

Thought

Hizb-ut-Tahrir

8th Safar 1393 -12th March 1973

Prologue

Four paragraphs of the original Arabic text have been omitted from this translation. The four paragraphs in question detail various examples of poems and prose highlighting issues related to Arabic grammar, syntax and literary style. Although it is possible to translate the paragraphs literally, to do so would result in English that fails to communicate the ideas that the author has endeavoured to address and that is perhaps even meaningless.

Thought

Truly man is the optimal creature; it is even said - which is a true statement - that he is superior to the angels. The superiority of man is reflected in his reason; for it is his reason that elevated his status and turned him into the optimal creature. Hence, it is imperative to perceive this reason and subsequently perceive thought. It is also imperative to perceive the method of thinking, because this reality known as thought is what renders to reason its value and yields these mellow fruits, with which life becomes virtuous, man becomes righteous and even the whole universe with everything in it, be it earth, vegetation and animals, becomes practicable. Sciences, arts, literature, philosophy, jurisprudence, languages and knowledge in itself are in fact the yield of reason and consequently the yield of thought. Hence, perceiving the reality of reason, what it is, thus perceiving the reality of thought and the method of thinking is imperative for man, life and the whole universe. Humanity has covered this long distance of life, and of this length of time, attending mainly to the yield of reason and the yield of thought, without attending to the reality of reason and the reality of thought.

It is true that there have been some attempts at perceiving the reality of reason, made by Muslim and non-Muslim scholars in the past and the present, but they failed to perceive this reality. There have also been some attempts at designing a method for thought; however, though they had succeeded in some aspects related to the fruits of this method, through the scientific achievements, they erred in recognising thought as it is, and they also misled other imitators who were seduced by this scientific success. Before that, the Greek savants and those who followed them embarked upon perceiving thought and succeeded in perceiving what is known as logic, as well as perceiving certain thoughts. However, they corrupted knowledge in its quality as knowledge. Hence, logic was a calamity upon knowledge instead of being - as it was meant to be - a vehicle towards attaining knowledge and a criterion for its soundness.

Furthermore, those who had set out to recognise thought, arrived at what is called philosophy, or what is known as the love of wisdom and the profound research into what is beyond existence, i.e. metaphysics; thus they established a delightful study that yielded pleasant results. However, it was far from reality and far from the truth. Consequently, philosophy alienated many away from the truth and it moved away from reality; thus it deceived many people and deviated thought from the correct path.

All of this and the like, if we can so to speak call it a research about thought and the method of thinking, despite the fact that it occasioned a host of information and a field of research, and although it has generated what could be described as useful to humanity, it was not however devoted to the reality of thought and was not proceeding in the correct path. Hence, it is not deemed as a study in the reality of thought; it is rather a study in the results and fruits of thought. Also it was not a straight method of thinking, but rather a style of this method that came accidentally as a result of the study in the yield of reason or in the fruits; it did not come through a study in the reality of thought.

Therefore, one can say that the research in a straight method of thinking is still a mere host of attempts revolving around the yield of thought and not the reality of thought itself.

As for the cause behind the failure in discovering the reality of thought, thus discovering the method of thinking, it is due to the fact that researchers had studied thought before studying reason. It is impossible to arrive at the reality of thought before recognising the reality of reason in a certain and decisive manner, because thought is the fruit of reason, while sciences, arts and all other types of culture are the fruit of thought. Hence, it is imperative to recognise the reality of reason first in a certain and decisive manner, then it would be possible to recognise the reality of thought and a straight method of thinking. Afterwards, and in the light of this it would be possible to judge whether knowledge is a science or not. In other words, it would be possible to perceive that chemistry is a science and that psychology and sociology are not sciences; and it would be possible to judge whether knowledge is a culture or not, i.e. it would be possible to perceive that legislation is culture and that painting is not culture. The issue as a whole is built upon the basis of recognising the reality of reason in a certain and decisive manner, then in the light of this knowledge, the reality of thought and consequently the method of thinking are studied; and in the light of this study, one can arrive in a sound manner at the style or the styles of thought. This is the issue, for the attainment of science and culture is the result of recognising the reality of thought as well as the method and the style of thinking. Arriving at the reality of thought must be the result of recognising the reality of reason. Hence, it is imperative to recognise the reality of reason in a certain and decisive manner, then recognise the reality of thought.

Those who described what is reason, i.e. those who attempted to recognise the reality of reason number many, whether in the past, from among the Greek philosophers, the Muslim scholars and the Western savants, or in modern times. However, these definitions, or in other words, those attempts, do not contain anything worth mentioning, nor anything that rises to the level of being worth

reviewing, except for the attempt of the communist savants. Their definition alone can perhaps be worth mentioning and can rise to the level of being worth a review, because it was a serious attempt that was only spoiled by their erroneous persistence on denying that existence has a creator. Had it not been for this persistence on denying the existence of a creator, they would have arrived at perceiving the reality of reason in a true manner, i.e... they would have arrived at recognising the reality of reason in a definite and decisive manner. They embarked upon studying reality and thought and said: "*Did thought exist before reality? Or did reality exist before thought and thought was the result of reality?*" They differed about this and some said that thought existed before reality, while others said that reality existed before thought. They finally decided that reality existed before thought and based on this, or as a consequence of this, they arrived at defining thought. Hence they said: "*Thought is the reflection of reality on the brain.*"

Therefore, their knowledge of the reality of thought is that it is a reality, a brain and a process of reflection of this reality upon the brain; thus thought is the result of reality's reflection upon the brain.

This is their opinion. It is an opinion that denotes a sound research and a serious attempt which is close to the truth. Had it not been for their persistence in denying the fact that this reality has a creator that created it and had it not been for their persistence that existence is eternal, this error in perceiving the reality of thought would not have occurred; because it is true that there is no thought without reality and that every knowledge devoid of a reality is in fact fiction or senility. Hence, reality is the basis of thought and thought is in fact an expression of a reality or a judgement of that reality. Reality is the basis of thought and the basis of thinking, for in the absence of reality it would be impossible to generate thought or thinking. Furthermore, passing judgement on reality and even everything within man as well as everything emitted by him is linked to the brain. Hence, the brain is the fundamental and basic centre in man. Therefore, it would be impossible to generate any thought unless there existed a brain, and the brain itself is a reality. Hence, the existence of the brain is a fundamental condition for the existence of thought and the existence of reality is a fundamental condition for the existence of thought.

Therefore, in order to have reason, i.e. to have the process of thinking or thought, it is imperative to have a reality and a brain. The Communist savants discovered these two elements. In other words they discovered that in order to have reason there must be a reality and a brain and that their existence together is a main and fundamental condition for the existence of thought, i.e. for the existence of reason. Hence, their attempt was serious and sound, and up to that point they had been proceeding along the straight path that would have led them to recognising the

reality of reason in a certain and decisive manner; however, when they attempted to link reality to the brain in order to arrive at thought, i.e. to generate the process of thinking, they lost their way and they made the link between them the reflection of this reality upon the brain. Hence, they ended up with the wrong outcome with regard to the recognition of reason, thus they gave reason the wrong definition. The main cause of this was their persistent denial of the fact that this existence has a creator who created it out of nothing. This is so because if they had said that knowledge preceded thought, they would have faced the home truth, namely the issue of where had thought come from before the existence of reality? Surely it must have come from other than reality. Consequently, where did the thought of the first man come from? Surely it came from other than him and from other than reality. Hence, the first man and reality have both been created by He who gave the first man knowledge. This is contradictory to what they hold in terms of decisive knowledge that the world is eternal and that reality is also eternal. Hence, they claimed that the reflection of reality upon the brain was reason, for it is this reflection that generated thought and through it the process of thinking was generated. In order to dodge the inevitability of knowledge's presence, they attempted to generate a host of phantasms and hypotheses, namely that the first man had experimented reality and managed to acquire knowledge. Then these experiments on reality were used as information that helped him in further experiments on reality, and so on.

They also insisted that reality and the reflection of the brain upon it is reason and it is thought and that it is what generates the process of thinking. They were obscured to the difference between sensation and reflection and to the fact that the process of thinking did not originate from the reflection of reality upon the brain, nor from the impress of reality on the brain; it rather came from sensation, whose centre is the brain. Were it not for the sensation of reality, no thought would be occasioned nor would any process of thinking be generated.

Their failure to differentiate between sensation and reflection rubbed salt into their wounds and deviated them from the path in which they had been proceeding; thus they blundered in their definition of reason. However, the fundament of their error was not reflected in their failure to differentiate between sensation and reflection, for otherwise they would have been able to discover that the point at issue is one of sensation and not reflection; the fundament of their error and deviation stemmed from their denial of the fact that this existence has a creator. Hence, they failed to perceive that the presence of previous information about this reality is an essential condition in the formation of reason. In other words, reality is an essential condition in the generation of the process of thinking thus becoming a vital condition in the formation of reason, i.e. in order for thought or the process of thinking to be occasioned. Otherwise, the donkey would be judged to possess the

quality of reasoning because it has a brain and reality does get reflected upon its brain, i.e. the donkey does sense reality. Reason is one of man's qualities and it was said in the past that man is a speaking animal i.e. a thinking creature because thought or reasoning is exclusive to him and no other living soul possesses reason or thought apart from him.

Nevertheless, the communist savants are the only ones to have made a serious attempt at perceiving the meaning of reason and to have proceeded in the straight path towards recognising the reality of reason. Although they blundered in their definition of reason and although they strayed from the path in which they had been proceeding towards reaching this knowledge in a certain and conclusive manner, they however paved the way for others to tread this path and attain this conclusive and decisive knowledge.

Although the Muslims do have what proves that the presence of previous information about a matter is indispensable in recognising it and although this is correct, to consider this fact a description of reality and considering that the aim is to compel all humans to the definition of reason, it would be imperative to have the definition of reason based upon the sensed and tangible reality, because the aim is to compel all humans, not just the Muslims from amongst them.

Allah (swt) says: ***“And He taught Adam the names of all things, He then placed them before the angels and said: Tell me the names of these if you are right. They said: Glory be to You, we have no knowledge save for what You have taught us. It is You Who is perfect in knowledge and wisdom. He said O Adam inform them of their names. When he had told them Allah said: Did I not tell you that I know the secrets of heavens and earth and I know what you reveal and what you conceal.”*** [TMQ 2-31,32,33]

These verses indicate that previous information is indispensable in attaining any kind of knowledge. Adam was taught by Allah (swt) the names or the specifics of things, so when they were displayed to him, he recognised them. Hence, the first man, Adam, was given information by Allah (swt) and he therefore recognised these things. Had it not been for this information he would not have recognised them.

Since the fundamental deviation in the path trodden by the communist savants, in their quest towards recognising the reality of reason was reflected in the necessity of having previous information, this would be sufficient to highlight the aspect of deviation and to prove that the presence of previous information about the reality being displayed to the brain is imperative. However, since the aim is to compel all people and not just the Muslims, it becomes incumbent upon us to exhibit the

sensed and manifest reality that stipulates the indispensability of having previous information about reality in order to bring about thought, i.e. in order for reason to be formed and exist. This is so because reason's existence depends on the availability of previous information to the brain, though reality is a precondition for the existence of the rational process, i.e. for the generation of thought and the process of thinking.

Hence, in order to follow the correct path in which the communists had been proceeding before they deviated, it would be insufficient to merely perceive that the process involves the brain's sensing of reality and not the reality's reflection on the brain, because this is easy and it does not constitute the fundament of the deviation. The fundament is rather related to the presence of previous information about reality in order to generate the rational process i.e. in order for reason to exist. It has already been established that what in fact occurs in the process is the sensation of reality by the brain and not the reflection of reality upon the brain; it has also been perceived before and after this, from our understanding of the noble Quranic verse and from the exhibiting of the sensed and manifest reality, that previous information about reality or what is related to it is indispensable for reason, i.e. for perception; in other words for the existence of reason. It would be impossible for reason or perception to be occasioned without this information, meaning that reason would have no reality. Hence, the meaning of reason was perceived and then it was defined soundly in a conclusive and decisive manner.

