلْنَآ إِلَيْكَ ٱلذِّكْرَ لِتُبَيِّنَ لِلنَّاسِ مَا نُزِّلَ إِلَيْهِمْ
وَلَعَلَّهُمْ يَتَفَكَّرُونَ * (النّحل، ١٦/٤٤)

. . . *And We have sent down unto thee* (also) *the message; that thou mayest explain clearly to men what is sent for them, and that they may give thought.* (Qur'an, 16:44)

. . . تِلْكَ أَمَانِيُّهُمْ قُلْ هَاتُوا بُرْهَانَكُمْ إِن كُنتُمْ صَادِقِينَ *

(البقرة، ٢/١١١)

. . . *Those are their* (vain) *desires. Say: "Produce your proof if ye are truthful."* (Qur'an, *2:111)*

وَإِذَا قِيلَ لَهُمُ اتَّبِعُوا مَا أَنزَلَ اللَّهُ قَالُوا بَلْ نَتَّبِعُ مَا أَلْفَيْنَا
عَلَيْهِ آبَاءَنَا أَوَلَوْ كَانَ آبَاؤُهُمْ لَا يَعْقِلُونَ شَيْئًا وَلَا يَهْتَدُونَ

(البقرة، ٢/١٧٥)

When it is said to them: "Follow what Allah hath revealed: " they say: "Nay! We shall follow the ways of our fathers. " What! Even though their fathers were void of wisdom and guidance?! (Qur'an, *2.170)*

INSURANCE IN ISLAM VS. MARXISM

Insurance in Islam differs from socialist insurance which is based upon the Marxist bases in many respects due to the difference between the two sys tems of insurance in the bases, frameworks and objectives.

We cannot attempt here except to display some of the aspects of such difference, having been satisfied with our detailed study thereof in our book *Our Economy*

1) Social Insurance in Islam: It is one of the human rights enforced by Allah Almighty. As such, it does not differ according to circumstances or civil levels. As for insurance according to Marxism, it is the right of the machine, rather than of man. When the producing machine reaches a particular point, social insurance becomes an essential condition for its growth and increase of production. Unless the producing powers reach this point, the idea of insurance does not make any sense. For this reason, Marxism considers insurance to belong to particular societies during a limited period of their history.

2) Islamic Concept of Practising Social Insurance: It is the result of fraternal sympathy prevalent in the Islamic society. Islamic brotherhood is the frame which does the role of insurance therein. The *hadith* says: "The Muslim is the brother of every Muslim; he neither does him injustice, nor does he abstain from his rescue. He does not deprive him. Therefore;

Muslims have to persevere, visit each other, cooperate with each other and console those who are in need."

As for Marxism, it regards social insurance, as nothing but the result of a huge and bitter struggle which must be enflamed and widened, so that when the class struggle starts, and one class victoriously wipes out the other, only then shall social insurance prevail . . . ! Insurance according to Marxism is but an expression of a tight unity and overwhelming fraternity; it hinges but upon a polar contradiction and a destructive struggle . . .!

3) Insurance, as a human right according to Islam, does not concern one group rather than the other. It concludes even those who are incapable of participating in the general production at all. They are, however, insured in the shade of the Islamic society, and the State has to make available for them all means of livelihood. As for the Marxist insurance, it derives its existence from the class struggle between the working class and the capitalist class the result of which is a victory for the working class and its cooperation with and participation in that wealth. For this purpose, there is no Marxist explanation

to the insurance of the life of those disabled who live far away from the class struggle because of their affiliation with the working class rather than the capitalist class, since they have no right to take any gains from the struggle and its booties . . .

4) Insurance according to Marxism is the responsibility of the State alone. In Islam, it is the responsibility of the individuals and the State; therefore, Islam has set two principles: one of them is the principle of general cooperation; and the other is the principle of social insurance.