As for the perception of the fact that what occurs in the process of thinking, i.e. the rational process, is sensation and not reflection, this is because there exists no reflection between matter and the brain. The brain does not reflect itself upon the matter, nor matter reflects itself upon the brain, because reflection requires the presence of the ability of reflection in the matter that reflects things, such as the mirror or light, thus they require the ability of being reflected upon. The brain and matter lack this ability, thus there is absolutely no reflection between the brain and matter because matter does not get reflected on the brain nor does it get transferred to it. What in fact is transferred is the sensation of matter to the brain through the senses. In other words, it is the senses that sense matter in any of the five senses, and this sensation moves to the brain which passes judgement upon it. The transmission of the sensed matter to the brain is not a reflection of matter upon the brain, nor is it a reflection of the brain upon matter; it is rather a sensation of matter and there is no difference in this between the eye and the other senses. Sensation occurs through touching, smelling, tasting, hearing and seeing.

Therefore, what in fact occurs from things is not a reflection upon the brain, but a sensation of things. Man senses things through his five senses and things do not reflect themselves upon his brain. This is as clear as daylight with regard to

material things, for what occurs is sensation. As for the non material things, be it abstract or spiritual, these must also be sensed in order for the rational process about them to take place. For instance, it would be imperative to sense the decline of a society before judging it to be declined, and this is a material matter. Likewise, it would be imperative to sense that a matter or an action wounds the pride before judging the pride to be wounded or that the matter has a cutting edge that wounds the pride; and this would be an abstract matter. As for what angers Allah (swt), one needs to sense that such action or thing provokes Allah (swt), i.e. it contains what angers the Supreme Being (swt), and this is a spiritual matter. Without the presence of that sensation, it would be impossible for the rational process to occur, be it in material or abstract things.

However, in the material things, the sensation occurs naturally, though its strength and weakness depends on the perception of their nature; thus it is said that the intellectual sensation is the strongest. As for the abstract matters, their sensing can only occur through the presence of an understanding of these matters or by way of imitation.

Anyhow, the fact that what occurs is a sensation and not a reflection is almost axiomatic, though in material things it is clearer than in the abstract matters. However, this is not essential, for this is tangible to every human being and there is no conflict of opinion over it, save for that fact that the way it has been described may be contradictory to reality as is the case with those who described it as being a reflection, or it may be reality itself as we have described it as being sensation or sense. However, the previous information about reality was the fundament of the deviation, for this made the error of the communist savants horrific. Also, because the previous information is the quintessence in the issue of reason i.e. it represents the main function in the rational process.

To sum up the topic of previous information, sensation alone does not generate thought, but what occur is purely a sensation, i.e. a sensing of reality. One sensation plus another sensation plus a million sensations, no matter how diverse the sensations were, would only lead to sheer sensation, and no thought whatsoever could be generated. It is essential for man to have previous information with which he could explain the reality that he had sensed in order for thought to be occasioned. Let us take the current man, any man, and let us give him a book written in the Syriac language, about which he has no previous information; if we were to allow his sensation to come into contact with the writing by way of seeing and touching and if we were to repeat this sensation a million times, he would not be able to recognise one single word, until he is given information about the Syriac language and about what is related to it. Only then could he start to think about it and perceive it. It would be wrong to say that this is specific to languages which

are manmade, thus requiring information, because the point at issue is a rational process and the process is a process of reason, be it with regard to enacting a rule, or understanding a meaning or perceiving a fact. The rational process is one and the same in everything. Thinking about a problem is like thinking about an onion and understanding the meaning of a word is like perceiving a reality, each one of them requires a rational process and the rational process is one in everything, in every matter and in every reality.

In order to avoid provoking an argument about the language and reality, let us look directly at reality. Let us take a child who has sensation but lacks information and let us place before him a piece of gold, a piece of copper and a stone, allowing all his sensations to partake in sensing these objects, he would not be able to perceive them no matter how numerous and no matter how diverse these sensations were. However, if he were given information about these objects and then if he were to sense them, he would use this information to perceive these objects. If this child were to grow up and reach twenty years of age, he would remain like the first day, sensing the objects but unable to perceive them no matter how developed his brain becomes, because what makes him perceive is not the brain, but rather the previous information with the brain and with the reality that he senses.

Let us also take a four year old child who is yet to see a lion, a dog and an elephant or hear about them, and who is also yet to see the scales or hear about them. If we were to show him a lion, scales, a dog and a elephant, or if we were to show the pictures of a lion, scales, a dog and an elephant, and then ask the child to identify any of these things or their names or what they are, he would not be able to recognise anything and he would not be able to generate any rational process towards these things. Also, if we were to teach him their names by heart, but in isolation from these things and without any link between them and their names, and if we were to afterwards display these things before him and tell him: "*This is their names, i.e. the names that you had memorised are names for these things.*", he would still be unable to recognise any of their names. However, if we were to give him the name of each one of these things and guide him towards its reality or towards the picture of that reality and then linked the name to that reality until he learnt the names with each name linked to its own reality, he would then be able to perceive each thing by its name, i.e. to perceive what that thing is: Is it a lion, or scales. He would not make mistakes and if we attempted to confuse him, he would not go along with us, but he would persist that this is a lion, in reference to the lion and its picture and these are scales, in reference to the very scales and their picture, and so on. Hence, the issue is not related to reality nor is it related to the sensing of reality. It is rather related to the previous information about reality, i.e. the information linked to reality according to his knowledge, or related to reality according to his own knowledge.

Hence, the previous information about reality or the previous information related to that reality is a fundamental and an essential condition for the rational process to be occasioned, i.e. a fundamental and a basic condition for reason to exist. This is with regard to rational perception; as for the sensory perception, it stems from the instincts and the organic needs and what occurs in animals occurs in man as well. Man would recognise after giving him an apple and a stone repeatedly that the apple is edible and the stone is not. Likewise, a donkey would recognise that barley is edible and that sand is not. However, this distinction is not thought nor perception, it is rather related to the instincts and the organic needs and it is existent in animals as it is existent in man. Hence, it is impossible to occasion thought unless the previous information was available together with the transmission of reality through the senses to the brain.

What many people are equivocal to is that previous information are generated from one's own experiments and they are also generated through acquisition. According to them, the experiments themselves generate information, thus it is the first experiments that generated the rational process. This confusion is removed by merely drawing one's attention to the difference between man's brain and the animal's brain in terms of linkage and by merely drawing one's attention to the difference between what is related to the instincts and the organic needs and what is related to the judgement passed upon things as to what they are. As for the difference between the animal's brain and that of man, the animal's brain does not possess the ability to link information, it rather has the ability to recollect the sensation if this were repeated. This recollection - with regard to the animal performing it naturally - is specific to what is related to the instincts and the organic needs and it does not exceed this domain. For if one was to ring the bell and feed the dog when ringing the bell and if one were to repeat this process the dog would discern that food is coming, thus it would salivate. Likewise if a donkey were to see a jenny, he would be aroused, but if he were to see a bitch, this would not arouse him. Also, cows tend to avoid poisonous and harmful grass when grazing. All of this and the like is in fact instinctive distinction. As for what certain animals tend to learn in terms of movements or actions unrelated to the instincts, they perform these actions by way of imitation and mimicry, not by way of reasoning and perception. The brain of an animal lacks the ability of linkage; it rather has a recollection of sensation and instinctive distinction. Hence, it senses everything related to the instinct and everything it senses could be recollected by its brain, especially if this sensation is repeated. Hence, animals perform naturally anything related to the instinct, whether they sensed it in the first instance or they recollected this sensation. As for that which is not related to the instinct, it would impossible for animals to perform it naturally if they sensed it. however, if this sensation were repeated and the animals recollected it, it would be possible for them to perform it by way of imitation and mimicry, but not naturally.

This is contrary to man, whose brain possesses the ability of linking information and not just the recollection of sensation. One would meet a person in Baghdad, then ten years later, would see him in Damascus; thus he would recollects his first sensation of that person, but due to the lack of information about this person, he would not link him to anything. However, if he were to meet this person in Baghdad and take some information about him, he would link his presence in Damascus to the previous information about him, thus perceiving the purport of his visit to Damascus. By contrast, if an animal were to recollect the sensation of that person, it would not perceive the purport of his visit; it would rather sense what is related to its instincts when seeing that person. Hence, animals recollect the sensation but do not link the information even if these were passed on to them by way of teaching and mimicry.

Man however, does recollect sensation and does link information. Man's brain has the ability of linkage and of recollecting sensation, but animals do not possess this linkage ability, what they rather possess is merely the recollection of sensation.

As for the difference between what is related to the instincts and the organic needs and what is related to passing judgement upon things as to what they are, man is capable of recollecting sensation with regard to what is instinct related if this sensation is repeated and he is also capable, thanks to the ability of linkage, to formulate information out of the sum of what he senses and what he recollects in terms of sensations, and he is capable of recollecting the sensations together with their information with regard to what is related to the instincts and the organic needs. However, he is incapable of linking this information to anything other than what is related to the instincts and the organic needs. In other words, he is incapable of linking them when it comes to passing judgement upon the thing as to what it is. Hence, previous information is indispensable in the linkage and the distinguishing feature between man and animals is reflected in the ability of linkage.

The fact that man could discern from the floating of wood that it is possible to make a boat from wood is like the monkey discerning that bringing down a banana from a suspended cluster could occur by hitting the cluster with a stick or something. All of this is related to the instincts and the organic needs and its occurrence, even if it were linked and turned into information, it would still be considered as a process of recollection and not a linkage process. Hence, it is not a rational process and it does not indicate that there is reason or thought. What in fact indicates the existence of reason or thought and what is truly a rational process is the judgement passed upon things as to what they are, and passing judgement upon things as to what they are cannot be achieved without a linkage process and a linkage with previous information. Therefore, the presence of previous information

is imperative to any linkage process in order to generate reason or thought, i.e. in order to generate the rational process.

Many people attempt to bring into the argument the first man and how, through his experiments and the information accumulated through these experiments, he discovered thought and the process of thinking, in order to arrive from this at proving that when reality itself is reflected upon the brain, or when man senses it, it makes him think and it generates in him a rational process, i.e. it generates in him thought or a process of thinking.

Although what we have stated so far, namely that this is a recollection process and not a linkage process, and that it is specific to the instincts and could not apply to the judgement of things as to what they are, is sufficient to disprove and answer this assumption, the point at issue is not a study of the first man, nor is it related to assumptions, conjectures and phantasms; it is rather related to man in his quality as such. Hence, instead of taking the first man and comparing him with the actual man, thus comparing the present with the absent, we ought to take the actual man, who is before us and whom we can see and sense, and then compare the absent with the present, for what applies to the actual man through sensation and observation, applies also to every man, even the first man. Hence, it would be wrong to reverse the evidence; it should rather be conveyed from its correct standpoint. The actual man is before us. We can see and sense him, so let us subject him to the rational process with regard to what is related to the instinct and what is related to the judgement passed upon things as to what they are; let us then observe the recollection, the linkage and the difference between them. We will deduce that to any man, previous information is essential for the linkage process, thus it is indispensable in the rational process. This is contrary to the recollection of sensation, for this is found in man and in animals and it does not constitute a rational process, nor is it reason or thought or a thinking process. The little child who does not recognise things and has no information, and who can acquire information is the truthful proof about the meaning of reason.

Therefore, reason is only existent in man and the rational process could only be performed by man. The instincts and the organic needs exist in man and in animals and their sensations, as well as the recollection of these sensations are also existent in man and in animals. However, all of this is not reason, nor perception, nor thought, nor a process of thinking; it is rather instinctive distinction and nothing else. As for reason, it requires a brain that has the quality of linking information, and this is only existent in man. Hence, the rational process could only take place with the presence of the linkage ability. This linkage ability links information with reality. The presence of previous information about reality is therefore imperative for any rational process, be it for the first man or the actual man, and the previous

information must be present before this reality that faces the person who wants to perceive it. This is why the first man must have had previous information about reality before the reality had been displayed before him. This is what Allah (swt)'s saying about Adam, the first man, denotes: "***And He taught Adam all the names.***" [TMQ]. He (swt) then said: "***O Adam! Inform them of their names.***" [TMQ]. Hence, previous information is a fundamental and basic condition for the rational process i.e. for the meaning of reason.

The communist savants proceeded towards perceiving the meaning of reason; hence, they perceived that there ought to be a reality in order for the rational process to occur. They also perceived that there ought to be a human brain in order for the rational process to occur; thus they proceeded in the right path. However, they erred when it came to expressing the linkage between the brain and reality and they expressed it as being a reflection and not a sensation. However, they completely deviated when they denied the necessity of having to have previous information so that the rational process could be achieved, and without the presence of this previous information, it cannot be achieved in any way whatsoever. Therefore, the straight path that leads to recognising the meaning of reason in a certain and conclusive manner is that it is incumbent to have four elements in order for the rational process to take place, i.e. in order for reason or thought to be generated. It is imperative to have reality, a sound brain, sensation and previous information. These four elements together, must be fulfilled altogether as a combined unit, in order for the rational process to be achieved, i.e. in order for reason, or thought, or perception to be generated. Therefore, reason, or thought or perception is the process of transferring the sensation of reality through the senses to the brain, with the presence of previous information with which this reality is explained. This is the only sound definition and there is absolutely no other definition whatsoever. This definition is binding upon all people at all times, because it is the only authentic description of reason's reality and it is the only description that conforms with the reality of reason.

Once we comprehend the meaning of reason in a decisive and conclusive manner, and once we comprehend the definition of reason in a decisive and conclusive manner, it becomes incumbent upon us to embark upon perceiving the manner with which reason functions in order to attain the thoughts, i.e. to perceive the method according to which reason produces thoughts. This is the method of thinking. There is a style for thinking and there is a method for thinking. As for the style of thinking, this is the manner that the study of the matter dictates, whether this were a material and tangible, or an abstract matter; it could also be the means which the study of the matter necessitates. Hence, the styles may diversify, change and differ according to the type, the alteration and the variation of the matter. As for the method, it is the manner by which the rational process i.e. the process of

thinking occurs according to its nature and according to its reality. Therefore, the method does not change, it rather remains as it is and evidently it does not diversify nor does it differ. Hence, it is inevitable for it to be permanent and fixed and it is inevitable for it to be the basis in the thinking process no matter how diverse the styles were.

The method of thinking, i.e. the manner according to which reason produces thoughts, no matter what these thoughts were, is in itself the definition of reason, meaning that it is what agrees with the reality of reason, and it does not deviate from it in any way whatsoever. Hence the name of the “Rational Method”, which is in reference to reason itself. The definition of this method, i.e. the Rational Method, is that it is a specific way of research, pursued in order to reach knowledge about the essence of the thing that one is researching, this by transferring the sensation of reality, through the senses to the brain, with the presence of previous information by which reality is explained; thus the brain issues its judgement upon it. This judgement is thought or rational perception. This method is utilised in researching tangible matters, such as physics and in researching thoughts, such as the research of doctrines and legislation, as well as perceiving the speech, such as the research of literature and Fiqh i.e. jurisprudence. This method is the natural method to reach perception per se, and its process is that which the reasoning or the perceiving of things is formed, and it is in itself the definition of reason, and it is according to its method, that man can reach, in his quality as man, the perception of anything that he had already perceived in the past or that he aims at perceiving.

This is the rational method and it is the only method of thinking. Any other method referred to as a thinking method, such as the scientific method or the logical method, these are either a branch of the rational method, as is the case with the scientific method, or a style of this method necessitated by the study of the matter, or a means of study of the matter, as is the case with the logical method. These are not basic methods of thinking, for the method of thinking is one and does not diversify, that the rational method and none else.

However, a distinction must be made with regard to the definition of this method between the previous opinions about the matter and the previous information about it or about what is related to it. What is inevitable in the rational process is not the presence of an opinion or opinions about reality, but rather the presence of previous information about it or related to it. Hence, it is the presence of information that is incumbent, not the presence of an opinion. As for the previous opinion, or previous opinions about reality, it would be wrong to have them; i.e. it would be wrong to utilise them in the rational process. What is rather utilised must be exclusively the information, while the presence of an opinion during the process

must be avoided and not allowed to interfere. This is so because if the previous opinion were used, it would cause an error in perception, for it could influence the information and interpret them wrongly, hence the error in perception. Therefore, it is essential to note the differentiation between the previous opinion and the information, and to utilise the information only to the exclusion of the opinion.

If the rational method were used soundly, this by transferring the sensation of reality, through the senses to the brain, with the presence of previous information - not previous opinions - by which, i.e. the previous information, reality is explained, with the opinions excluded, hence the brain issues its judgement upon this reality; if this method were used soundly, it would yield sound results. However, the result that one reaches must be looked into, for if this result were a judgement upon the existence of the thing, it would then be conclusive and error could absolutely and under no circumstances whatsoever creep into it. This is because this judgement has come through the sensation of reality and it is impossible for the sense to err about the existence of reality, for the senses' sensation of reality's existence is conclusive; thus the judgement that reason passes upon the existence of reality in this method is conclusive.

However, if this result were a judgement upon the essence of the thing, or the quality of the thing, it would then be doubtful, with the possibility of error. This is because this judgement has come by way of information or analysis of the sensed reality with the information, in which case, error could creep into such a result; it would remain however a sound thought until its error is discovered. Only then it would be judged as a false result, but before that it remains a sound result and a correct thought. Therefore, the thoughts which reason attains through the rational method of thinking are conclusive if these were related to the existence of the thing, such as the doctrines; if they are related to passing judgement upon the essence or the attribute of the thing, such as the Shari'ah rules, they would be doubtful thoughts, i.e. the rule on a thing or a matter is probably such and such, thus they are correct but they may be wrong and they remain correct until the error becomes patent.

The rational method is the method according to which man, in his quality as such, thinks and passes judgement upon things and according to which he attempts at perceiving the essences and attributes of things, regardless of whether this method is defined in a sound or an erroneous manner.

However, the West, meaning Europe then America, who were afterwards joined by Russia, generated in Europe the industrial revolution and achieved a great success in experimental science. Since the 19th century the Western sphere of influence spread until it engulfed the whole world. The West named the style of

research in experimental science as a scientific method of thinking, hence the so-called scientific method emerged and it was propagated as the method of thinking and the West made it the basis of thought. The communist savants adopted this method and utilised in experimental sciences as well as in other than experimental sciences.

The European savants proceeded according to this method in experimental sciences and so did the American savants; as a result of the influence and dominance of the West and that of the Soviet Union, the rest of the world followed suit in adopting this method, until it became prevalent throughout the world. Consequently, society in the Islamic world as a whole sanctified the scientific thoughts and the scientific method. Hence, it is imperative to explain this scientific method.

The scientific method is a specific procedure of research, utilised to attain knowledge about the essence of matter being researched, by way of carrying out experiments upon the matter. This method is confined to physical matters and is not applicable to thoughts. Hence, it is specific to experimental sciences and it entails subjecting matter to other than its original conditions and elements, observing matter and the original conditions and elements and then deducing from this procedure on the matter a material and tangible fact, as is the case in laboratories.

This method imposes the abandonment and the non-existence of all previous information about the matter being researched; then it sets about observing and testing the matter. This method makes it incumbent to erase from oneself every previous opinion and every previous belief that one might have held with regard to this research; then one would start by observing and testing, then move to comparison and classification, then to deduction based upon these scientific preludes. If one were to achieve a result, this would be a scientific result based evidently upon research and investigation, yet it remains scientific as long as scientific research does not prove the error in any of its aspects. Hence, the result reached by the researcher according to the scientific method is not conclusive but rather doubtful and susceptible to error, despite the fact that it is referred to as a scientific fact or a scientific law. According to what is established in scientific research, this susceptibility to error within the scientific method is one of the basis that must be always observed.

This is the scientific method and one concludes from its study that it is a sound method. It is also sound to call it a method because it is a permanent and specific procedure of research. The method is the manner that does not change. The error stems from making this method the basis of the process of thinking. This is so

because making it a basis is unfeasible, for it is not a basis that one could build upon; it is rather a branch that is built upon a basis. Also, because turning it into a basis would exclude most of knowledge and facts from the research and it would also lead to judging a great deal of knowledge as being non-existent, despite the fact that this knowledge is studied, contains many facts and is effectively existent and tangible through the sense and through reality.

Hence, the scientific method is a sound method, but it is not a basis in the process of thinking; it is rather a fixed style of thinking. It is not applicable to every matter, but can only be applied to one single matter, namely the tangible matter in order to recognise its essence by carrying out experiments upon it. This method can only be practicable in researching tangible matters, thus it is specific to experimental sciences and is not utilised in other than that.

As for the fact that it is not a basis, this is evident in two aspects:

1. One cannot proceed according to it unless previous information were present, even if these were basic information, because thinking is impossible without the presence of previous information. The physics scientist, the chemistry scientist and the scientist in the laboratory cannot proceed for one single second in the scientific method unless they had previous information available to them. As for their claim that the scientific method necessitates abandoning the previous information, they mean by this abandoning the previous opinions not the previous information. In other words, the scientific method necessitates from the researcher if he wanted to carry out a research to erase from his mind every previous opinion and every previous belief he might have had with relation to this research and to start by the observation and experimentation, then comparison and classification, and then by deduction built upon these scientific premises. Though this method is tantamount to observation, experiment and deduction, it does however require information. These data would have come from other than observation and experiment, i.e. from transferring reality through the senses, because the basic information of the first scientific research cannot possibly be experimental information, for this would not have occurred yet. Hence, it must be by way of transferring reality through the senses to the brain. In other words, information must have come via the rational method. Therefore, the scientific method cannot be a basis. Rather the rational method is the basis with the scientific method built upon this basis, thus it is a branch of the rational method not a basis for it. It is therefore wrong to establish the scientific method as a basis for thought.
2. The scientific method stipulates that all that which is not physically sensed has no existence from this method's viewpoint; thus there is no existence for logic,

history, politics, nor for many other types of knowledge, because these are intangible and they cannot be subjected to experiment. According also to the scientific method's viewpoint, Allah, the angels, the devils and other beings do not exist, for all this has not been scientifically established. In other words, it has not been established through observation and experiment on the matter and the material deduction of things. This is the flagrant error of this method because natural sciences are one branch of knowledge and one type of thought, while the rest of the types of knowledge in life are diverse and numerous, and these have not been established through the scientific method, but rather through the rational method. The existence of Allah has been established through the rational method in a conclusive manner and the existence of the angels and the devils has been established through the conclusive text, which is definite in meaning and whose decisiveness and definite meaning have been established through the rational method as well. Hence, it would be wrong to adopt the scientific method as a basis for thought, for its failure and inability to prove the existence of something that exists in a conclusive manner, serve as a decisive proof that it is not a basis for thought.

Furthermore, the susceptibility of error in the scientific method is one of the basis that must be remarked in it, according to what is established within the scientific research. Errors in the results of this method have effectively occurred and this was manifest in many scientific fields of knowledge. These were exposed as erroneous after they had been established as scientific facts. The atom for instance used to be known as the smallest particle of matter and that it did not split. Then the error of this was revealed and it became established through the same scientific method that the atom splits. It used to be also said that matter was inexhaustible; then the error of this theory was exposed and it became established through the same scientific method that matter was exhaustible. Likewise, many of what had been considered as scientific facts and scientific law was discovered through the scientific method itself that they were wrong and that they were never scientific facts nor were they a scientific law. Hence, the scientific method is not a conclusive method but a doubtful one. It yields doubtful results about the existence, the attribute and the essence of the thing. Hence, it would be wrong to adopt the scientific method as a basis in thought.

Nevertheless, it is a sound method of thinking and can be considered a method of thinking, but only suitable in experimental sciences; in other words, it is only suitable in what is possibly subject to observation, experiment and then comparison and sequencing. It is absolutely impossible to apply this method to other than this domain, for it is specific to experimental sciences and nothing else. Although it is possible to deduce thoughts through the scientific method, but one cannot originate a thought exclusively through this method, for it cannot originate

any new thought as is the case in the rational method. It rather deduces new thoughts, but these remain deduced thoughts and not newly originated thoughts.