The principle of cooperation means that each Muslim individual is responsible for ensuring the livelihood of others according to his capacity. Muslims should practise this principle even during the cases when they lose the State which practises the legislative injunctions. The *hadith* states that: "Any believer who denies another believer the use of something he needs, while he or someone else is able to let him do so, then Allah will resurrect him on the Day of Judgement with a black face, blue eyes, his hands tied up to his neck. It will be said: `This is a traitor who betrayed Allah and His Messenger'; then he will be thrown into Hell-fire."

The principle of social insurance determines the responsibility of the State in this respect. It has to ensure a level of honourable prosperity for all citizens from the State and general sources of income, and also from its budget.lo

For the clarification of this principle, the *hadith* says: "The ruler receives wealth and distributes it, according to the Commandments of Allah, to eight shares: to the poor, the destitutes, the tax-collectors, those who do not mind helping Muslims, the slaves, those incapable of. paying their debts in the Way of Allah and to those wayfarers who are unable to buy their journey back home. Eight shares he distributes among them, each according to his need, without stringency or fear. Whatever remains will be turned back to the ruler. Whatever lacks, and people do not have enough, the State has to finance their need from its own budget according to their need, so that they will all have enough."

* * * * *

NOTES

1. Refer to *Iqtisaduna* (Our Economy), pp. 3- 196.

2. This experiment won a great significance in the scientific field, having achieved an unexpected success in finding out many facts and unveiling surprising secrets which enabled mankind to utilize those secrets and facts in his practical life. The success it has achieved has won it sanctity in the minds of common people, making them depart from the abstract ideals and all facts which cannot show through the senses and experiments, so much so that the experimental sense has become, according to the doctrine of many experimentalists, the only basis for knowledge and science. We have explained in *Falsafatuna* (Our Philosophy) the fact that the experiment itself relies upon the mental intellect, and that the main basis for all knowledge and science is the mind which realizes facts the senses cannot feel as well as it does the concrete facts.

NOTES

3. Among the prevalent beliefs which used to enjoy a high degree of clarity and simplicity, although based neither upon an intellectually logical basis nor on a philosophical proof, was the belief that earth was the centre of the world. When such beliefs crumbled down in the shade of accurate experiments, the common notion was shaken, and a wave of doubt overtook many intellects, causing thereby the resurrection of Greek sophistry influenced by the doubting spirit just as it was influenced during the Greek period by the spirit of suspicion which had resulted from the contradictions of philosophical creeds and the intensity of arguments among them.

4. For the Church played a significant role in utilizing religion in a scandalizing manner, making its name nothing but a tool for the achievement of its own aims and objectives, strangling scientific and social liberties, establishing the inquisition courts and granting them wide prerogatives to fare with people's fate . . ., so much so that all of that resulted in people being fed up with religion and feeling disgusted with it, for crimes were being committed in its name, although in its pure reality and accurate essence not less than those grumbling critics in its renunciation of crime and desire in uprooting its motifs and results! ! !

5. I have explained these theories and undertaken a detailed scientific study thereof in my book *Iqtisaduna.*

6. Refer to *Iqtisaduna* p.307.

7. For this reason, the word "freedom", used in its general sense in genuine Islamic texts, cannot be charged of being influenced by the precepts of the Western civili zation. The Commander of the Faithfuls `Ali, peace be upon him, is quoted saying: "Do not be a slave to others since Allah has created you free." al-Imam Ja'far ibn Muhammad as-Sadiq, peace be upon him, has said "Five virtues: that who is without them does not really have much of any interest. First of them is faithfulness; the second is good management; the third is shyness; the fourth is good manners; and the fifth, which combines all of these virtues, is freedom."

8. See my article *(Freedom in the Qur'an)* printed in series: *(Ikhtarna laka),* Dar az-Zahra', Beirut, 1395/ 1975, pp.43-54.

9. For the purpose of elaboration, notice our study of capitalist democracy in *Iqtisaduna,* pp.247-269.

10. For detailed information, see *Iqtisaduna* (chapter on: The Economical Problems in view of Islam and their solutions), p.328 onwards.

* * * * *