The thoughts that are newly originated are those obtained directly by reason. Hence, recognising Allah's existence and recognising that thinking about one's folk is superior to personal thinking about oneself as well as recognising that wood burns, that oil floats on water and that thinking of an individual is stronger than that of a group of people, all these are thoughts taken directly by reason. This is contrary to the thoughts that are not newly originated, namely the thoughts deduced according to the scientific method, for these have not been obtained directly through reason, but they have been obtained from several thoughts which reason had previously obtained alongside the experiments. Therefore, recognising that water is composed of oxygen and hydrogen, that the atom splits and that matter is exhaustible, all these are thoughts which reason had not obtained directly and they had not been newly originated. They had rather been obtained from thoughts which reason had previously obtained. Then experiments were carried out alongside these thoughts, then the thought was deduced; thus it is not a new origination but rather a deduction from existent thoughts and through experiment. Hence, it would be wrong to consider this process a new origination, for it is a host of thoughts obtained from other thoughts and through experiment.

The scientific method can deduce a thought but it cannot originate a thought. Therefore, it is, naturally and inevitably, not a basis for thought. Confidence in the scientific method has however reached the point of sanctification or near sanctification in the West i.e. Europe and America, and in Russia, especially in the 19th and the beginning of the 20th centuries. This led them to becoming deviant in thought and to straying from the straight path, because they made of the scientific method their method of thinking and they turned it into the exclusive basis for thought and the judge upon all matters. Consequently, they deemed the sound research to be the one carried out according to the scientific method. Even this point was exceeded and some of them did effectively start researching matters that had no connection to the scientific method, such as the thoughts related to life and society, according to and in imitation of the scientific method. Some types of knowledge related to man, society and people were researched rationally, but according to the style of the scientific method, and yet they referred to these types of cognition as science. This was because of the West and Russia's generalisation and reverence of the scientific method and because they adopted it as a basis for thought.

For instance, the communist savants proceeded in their viewpoint about life and in the social system according to the scientific method, thus they fell into a monstrous error and they perished therein. Examples about their error are

numerous and existent in every single thought of theirs, because they compared nature and society to the things that are researched in laboratories, thus ending up with flagrantly erroneous results.

In order to perceive the error in all their thoughts, it would be sufficient to address two main ideas and then highlight the aspect of error in each one of them and demonstrate how the scientific method was the cause of error. Their idea about nature being an indivisible whole that is in a constant state of change, and that this change occurs through the contradictions that are inevitably inherent in things and events. Let us take the contradictions, which are one of the basic thoughts they carry. If it is true that these contradictions are inherent in things, they are not inherent in all things, for there are things that do not contain contradictions. They claim that living organisms contain contradictions under the pretext that they have cells that die and other cells that come into being; these living organisms do not contain any contradictions. What is observed in the living organisms in terms of cells dying and cells coming into being is not contradictions. The fact that things are born and then die and that they become extinct and come into being, does not mean that there are contradictions, it is rather due to the strength or the weakness of the cell and its ability or inability to resist, and this is not contradictions. Also, extinction occurs in the non living bodies but no birth occurs in them and despite this, they claim that contradictions occurs in all things. If for argument's sake assumed that contradictions existed in things, this does not necessarily mean that contradictions exist also in events. The transactions of trading, hiring, partnerships and the like, all of these occur without any contradictions. The acts of prayer, fasting and Hajj and the like, all of these also occur without any contradictions. They conclusively do not contain any contradictions. However, what led to the error of their theory is their pursuance of the scientific method, especially with regard to events. As a result of the error of their theory, namely that events do contain a host of inevitable contradictions, they were led to believe that contradictions would inevitably occur in Europe, and yet no contradictions occurred in Europe. Contrary to that belief, Europe sunk into the Capitalist system and snubbed Communism. What made them fall into error was their pursuance of the scientific method in passing judgement upon things and in passing judgement upon events.

Their viewpoint towards society is that it is composed of the geographical milieu, the population's growth and support of one another and the style of production. The material life in society is what eventually determines the shape, the thoughts, the political opinions and situations of society. Since the material life is affected by the style of production, society is therefore affected by the style of production, because the productive forces of society consist of the tools of production and the people who use them, as well as the knowledge of how to use these tools. They as

a whole from one single side, that is the side that expresses people's behaviour towards the elements of nature and its productive forces. As for the other side, it is people's relationships amongst themselves during the production progress. This is wrong, for society consists of people and what is between them in terms of relationships, regardless of the production tools, even regardless of the existence or non existence of the production tools. This is so because what generates the relationships between them is the interest and this is not determined by the production tools; they are rather determined by the thoughts which people carry with regard to satisfying the needs that they want to satisfy. What caused this error is that they viewed society in the same way they would view matter in the laboratory; thus they attempted to research what they observed in terms of elements in order to put their theory into practice and then they set about implementing what occurs in matter upon people and their relationships. Hence, they blundered, because people are other than things. Also, relationships and events are subject to research in the same way as matter is researched in the laboratory. Subjecting them to observation and experiment is what led them to fall into error.

The cause of error in communism as a whole lies in the fact that they proceeded according to the scientific method in dealing with events and relationships. This was because in the 19th century, respect for the scientific method was widespread and because it was carried to excess to the point where it was implemented upon everything and utilised in every research.

Also, the Western savants, i.e. the savants of Europe and America, confused the deductive thoughts resulting from the rational method with the scientific thoughts resulting from the scientific method; thus they implemented the scientific method upon man's behaviour and circumstances and they came up with what is known as psychology, sociology and pedagogy. The outcome of this confusion was reflected in the evident error found in psychology, sociology and pedagogy. They consider what is called psychology as a science and they consider its thoughts as being scientific thoughts because they came as a result of observations carried out upon children in different circumstances and at different ages, thus they considered these observations to be experiments. In fact, the thoughts of psychology are not scientific thoughts, but rather rational thoughts, because the scientific experiments entail subjecting matter to conditions and elements other than its original ones, and then observing this subjection, i.e. they are experiments carried on matter itself such as the natural or the chemical experiments. As for the observation of the thing at different times and in different circumstances, this is not considered a scientific experiment. Hence, monitoring a child in different circumstances and at different ages does not form part of scientific experiments; thus it is not considered as a scientific method. It is rather a process of repetitive observation and deduction

only; thus it is a rational method and not a scientific method. It is therefore wrong to consider it part of the scientific thoughts. This monstrous error resulted from the application of the scientific method upon man. The most important element of the scientific method is experiment and this is only applicable to matter, because it is matter that can be subjected to tests in the laboratory. Observation is not related to actions or to things in different circumstances, it is rather an observation of matter itself and an observation of the original circumstances and elements and of those it has been subjected to. The deduction occurs from this specific observation and not from sheer observation.

Hence, the application of the scientific method upon other than this specific aspect, i.e. upon other than matter and its subjection to experiment, is a horrific error that leads to horrific errors and flawed deductions. This is what happened to the Western savants with regard to the rational topics in which they proceeded according to the scientific method and which they deemed as science and scientific thoughts; thus they fell into the horrific blunder in which they perished.

The examples about their error are numerous and they are reflected in every thought and every research of theirs. They compared man to things that are subject to research and they ended up blundering in a big way. In order to perceive the error, it would be sufficient to address one single idea of theirs, namely the instincts, and to highlight the aspect of error in this idea.

As a result of their progress in the application of the scientific method upon man, they set about observing man's actions and attribute them to motives. They engrossed themselves in the various actions and in observing them. This diverted them from the real research and led them to erroneous results.

In fact had they proceeded according to the rational method, they would have transferred their sensation of man and his behaviours to the brain, then with the previous information, they would have explained the reality of man and the reality of these behaviours and they would have come up with results different to the ones they had concluded, even if these results were doubtful. They for instance claim that the instincts are numerous. They at first enumerated them, and when they came across a host of other actions they started saying that the instincts are diverse and countless. They said that there was the possessiveness instinct, the fear instinct, the sex instinct, the herd instinct among other instincts that they claimed existed.

What led them to such an understanding is their failure to differentiate between the instinct and the aspect of the instinct; i.e. between the origin of the vital energy and the aspect of this energy. Hence, the vital energy or the instinct is part of man's

essence, thus it cannot be treated, nor erased, nor suppressed, for it has to exist in any of its aspects. Contrary to the aspect of the original energy, i.e. the aspect of the instinct, which is not part of man's essence, thus it can be treated, erased and suppressed.

Egoism and altruism are both aspects of the survival instinct, thus egoism can be treated by altruism; it can even be erased and suppressed. Also, lustful inclination towards a woman is one aspect of the species instinct, so is one's inclination towards his mother. The species instinct cannot be treated, nor can it be erased or suppressed. However, the treatment of this instinct's aspects is possible; these aspects can even be erased and suppressed. For instance, lustful inclination towards women is one of the species instinct's aspects and so is the inclination towards the mother, the sister, the daughter and so on. Hence, the inclination towards a woman with lust can be treated by the inclination towards one's mother with affection. Hence, affection treats lust just like altruism treats egoism. The affection towards one's mother can often distract from one's wife and even from marriage and sexual inclination; likewise, sexual inclination often distracts man from his mother's affection. Therefore, any aspect of the species instinct can replace another aspect, and one aspect can be treated by another aspect. The aspect is therefore treatable and even erasable and suppressible, but the instinct cannot be subjected to such an application because it is part of man's essence; unlike the aspect, which is not part of his essence.

Therefore, the psychologists strayed in the perception, the enumeration and then the non-enumeration of the instincts.

In fact the instincts are confined to three types. These are the survival instinct, the species instinct and the religiosity or veneration instinct. This is so because man aspires to the survival of his being; thus he acquires wealth, fears for himself, attacks others fearlessly, gathers with others and performs other actions for the sake of preserving his being. Hence, fear is not an instinct, nor is possessiveness, nor is bravery, nor is grouping. They are rather aspects of one instinct, which is the survival instinct. Likewise lustful inclination or affectionate inclination towards a woman, the inclination towards helping the unfortunate and so on, all of these are not instincts, but rather aspects of one single instinct, that is the species instinct. It is not the sexual instinct because sex is shared between man and animal; the natural inclination is from human towards human and from animal towards animal, for the lustful inclination from man towards animal is queer and not natural. Such an inclination does not occur naturally but rather abnormally, for an instinct is a natural inclination. Likewise, an inclination from a male towards another male is queer and unnatural; it does not occur naturally but rather queerly.

Hence, the lustful inclination towards a woman and the affectionate inclination towards one's mother or daughter, all these are aspects of the species instinct. However, the sexual inclination from a man towards an animal and from a male towards another male is unnatural, instinctively deviant and queer. Hence, the instinct in question is the species instinct and not the sexual instinct and it is for the sake of the human species' survival not for the sake of the animal species' survival.

Also, the inclination towards worshipping Allah, the sanctification of heroes and the reverence of the powerful, all these are aspects of one single instinct, which is the religiosity instinct or the sanctification instinct. This is so because man has a natural feeling of survival and perpetuity. Hence, he feels towards anything that threatens this survival in a certain manner, according to the type of threat that he faces. He would either be fearful or brave, mean or generous, individualist or sociable, according to what deems fit; this generates in him a feeling that motivates him into action and certain aspects of actions emanating from the feeling of survival appear on him. Likewise, he has a feeling of the human species' survival, because the extinction of man threatens his survival. Hence, whatever threatens the survival of his species, he naturally feels towards it in a specific manner according to the type of threat.

The sight of a pretty woman stimulates lust in him, and the sight of his mother stimulates in him affection and the sight of a child stimulates in him pity. Hence, he feels stimulated into action and as a result a host of aspects of actions appear on him; these might be concordant and they might also be contradictory. Also his inability to satisfy the feeling of survival or that of the species survival stimulates in him other emotions, namely surrender and submission to what is, according to his emotion, worthy of surrendering and submitting to. Hence, he supplicates to Allah (swt), applauds the leader and respects the powerful, and this is due to his feeling of natural weakness.

Therefore, the origin of instincts is the feeling of survival or the species' survival or the natural weakness and from this feeling a host of actions resulted and these actions were in fact aspects of those natural origins and each one of these aspects is attributable to one of these three origins. Hence, the instincts are three types and no more.

Still, man in essence has a vital energy and this vital energy contains a host of natural sensations that stimulates man towards satisfying. This stimulus is in fact emotions or sensations and they require satisfaction; some of them require inevitable satisfaction, for if man did not satisfy them he would die, because it is related to the existence of the energy as far as its existence is concerned; others

also require satisfaction but not in an inevitable manner, for if satisfaction did not occur, man would be agitated but he would remain alive, because it is related to the requirements of the energy and not to its existence.

Hence, the vital energy is two parts; one of which that requires inevitable satisfaction, and this is called the organic needs, such as hunger, thirst and excretion, and the other requires mere satisfaction, and this is called the instincts, which are three: the survival instinct, the species instinct and the religiosity instinct.

This is the true facts about the instincts and this is the true facts about man. Had the Western savants proceeded according to the rational method by transferring the sensation of man and his actions and had they then explained this reality or this sensation of reality by the previous information, they would have been guided towards the truth of this reality. However, due to their progress according to the scientific method and due to their consideration of man as being like matter, thinking that observing man is like observing matter, they were led astray from the truth and they ended up with these erroneous findings about the instincts and about other study in psychology. The same applies for sociology and pedagogy; all these are not part of science and they are altogether false. These errors that occurred in the West, i.e. Europe and America, followed by Russia, i.e. the errors made by the communist savants, the psychologists, the sociologists and the pedagogues, are due to the adoption of the scientific method in researching everything and due to the excess in revering the scientific method and applying it upon all the studies. This is what made them fall into error and aberration, and this is what happens to every person implementing the scientific method upon every research.

The scientific method is a sound method of research, not an erroneous one, but it is only sound with regard to scientific research alone, i.e. with regard to matter that is subject to experiment. The error is in its application in other than the scientific researches, i.e. in other than the research of the matter that is subject to experiment.

It is wrong to apply it in the research of the viewpoint about life, or what is known as the ideology, and it is wrong to apply it to man, or society, or nature or in historical researches, or jurisprudence, or education or similar researches. It should rather be confined to the scientific research only, i.e. in the research of matter that is subject to experiment.

The error that occurred in the implementation of the scientific method upon every research was due to the fact that the scientific method was adopted as the basis of

thought; and because adopting it as such has led to treating it as a foundation upon which everything is built, thus turning it into a basis for every research.

To make the scientific method a basis in the process of thinking leads to its application on researches that which cannot be subjected to such an application, such as the researches of the ruling systems, the instincts, the brain, education and the like. This led to the horrendous errors of the socialist idea and of what is known as psychology, pedagogy and sociology.

Furthermore, adopting the scientific method as the basis of the process of thinking excludes many types of knowledge from the research and leads to judging many types of knowledge that are studied and that contain many facts as non-existent, despite the fact that these do effectively and tangibly exist; also, it leads to the denial of many existing things.

The scientific method is doubtful and the susceptibility to error is one of the bases that must be observed in it, thus it would be wrong to adopt it as a basis of the process of thinking. This is so because the scientific method yields doubtful results about the existence, the essence and the attribute of the thing. There are certain things which the results about their existence must be decisive and conclusive, thus it would be wrong for the doubtful method to be a basis to reach the conclusive result. This alone is sufficient to make the doubtful method unfit to be a basis for the process of thinking.

Hence, thought has only two methods: the rational method and the scientific method. After study and exploration, it has been concluded that there is no other method. The scientific method is only suitable for one single branch of knowledge, namely the branch of the research of matter that is subject to experiment. Contrary to the rational method, which is suitable for every type of research.

Hence, it is the rational method that must be the basis of the process of thinking, for it is in the rational method that thought is originated and without it no thought can be newly originated. The perception of scientific facts, by way of observation, experiment and deduction, is generated through the rational method; i.e. it is through to the rational method that the scientific method itself is generated. Also, the perception of logical facts is also generated through the rational method; the perception of historical facts and the distinction of right and wrong in these facts is also generated through the rational method. It is also through this method that the comprehensive idea about the universe, man and life and about their essences is generated. The rational method provides a conclusive result about the existence of the thing. Although it provides a doubtful result about the essence of the thing and its attribute, it does however provide a conclusive result about its existence. Hence,

with regard to its judgement about the existence of the thing, it is conclusive and decisive, thus it must be exclusively adopted as the basis of research, i.e. it must be taken as a basis in view of the fact that its results are conclusive. Therefore, if a rational result were to conflict a scientific result with regard to the existence of the thing, the rational method inevitably be taken and the scientific result that conflicts the rational result should be rejected, because it is the conclusive that should be taken not the doubtful.

Therefore, the error is reflected in the adoption of the scientific method as a basis for the process of thinking and in making it an arbiter when it comes to judging things. This error must be corrected and the rational method must become the basis of the process of thinking and it must be referred to when passing judgement upon things.

As for the logical research, it is not a method of thinking, but rather a style of research based upon the rational method. This is so because the logical research consists of building a thought upon another thought so as to it ends with the sense and it leads through this build up to a specific result. For example, the blackboard is made of wood, and all types of wood burn, thus the blackboard burns; also, if there were life in the slaughtered sheep it would move, but it did not move, thus there is no life in the slaughtered sheep, and so on. In the first example, the idea of every type of wood burns was linked with the idea of the blackboard being made of wood, and as a result of this link, it has been concluded that the blackboard burns. In the second example, the fact that the slaughtered sheep did not move was linked to the idea of life in the slaughtered sheep would have made her move, and as a result of this link, it has been concluded that there was no life in the slaughtered sheep. This logical research would yield sound result if its issues that contain the thoughts linked together were sound as well, and if they were false, the result would be false as well. The prerequisite of the premises is that each issue must end up at the sense. Hence, it is referred to the rational method where the sensation plays the role of the arbiter so that its soundness can be perceived. Therefore, it is a style that is built upon the rational method and it is susceptible to lies and deception. Hence, instead of testing the soundness of logic by referring to the rational method, it would be more appropriate to utilise the rational method in the first place when undertaking a research, rather than resorting to the logical style.

Here, it is imperative to remark two issues:

1. The most important feature of the scientific method is that if one wanted to undertake a research, one must discard from his mind every opinion and every belief that he may hold about this research, for this is what makes the research proceed according to the scientific method and it is on this basis that people can claim that this is a scientific research or that this research is proceeding according to the scientific method. The answer to this is that this opinion is correct but it is not practical, nor does it proceed within the scientific method; it is rather rational and proceeding within the rational method. This is so because the topic is not related to the opinion but rather related to the research. The rational research is conducted through the transference of reality through the senses to the brain, whereas the scientific research is conducted through experiment and observation. This is what distinguishes the rational method from the scientific method. If the sense were sensed, one would judge its existence according to the rational method, and if the experiment and the observation did not indicate the existence of the thing, one would not judge that it existed. Hence, the fact that the wood burns, it would be sufficient in the rational method to sense its burning, but in the scientific method it must be subjected to experiment and observation before judging that it burns. Hence, the fact that the presence of previous information is inevitable in the rational method is an inescapable matter. The scientific method necessitates the abandonment of the previous information, though it would be impossible to occasion any thinking unless they existed. As for the previous opinions and the previous belief, they mean by this what one holds in terms of information and previous judgements. Therefore, the issue of the presence of previous opinions does not mean the opinions per se, but rather the previous judgement. Hence, the point at issue in the scientific method is not the presence of a previous opinion or a previous belief, what is rather meant is the previous judgement in its quality as information by which experiment and observation are explained. Hence, the most important features of the scientific method are experiment and observation, not the opinion and the information.

As for the previous opinion or the previous belief, its use or non use during the research and its interference or non interference in the research, the flawlessness of the research and the soundness of its result necessitates the abandonment of every previous opinion about the topic; in other words it necessitates abandoning what one has in his mind in terms of opinions and judgements related to the topic being researched, lest they affect the research and the result of the research. For instance, if I held the opinion that France and Germany cannot possibly be united in one single state and become one nation, it would be wrong for such an opinion to exist when studying the possibility of

uniting them, because it would corrupt the study and the result. Also, if I held the opinion that revival could not be generated except through industry, invention and education, I should abandon such an opinion when studying the issue of reviving my people or my nation. Also, if I held the opinion that the atom was the smallest particle and that it could not be split, I should erase from my mind such an opinion when researching the possibility of splitting the atom. Hence, when researching any topic, one must abandon every previous opinion related to the research and to the topic he wants to research.

However, these opinions that he must abandon when undertaking a research depends on their reality, for if they were conclusive opinions, established through the conclusive evidence that is beyond any doubt, it would be wrong to abandon them regardless of the circumstances, that is if the research being undertaken were doubtful and if the result that it led to were doubtful as well. This is so because if the conclusive contradicted the doubtful, the conclusive must be taken and the doubtful discarded. Hence, the conclusive must control the doubtful. However, if the research were conclusive and the result it led to were also conclusive, in this case it is imperative to abandon every previous opinion and every previous belief. Abandoning every previous opinion is an inevitable matter of the integrity of the research and the soundness of the result. However, if the research were doubtful, it would be wrong to abandon the conclusive opinions and the decisive belief when undertaking the research; but any doubtful previous opinion related to the topic must be discarded and there is no difference with regard to this between the scientific method and the rational method. The blight of researches is reflected in the interference of previous opinions in the research.

As for what is known as the objectivity, it is not only the abandonment of every previous opinion, but also the confinement of the research to the topic being researched in addition to the abandonment of every previous opinion. When for instance one is analysing olive oil, it would be wrong to allow any other research, or any other opinion or anything else to creep into the research. Also, when we research the industrial policy, no other research, nor any other opinion, nor anything else should interfere with this research; thus one must not think about the markets, nor about the profit, nor about the dangers, nor about anything else apart from the industrial policy of the state. Likewise, when researching the deduction of a Shari'ah rule, it one must not think about the benefit, nor the harm, nor people's opinion, nor about anything else apart from the deduction of the Shari'ah rule. Therefore, one should confine his mind to the topic of research, for objectivity is not only the non interference of the previous opinion in the topic, but in addition to this, it is the confinement of the

research to the topic itself and discarding anything else, as well as concentrating the mind on the researched topic only.

2. The second issue is that of logic. Logic and all what is related to it has the susceptibility of deception and perversion. It is most damaging in legislation and politics. This is because the results of logic are built upon premises, and the falsehood and the truthfulness of these premises is not easily perceived in all situations, for the falsehood of one of the premises could be concealed, or its truthfulness could be based on false information, thus leading to erroneous results. Furthermore, logic could lead to contradictory results. For instance: The Qur'an is the speech of Allah and the speech of Allah is old, thus the Qur'an is old. By contrast one may say: *"The Qur'an is the speech of Allah is in Arabic and the Arabic language is created, thus the Qur'an is created."* Logic could also lead to deceptive outcomes, such as: *"The Muslims are underdeveloped and every underdeveloped is declined, thus the Muslims are declined."* Hence, the dangers of logic are horrendous, for they could lead to error and they could lead to deviation and even to destruction. The peoples and nations who adhered to logic missed out on life's eminence because of it. Hence, although logic is one of the rational method's styles, it is however a futile style, and even a harmful style; its danger is destructive. It must therefore be rejected, be wary of it and keep people away from it.

Although the logical style is one of the rational method's styles, it is however a complicated style, susceptible to deception and perversity and could lead to the contrary facts that one is endeavouring to perceive. Furthermore, one would not be able to achieve the results directly through the sensation of reality, -whether he needed to learn logic or were naturally a logical person- he would rather end up at the sensation of reality, thus logic is almost a third method of thinking; and since thought has only two method, it would be more appropriate to avoid this style. What would be safer with regard to the soundness of the results is to utilise the rational method directly, because it is the method by which the soundness of the result could be guaranteed.

Nevertheless, the natural method of thinking and the method that must be the basic method is in fact the rational method. It is the method of the Qur'an, thus it is the method of Islam. A quick glance review of the Qur'an will highlight the fact that it proceeds according to the rational method, be it in terms of establishing the proof or in terms of explaining the rules. If one were to look into the Qur'an, he will find it saying with regard to the proof: *"Let man think from what he was created."* [TMQ 86-5], *"Won't*

they look at the camels how they were created.” [TMQ 88-17] , *“And as a sign for them is the night, We withdraw therefrom the day, and they are plunged in darkness.”* [TMQ 36-37], *“No son did Allah beget, nor is there any god along with Him, then each god would have taken away what he had created and some would have lorded it over others.”* [TMQ 23-91] , *“Those on whom you call beside Allah cannot create even a fly, if they all met together for the purpose and if the fly should snatch away anything from them, they would have no power to release it from the fly. Feeble are those who petition and those whom they petition.”* [TMQ 22-73] *“If there were in the heavens and the earth other gods besides Allah, there would have been confusion in both.”* [TMQ 21-22], in addition to many other verses, all of which inviting man to utilise the senses to transfer reality so that he could achieve the sound result.

He will also find the Qur'an saying about the rules: *“Your mothers are unlawful to you.”* [TMQ 4-23], *“Forbidden to you is dead meat.”* [TMQ 5-3], *“Fighting has been prescribed upon you though you hate it.”* [TMQ 2-216], *“Whoever who witnesses the month should fast it.”* [TMQ 2-185] , *“And consult them in the matter.”* [TMQ 3-159], *“Fulfil all obligations.”* [TMQ 5-1], *“Immunity from Allah and His Messenger to those polytheists with whom you have entered into covenants.”* [TMQ 9-1], *“Allah made trade lawful and prohibited usury.”* [TMQ 2- 275], *“Then fight in Allah’s cause you are held responsible only for yourself.”* [TMQ 4-84] , *“And exhort the believers to fight.”* [TMQ 8-65], *“Marry women of your choice, two or three or four.”* [TMQ 4-3], *“And if they suckle your children then give them their recompense.”* [TMQ 65, 6], in addition to many other verses, all of which give sensed rules to sensed realities. The understanding of either the rule of the event which the rule brought, is acquired through the rational method; in other words, thinking about them and about their implementation is conducted according to the rational method and to the direct style, not according to the logical style. What might be imagined to have come according to the logical style such as Allah (swt)’s saying: *“If there were in the heavens and the earth other gods besides Allah, there would have been confusion in both.”* [TMQ 21-22] it came as such through the direct style, thus it did not come through premises, but rather by urging one to think, by transferring the sensation directly to the brain and not via a host of interlinked premises.

Therefore, people should proceed exclusively according to the rational method and the direct style is the safest way to proceed, in order for the thought to be sound and for the outcome to be also nearer to soundness in terms of what is doubtful and to be conclusive and decisive in terms of what is conclusive; because the whole issue is related to thought. It is the dearest thing man has and the dearest thing in life, for the progress in life depends on it; thus one must adhere to it by adhering to

the method of thinking. Thought is however prone to slippage and detachment, be it with regard to understanding facts, or understanding events and texts i.e. be it with regard to perception or understanding, due to the constant change and multiple diversity. Hence, confining research to the method of thinking would be insufficient, for it is imperative to research thought itself in an open manner and with regard to all situations events and things. One is therefore required to study what is worthy of being subject to thought and what is unsuitable to be subject of thought. One is required to study the thought about the universe, man and life, the thought about living, the thought about facts, styles and means, as well as the thought about objectives and targets, and the like from among what is linked to thought. in addition to this, it is imperative to study the thought related to understanding the speech that we hear and the speech we read; i.e. it is imperative to study the thought related to understanding the texts.

As for the study of what is worthy of being the subject of thought and what is not worthy, despite its obviousness, it is deemed to be the knottiest problem and the slip-up of many people, even the intellectuals. As for its obviousness, the definition of reason or the recognition of its meaning in a decisive manner, necessitates obviously that the process of thinking occurs within what is reality or has a reality; it would be wrong for the process of thinking to occur in other than the sensed reality. This is so because the process of thinking is the transference of reality through the senses to the brain, thus if there were no sensed reality the rational process could not possibly occur. The absence of the sensation of reality denies the existence of thought and denies the possibility of thought. As for the study of this topic being the knottiest problem, it is due to the fact that many thinkers did research in other than reality. The Greek philosophy is but a research in other than reality. The researches conducted by sociologists pertaining to the division of the brain are but researches in non sensory matter. Likewise, many of the Muslims' scholars who researched in the attributes of Allah (swt) and the descriptions of Heaven and Hell, were researching in what is beyond the sense. Besides, people in general tend to predominately think in other than reality or in what is beyond the sense when it comes to taking many thoughts and they think about many matters. This is why the study of what is worthy of thought and what is not is the knottiest of problems.

However, despite the presence of many respected and doctrinal types of knowledge, from among what is not worthy of being the subject of thought, the definition of reason and the adoption of the rational method as a basis for thought necessitate that whatever is not reality and whatever is beyond the sense should not be subject to thought and it would be wrong to refer to its procedure a rational process. For instance, the talk about the first reason and the second reason and so on is sheer phantasms and assumptions. It is not a reality that the sense had come

across, nor is it part of what the sensation could possibly reach. It is the imagination that imagined and assumed theoretical assumptions, then it arrived at results. It is not a rational process and imagination is not a process of thinking; even all the assumptions are not considered as thought nor as a rational process, even if these assumptions were related to mathematical science. Hence, one can say that the Greek philosophy as a whole is not part of the thoughts, nor was it the subject of the rational process; thus it would be wrong to consider it as the results of thinking, because no thinking over it occurred, nor was the rational process carried out over it; it is but imagination and assumptions.

For instance, to claim that the brain is divided into several sections and that every section is specialised in a specific science etc., all of this is sheer phantasms and assumptions. It is not a reality because the sensed reality of the brain stipulates that it is not sectioned; it is also not part of what comes across the sense because when the brain is functioning, i.e. when it is carrying out the rational process, it is impossible for the sense to reach it. Hence, to claim that it is sectioned has not come as a result of a sensation, in addition to the fact that it contradicts reality. It is therefore possible to say that not everything in pedagogy is deemed as thoughts, nor that they are the yield of a rational process, but rather sheer phantasms and assumptions.

For instance, to say that Allah (swt) has the quality of capability and the quality of being capable, and that the capability has an old facultative pertinence and a neoteric facultative pertinence, and the establishment of rational proofs about the attributes of Allah (swt), all this and the like, even if it were given a tinge of the rational research and the rational proof, it could not be considered a thought nor could it be considered the yield of a process of thinking, for the rational process did not occur over it simply because it is beyond man's senses.

The rational process, i.e. thought cannot be generated without a reality which man's senses can reach. However, there are certain matters or things that have a reality but this reality cannot be sensed by man nor can it be transmitted through the sense; but the effect of this reality can be within the range of man's sense and it can be transmitted to the brain through the sense. This type of matters can be the subject of the rational process, i.e. it is possible for the thinking process to occur over it; but this thinking would be about its existence and not about its essence, because what is transferred to the brain through the sense is its effect and the effect can only indicate its existence and it cannot indicate its essence. For instance, if an aircraft were flying at a very high altitude to the point where the naked eye could not see it, but its sound could still be heard by the ear, man would still be able to sense its sound and this sound is the evidence about the existence of a thing, i.e. the existence of the aircraft, but it could not indicate the essence of the

aircraft. The heard sound, coming from above is the sound of something that exists and through the distinguishing feature of the sense man can deduce that it is the sound of an aircraft. Hence, the rational process in this instance has occurred with regard to the existence of the aircraft, i.e. the process of thinking about the existence of the aircraft has occurred and the judgement about its existence has been passed, despite the fact that the sense did not come across it, but it has come across its effect, i.e. across something that indicates the presence of the aircraft; thus reason has judged its existence through the existence of its effect. It is true that one can distinguish between the sound of a Mirage and the sound of a Phantom and one can judge the type of the aircraft just like one can judge the sound to be that of an aircraft through the distinction of the sound's type. However, to recognise that it is a Mirage or a Phantom has come from the distinction of the sound, and the judgement as to whether it is an aircraft or not has also come through the distinction of the sound. However, this judgement is not about its essence, but rather a judgement upon the type of this existent through the distinction of its effect. Nevertheless, this is thought, because the process did take place over it effectively; i.e. the process of thinking over it occurred because the senses did transfer its effect. It would be wrong to say that the judgement about the existence of the aircraft is doubtful, for the point at issue is the possibility of having a process of thinking with regard to what man can sense its effect and does not sense its essence. In any case, if the judgement about the sound being that of an aircraft were doubtful, the judgement about the existence of something from which the sound emanated would be however conclusive. The results of the rational method could be either conclusive or doubtful, according to the sensation that is transferred to the brain and according to the information by which this reality is explained.

However, this thought that occurs over what the sense does not come across is specific to the effect of what the sense comes across, because the effect of a thing is part of its existence; thus that which the sense comes across its effect is considered to be within the range of the sense with regard to its existence and consequently it would be sound to think about it and it would be sound to establish through the process of thinking its existence conclusively, and to think also over what the sense indicates and distinguishes its type. Anything else apart from this, it would be impossible for the process of thinking to occur over it thus it is not considered as thought. For instance, the sense comes across certain matters that are attributes of a thing and not one of its effects, thus these attributes are utilised as a means to passing judgement upon the matter and upon the thing, such as the fact that America embraces the idea of freedom, which means it is not a colonial power because colonialism means enslaving peoples and this contradicts the idea of freedom; this premise, i.e. America embracing the idea of freedom, is not one of America's effects outside her own lands, it is rather one of its attributes. Hence,

the fact that the attribute of something is such and such, it does not mean that this attribute is its effect. Therefore, it is not subject to the process of thinking, for it is not an attribute that the sense transfers to the brain in order to judge all the actions, it is rather an attribute which is specific to the matter and not one of its effects; thus it is wrong to judge the vanguard of actions through it because actions are not initiated by man due to his acquisition of a specific attribute, but rather due to several considerations and diverse and numerous attributes. The fact that Islam is a Deen of might, this does not mean that the Muslim is mighty, because might is not the Deen but rather one of its ideas; besides, when someone embraces a Deen, it does not mean that he has adhered to it. Hence, might is not an effect of the Deen, but rather one of its attributes. The adherence to the Deen is not one of the Deen's effects, but rather one of its attributes, thus the process of thinking does not occur over it, for it is a mere assumption and not a process of thinking. Hence, it is the effect of the thing that is the subject of thought not its attributes because the effect can be transferred through the sense, but the attribute of that which is not sensed cannot be transferred through the senses; whereas with regard to what can be sensed, though the attribute can be transferred, the process of thinking occurs over it and not over its effect. Hence, to take the attributes of the thing as a means to pass judgement upon its effect or to pass judgement upon it does not constitute a rational process, thus thinking over it does not occur. In other words, the assumptions are not suitable for passing judgement, for they are palpable. It is true that some assumptions form part of what is within the range of sensation, such as the logical premises; however, if these were as such, they would not be assumptions but rather facts. An assumption is considered to be a mere estimation and not a sensation, nor is it an estimation resulting from a sensation. This is where the error occurs, when one considers the phantasms and assumptions as being thoughts.

It could be argued that confining thought to what is palpable or whose effect is palpable means confining thought to what is perceptible through the senses, which means that the scientific method is the basis of thought for it does not believe in other than what is palpable. So where did the rational method go?

The answer to this is that the scientific method stipulates the subjection of the palpable matters to experiment and observation and it does not content itself with the mere sense. Therefore, the fact that thought does not occur but over what is perceptible through the senses, this encompasses the palpable matters that are subjected to experiment and observation and the palpable matters which their mere sensation would be sufficient. This does not turn the scientific method into a basis for thought; it rather makes it a sound process of thinking because it stipulates that the thing must be palpable and in addition to this it stipulates its subjection to experiment and observation. As for the issue of the rational method, it necessitates

the confinement of thought to what is perceptible through the senses. The fundament in the definition of reason is not the existence of previous information, but rather is the palpable reality and the previous information provided the palpable thing has been thought about, otherwise it would remain a mere sensation. The origin in thought is for it to be about a sensed reality not about something that has been assumed nor about something whose existence has been imagined.

Therefore, when it is said that the process of thinking of the first man occurred in such a manner, this is not deemed as thought because the first man is not a sensed reality; rather the actual man is the sensed reality; thus the actual man is taken and studied in order to recognise how his thinking occurs. Then the result of the study is applicable to the human race, because the one species that does not differ or the one type that does not differ will have everything confirmed about one single item of it, applicable to its species or its type, because it is one species and one type. This is like one atom of soil, or a specific soil, everything reached through the sense in relation to this atom of soil is applicable to the whole of its species and the whole of its type, whether it were present or absent and whether thought occurred over it or not. What is important is for the thing being thought about to be a palpable reality in itself or for its effect to be palpable. No process of thinking can possibly take place in anything impalpable or whose effect is impalpable.

Therefore, it must be clear that what is issued in terms of judgements and what is taken in terms of information about other than reality, or about a reality whose existence is either assumed or imagined, is not considered to be thought whatsoever; i.e. it is not considered to be the yield of reason because reason does not function without the palpable reality or the reality whose effect is palpable. Consequently, thought only occurs over reality or the effect of reality and it does not occur over anything else whatsoever. Hence, many of the so called thoughts, whether these were written in books or were the topic of discussion, are not considered the yield of reason nor did thought over them occur, thus they are not thought.

Here the issue of the unseen may be raised, be it unseen vis-à-vis the thinker or unseen vis-à-vis the sense. Is the brain's attendance to the unseen matters not considered as thought and consequently is what has been said about the unseen matters not considered as thought as well? The answer to this is that the unseen matters who are remote from the thinker are not in fact unseen but rather present; because what is meant by the transference of the sensation is any transference and to any man and not only the transference of the thinker. When a person thinks about Makkah and the Sacred House or either of them without having seen them nor sensed them, this does not mean that he is thinking about the impalpable, he is

rather thinking about a palpable matter; this is so because the palpable matter is not necessarily what the thinker is sensing, but rather what is within the range of the senses. What is remote from the thinker in terms of palpable matters are still deemed as thoughts if thinker were to think about them, and the brain's attendance to such matters would still be deemed as thought as well. Hence, history is considered as thoughts, even it were recorded and talked about after thousands of years. Likewise, the old types of knowledge are deemed as thoughts and the brain's attendance to them is deemed as thought as well even if this occurs thousands of years later. Also, the news that reported through telegraphs are deemed as thoughts and the brain's attendance to them is deemed as thought even if these came from remote areas. Hence, what is absent or unseen to the thinker is not an unseen matter but rather part of the palpable matters because the sensation is not necessarily a must for the thinker, for it could be transmitted to him; he could hear it or read it or have it read for him. The point at issue is that knowledge cannot be a thought unless it results from a sensed reality. The sensed reality or whose effect is sensed are the only things whose knowledge is deemed as thought and the brain's attendance to them is deemed as thought as well. Anything other than these is not considered as thought nor the brain's attendance to it is considered as thought.

As for the matter that are beyond the senses, these are known as the unseen matters and they are subject to scrutiny. If they are transmitted or reported by whose truthfulness is conclusive and whose existence had been established through the decisive evidence, they are then deemed as part of thought and the brain's attendance to them is considered a rational process, i.e. considered a thought. This is so because the decisiveness of the narrator's existence or the reporter has been established through the sense and through the conclusive thought; thus it is deemed to be in origin emanating from a palpable thing in itself or whose effect is palpable. Furthermore, the existence of the source has been established and its credibility has also been established through the conclusive thought; this is why it is deemed as thought and the brain's attendance to it is a process of thinking, whether the report or the narration has been established through the decisive evidence or through the doubtful evidence. This is so because the decisiveness is required for its existence and its credibility as a source in order to be deemed as thought, and the certainty of the speech is not a requirement in this context, but its soundness is required even if this were with the least amount of doubt.

Hence, the unseen matters that emanate from whose existence and truthfulness have been established by the conclusive proof are considered as thought and the brain's attendance to them is deemed as a process of thinking if the soundness of their emanation were established by way of decisiveness or with the least amount of doubt.

However, if that which the soundness of its emanation from whose existence and truthfulness are established conclusively, were established in a decisive manner, thus making it decisive in text and decisive in meaning, it should be then assented in a decisive manner and it would be wrong to have doubt in it; if on the other hand it were not established in a decisive manner, but rather in a doubtful manner, it would be then allowed to assent it in an indecisive manner. However, they would both be deemed as thought and the brain's attendance to them is a process of thinking.

Therefore, what has been stated in terms of unseen matters by the Muslims, whether in the evidentially approved individual Ahadith, or stated by the glorious Qur'an, is deemed as thought and the brain's attendance to it is deemed as a process of thinking.

As for what has been stated by whose existence is inconclusive and whose credibility is also inconclusive, it is not deemed as thought nor is the brain's attendance to it deemed as a process of thinking; it is rather deemed as phantasms, assumptions and sheer senility.

Hence, the unseen matters are not deemed as thought the brain's attendance to them is not deemed as a process of thinking unless they emanated from whose existence is conclusive and whose credibility is also conclusive in a sound manner. This is the only instance where the unseen matters are deemed as thought and where the brain's attendance to them is a process of thinking because they are based upon the palpable in terms of their origin, for they have emanated from he who senses them or they have been taken from whose existence and credibility is conclusive. Apart from this instance, the unseen matters are not deemed as thought the brain's attendance to them is not deemed as a process of thinking, because they are not part of the palpable matters. The process of thinking is the brain's attendance to the palpable matters or matters whose effect is palpable, and thought would be the result of this attendance; this cannot occur but in the palpable matters or matters whose effect is palpable.

As for the research in the universe, man and life, it is not a research in nature, because nature is more general than the universe, man and life. It is also not a research in the world, because the world is everything other than Allah (swt), thus it includes the angels the devils and nature. Hence, when we say that we are researching in the universe, man and life, we do not mean nature, nor do we mean researching the world, but we rather mean these three matters only. This is so because man lives in the universe, thus it is inevitable that he knows about man, the universe and life. Hence, the research of nature does not concern him, for researching nature does not compensate him for the research of his gender, his life

and the universe in which he lives. The research of other than these matters does not concern him, such as the angels and the devils, because their research does not form part of what constitutes a problem for him. Man senses himself that he exists; he senses also the life within himself and senses the universe in which he lives. Ever since he starts distinguishing matters and things, he starts to wonder whether something existed before his own existence and that of his mother and father and those before them and up to the highest grandfather or not? He starts also wondering whether something existed before this life within him and within others from among humans or not? He starts also wondering whether something existed before this universe that he sees, namely the sun, the moon and the stars, or not? In other words, he wonders whether these things are eternal and whether they had always existed in sempiternity, or there had been before them something sempiternal. Man will then wonder whether there will be after these three things anything or not; in other words, are they a beginning that will remain as such and does not evanesce or not? These questions will often come to his mind and the older he grows, the questions increase and form a major complex which he endeavours to solve. This wondering or questions is a research into a reality; i.e. it is a transference of a reality through the senses to the brain. Hence, he continues to sense this reality but what he has in terms of information are not sufficient to solve the greatest problem of his. He grows up and the information increase and he attempts to explain this reality through the information he has acquired; if he manages to explain this reality in a conclusive manner, he would not repeat this wondering for he will have solved the greatest problem. However, if he fails to explain this reality in a conclusive manner, he will continue to wonder; he might solve this problem temporarily but the questions come back, thus he realises that he is yet to solve the greatest problem. Therefore, he continues in a natural manner the series of questions until he reaches the answer which his nature assents, i.e. the answer that responds to the vital energy he possesses; in other words the answer that responds to his emotions. At that time, he will become certain that he has solved the greatest problem in a conclusive manner and the questions will cease to haunt him; whereas if the greatest problem of his remains unsolved, the questions will continue to come to his mind and irritate him. The greatest problem will remain outstanding and he will continue to be in a state of unease and worry over his fate, until the solution occurs, regardless of whether this were a sound or erroneous solution, as long as he feels reassured towards it.

This is the thought about the universe, man and life. It is a natural and an inevitable thought. It must occur to every man, because his existence necessitates the existence of this thought and because his sensation of these three matters is constant. This sensation drives him towards attempting to reach the thought. Hence, thinking about the universe, man and life is inherent in the existence of man, because the mere sensation of these three matters, which is an inevitable

matter, evokes the relevant information available to him, or evokes the attempt to seek this information from others, or the attempt to require the solution from others. Hence, he spontaneously endeavours to solve this issue. The solving of the greatest problem pursues man in a constant manner demanding a solution. However, despite the inevitability of the wondering and the inevitability of undertaking several consecutive attempts to reach an answer, people differ in their response to this pursuit. Some of them avoid the questions, while others continue to request an answer to these questions. However, when they are adolescent, they receive the answer to their questions from their parents, for they are born devoid of these question, but when they start to distinguish what is around them the questions start to come to their minds, thus their parents undertake to answer them; and due to their trust in their parents or their tutors, they consent to these answers and they feel reassured with this consent, because it is a consent to those in whom they trust. When they reach the age of puberty, the overwhelming majority from amongst them remain at the point of the answer they had received while the questions return to the minds of the minority due to their lack of confidence in the answers they had received when they were young; thus they review the answers they had received with regard to the solving of this major problem and they attempt to solve it themselves.

Hence, thinking about solving the greatest problem, i.e. thinking about the universe, man and life is an inevitable matter for every man. However, some solve it themselves and other receive the solution from others. Once, it is solved, in any manner, be it with a solution that man had arrived at by himself or a solution that had come to him from others, man will feel content and will sense the bliss of tranquillity if the solution were in concord with his nature; if it were not however in concord with his nature, he would not feel at ease with the solution and the questions would continue to haunt him and trouble him even if he did not give any hint to this effect. Hence, it is imperative to solve this major problem of man in a manner that is compatible with his nature.

Indeed the thought about solving the greatest problem is natural and inevitable, but this thought itself may be a sound thought and may be a poor thought; it may also be a thought about avoiding thought. Nevertheless, it is a thought according to the rational method. Those who refer to man, the universe and life as being matter avoid the thought about man, the universe and man to think about instead about matter; this thought about matter, deemed to be a avoidance of the natural and inevitable thought, leads them to an ailment in the thought. Matter is subjected to the laboratory, but man, the universe and life are not subjected to the laboratory. The questions that come to mind require a rational thought, while these people shift towards the scientific thought; thus it would be impossible for them to generate the sound thought and consequently they produce the erroneous solution.

They would solve the greatest problem, but this solution is wrong and man's nature does not harmonise with it. This is why such a solution remains a solution for individuals, not for a people or a nation.

Hence, the people or the nation would remain without a solution to the greatest problem in a manner that agrees with her nature, and the questions would continue to haunt people and even those who consent to this solution.

As for those who deem that this greatest problem is individual and does not concern the people in its quality as such and does not concern a nation in her quality as such, and who also deem that it has no bearing in matters related to the mode of life, they in fact tend to run away from solving the greatest problem and they tend to leave the individuals, the people or the nations to their own devices. Hence the greatest problem would continue to haunt the individuals and the people or the nation; it continues to irritate the individuals and the communities. Everyone would live in a state of false tranquillity towards the solution of this greatest problem, because in fact it has remained unsolved and the emotional or natural anxiety would continue to dominate the individuals and the people or the nation.

The truth of the matter is that the solution to the greatest problem has two aspects: The rational aspect, i.e. that related to reason or to the very thought that takes place, and the aspect related to the vital energy within man, i.e. the aspect related to what requires satisfaction. Hence, thought must arrive at satisfying the vital energy. The satisfaction of the vital energy by thought must come via the process of thinking i.e. via the transference of reality through the senses to the brain, for if the satisfaction came via the phantasms and the assumptions or via other than a palpable reality, the tranquillity does not occur and the solution is not generated. Also, if thought came with what does not generate satisfaction, i.e. with what does not agree with human nature, it would be mere assumptions or mere sensation, thus it would not lead to a solution that reassures the heart and generates satisfaction.

Therefore, in order for the solution to the greatest problem to be sound it must be the result of a thought according to the rational process and it must satisfy the vital energy; it must also be decisive lest the questions return to haunt man. Only then the sound solution is generated and the constant tranquillity with regard to this solution is established. Hence, the thought about the universe, man and life is one of the most important types of thoughts; that is the thought about solving the greatest problem in a manner that agrees with human nature, i.e. the solution that leads to satisfying the vital energy in a decisive manner that prevents the return of these questions.

Indeed the attempt of the vital energy to satisfy that which requires satisfaction could lead to solving the greatest problem, for the feeling of weakness and of the need for a helping force could lead man towards solving this problem and could dictate the answers to these questions. However, this path is not reliable and does lead to stabilisation if left unattended, for the religiosity instinct could generate in the brain a host of phantasms or assumptions that does not relate to the truth whatsoever; and although it satisfies the vital energy, but it could satisfy it in a queer manner, such as the worship of idols, or it could satisfy it in an erroneous manner such as the sanctification of righteous men. Hence, it would be wrong to let the vital energy to solve the greatest problem and answer the questions by itself; rather the process of thinking about, man the universe and life must occur in order to answer these questions. However, this answer must be in harmony with human nature, i.e. the vital energy must be satisfied by it and it must be in a decisive manner that does not allow any doubt to creep into it. If this solution occurred through the thought which the human nature agrees with, it would in this case be a solution that convinces reason and fills the heart with tranquillity.

As for the thought about subsistence, it is natural and inevitable because the satisfaction of the vital energy, i.e. the satisfaction of the organic needs such as eating and the satisfaction of the instincts, such as ownership, makes it indispensable for man to think about subsistence. However, the thought about subsistence just like this, just for the sake of subsistence would not suffice man if he were to revive and would not suffice him if he were to attain happiness, i.e. to attain constant tranquillity. Hence, in order for man to revive and in order for him to attain happiness i.e. constant tranquillity, it is imperative for him to make his thought about subsistence built upon his thought about his viewpoint in life, for he is a man who lives in the universe and his subsistence in this universe means his life in the universe; thus his thought about subsistence must be based upon his viewpoint towards this life he leads. If he did not build his thought about subsistence upon his viewpoint towards life, his thought would remain declined, limited and narrow; thus he would not enjoy any revival, nor would he acquire any constant tranquillity. Hence, the thought about the universe, man and life must be the basis of the thought about subsistence. It is true than man thinks about subsistence in response to the requirements of satisfaction, regardless of whether he had a viewpoint towards the universe, man and life or not. However, this thought remains primitive, troubled and not proceeding in the upward trend so that it is built upon the thought about the universe, man and life, or so that it is built upon one's viewpoint towards life. The point at issue is not which of the two thoughts should precede the other, for it is recognised evidently that the thought about subsistence precedes all other thoughts. The point at issue is the thought about the refined subsistence, the subsistence that brings the constant peace of

mind; thus the thought about subsistence must be built upon the viewpoint towards life.

It is true that the thought about subsistence rises above thinking about one's subsistence to thinking about the subsistence of his family and his tribe; it also rises above thinking about his own subsistence to thinking about the subsistence of his people and thinking about the subsistence of his nation and above thinking about the subsistence of his nation to that of humanity. However, although this elevation is found in man's nature, it could however be confined to thinking about one's subsistence and may not exceed this scope unless it were related to the thought about his subsistence, if it were neglected and left with no basis upon which it could be built. Even when the scope of thinking about one's subsistence is exceeded to encompass the thought about his people and his nation, it would however remain a thought about his own subsistence, thus it would remain under the influence of egoism and the decline would always remain evident in his conducts, or in some aspects of his life, without exceeding this towards revival or towards constant tranquillity. Hence, it would be wrong to leave the thought about subsistence to follow its natural course without building it upon a viewpoint towards life, and it would be wrong to allow this to continue, for it would not lead to revival, nor to constant tranquillity, it would rather impede constant tranquillity; primitive subsistence or the declined peoples' subsistence serves as the best example of this.

The thought about subsistence does not mean the thought about satisfying the vital energy instantly or haphazardly, nor does it mean satisfying only oneself, or only the family or the only people or the nation, for man lives in the universe and it is imperative for the thought about subsistence to be constant, to be at the finest level possible and to be for the sake of man's subsistence in his quality as such, according to the requirements of the human species instinct. This cannot possibly generated without building the thought about subsistence upon a specific viewpoint towards life, for it remained as it is, it would continue to be primitive and characterised by decline.

In any case, whether the thought about subsistence were built upon the viewpoint towards life or not, the most important substance in it is that it must be a responsible thought that strives to fulfil its own purpose and the purpose of subsistence; it must also have as its most important feature the responsibility over others. This includes those which human nature stipulates responsibility over them, and those which the protection stipulates the responsibility over them, who in turn include those by whom the protection occurs. The head of family, the father, is like the wife and the children, and the head of the tribe, the chieftain, is like any other member of the tribe, all of them, the father, the wife, the children,

the chieftain and every member of the tribe, must strive to fulfil the aim over which he thinks about subsistence, as well as the aim itself of subsistence, while observing the responsibility over others. The responsible thought must be the characteristic of the thought about subsistence in order for it to be a thought about subsistence, because the irresponsible thought in the issue of subsistence is no more than the instinctive distinction that animals have with regard to satisfying the vital energy, and this is not befitting for man and it must not remain as man's thought.

To stipulate that the thought about subsistence must be a responsible thought is in fact the minimum requirement, for although it is not sufficient to occasion revival and to generate constant peace of mind, it represents however the bare necessities that elevate man's level above that of animals, and to turn it into a thought of a man that possesses a brain characterised by the ability to link, not just an animal that merely seeks to satisfy the vital energy.

The thought about subsistence is what shapes life for the individual, the family and the tribe. It is also what shapes life for the people and the nation, and above all, it shapes life for humanity in a specific manner, for it could turn it into a life of a monkey or a pig, or that of gold or tin, i.e. it could turn it into a life of might, affluence and constant tranquillity or a life of misery, sadness and a chase after the loaf of bread. A single glance at the Capitalist thought about subsistence and how it shapes life for humanity as a whole in a specific manner, demonstrates what this shaping brought to humanity as a whole in terms of suffering and misery, and how it made man spend all his life running after the loaf of bread; it also demonstrates how it turned the relationship between people that of constant dispute, that is a relationship of: *“The loaf being between you and I, either I eat it or you eat it; the struggle between continues until one of us gets the loaf and deprives the other from it, or one of us would give the other what keeps him alive so that he provides the loaf to the other and increase his bread.”*

Hence, a single glance at this shaping of life demonstrates how the Capitalist thought about life turned life into a household of suffering and misery and a household of constant dispute between people. This is so because although the Capitalist thought about subsistence has been based upon a comprehensive idea about the universe, man and life, i.e. although it has been built upon a specific viewpoint in life and although it has achieved revival for the peoples and nations who proceeded according to this thought about subsistence, it has however brought misery to those peoples and nations and it has brought wretchedness to the whole of humanity. It is this Capitalist thought that generated the notion of colonialism and exploitation and enabled certain individuals to have a standard of living in which their servants, i.e. their slaves would hand them the messages they receive

on a golden tray; whereas others were deprived from being servants or slaves even to their own families, or tribes or nations and deprived from acquiring the bread crumbs. In a rich America, a Britain who dreams of the empire and a France whose imagination is immersed in glory and grandeur, one finds several models of this life, in addition to what this idea of colonialism and exploitation has done in other than Europe and America in terms of enslavement and blood sucking. All of this was because the thought about subsistence was an irresponsible thought, i.e. a thought devoid of any responsibility for others; it was rather a thought devoid of real responsibility, though it seemed to reflect responsibility for the family or the tribe or the nation, whereas in fact it lacked responsibility, for it only provided what guaranteed mere satisfaction.

The Socialist idea has come to instil responsibility into the thought about subsistence, namely a responsibility towards the poor and the proletarians, but it failed to resist before life and with time it deviated until it turned into a mere rhetoric or a shadow, and it gradually lost the responsibility over others until it became effectively a mere thought about subsistence, no different from the Capitalist thought, in terms of lack of responsibility over others; it turned in essence into more of a nationalist idea than a humanitarian idea.

Therefore, although the thought about subsistence in this world is built upon a viewpoint in life in Europe, America and Russia, i.e. the states that shape life in this world, the thought about subsistence that exists in the world today is in fact deemed to be devoid of responsibility over others. One may perceive that the lack of responsibility over others in the thought about subsistence may be naturally found in a declined man, but he does not perceive how it makes the enslavement and exploitation of others in order to satisfy one's ego take the place of the responsibility over others. Therefore, despite the aspects of revival and progress found in the world today, the lack of responsibility over others in the thought about subsistence, especially among the powerful people who are capable of acquiring subsistence, makes the discerning and sensible person perceive that the world's thought about subsistence is in fact declined rather than advanced, troubled rather than serene; such a person deems that this thought about subsistence, which is devoid of responsibility over others should not continue to exist because it is harmful to life and it only yields misery to mankind. Hence, it is imperative to eradicate this thought and work towards replacing it by a thought where the responsibility over others becomes an integral part of it.

It is true that the loaf represents the relationship between a man and another, and it is true that the thought about subsistence is the thought about acquiring this loaf in order to satisfy the vital energy that drives man towards satisfaction, however, instead of having the relationship of the loaf between a man and another based on

“either I eat it or you eat it”, this relationship should be based on *“you eat it, not me; I acquire the loaf in order to feed it to you and you acquire the loaf in order to feed it to me, not to fight you in order to take it from you or you fight me in order to take it from me.”* In other words the relationship should be one of altruism rather than egocentricity; i.e. you should be happy to give rather than being happy to exploit others and I should be happy to give rather than happy to exploit others.” May Allah bless the Arab poet who said: You find him radiant with joy when you come to him As if you are giving him what you are asking him for .

Though man feels happy when he takes, in response to the survival instinct , but when he becomes elevated he feels equally happy when he gives, and this is also in response to the survival instinct, which generosity and bestowal is one of its aspects, just like ownership and taking, which is also another aspect of the survival instinct.

Hence, the point at issue is not making the thought about subsistence a thought about others, because the thought about subsistence is a thought about satisfying the vital energy of the person who thinks, thus it is inevitable for it to be in harmony with the satisfaction in order for it to be a sound thought; the point at issue is rather for that particular thought to carry the responsibility over others, not to be a thought about satisfying others, for one does not think about subsistence to satisfy other persons’ vital energies, one rather thinks about subsistence in order to satisfy his own vital energy; however, when he thinks in a responsible manner, i.e. when his thought is characterised by the attribute of being responsible over others, he would in this case satisfy the aspect of generosity instead of satisfying the aspect of possessiveness and he would satisfy the aspect of commendation instead of satisfying the aspect of fear. In both cases he would satisfy his vital energy through the satisfying of the survival instinct, yet he would chose to satisfy finer aspect, rather than satisfy the declined aspect.

This is the issue pertaining to making the thought about subsistence a responsible thought, for the responsibility over others with regard to the thought about subsistence is what turns it into a thought about subsistence that yields a refined and serene subsistence.

As for the thought about facts, though it does not differ from the thought about anything, for a fact is the conformity of the thought with reality, it is however imperative to highlight this type of thought, in its capacity as a thought that differs from any other thought, since facts do have a certain gravity, especially the incorporeal facts.

The thought about facts is to make the passed judgement in total conformity with the reality that has been passed to the brain through the senses. It is this conformity that makes what the thought indicates a fact, provided this fact is naturally harmonious with human nature.

For instance, to say that society consists of relationships and people, this would be its reality. Hence, when the judgement is passed upon society as to what it is, all the judgements upon its reality would have been conducted according to the rational method, which is a thought. However, this thought being a fact or not depends on the conformity of this thought in real terms. Those who said that society consists of a group of people, they deemed a collective to be composed of individuals, and that society cannot come into being unless a group of individuals existed; thus this reality was transmitted to their brains through the senses and they explained it with the previous information, then they passed their judgement, namely that society is a group of individuals. This judgement is a thought; however, its conformity or non conformity with reality is what indicates whether it is a fact or not. Hence, when applying it to reality, one can deduce that the group of individuals sailing together in a cruise cannot be deemed a society no matter how numerous they were; they are rather a collective, despite the fact that they are a group of individuals. Whereas the collective who live in a village, regardless of their number, are a society. Hence, what makes the village a society and does not make the cruise a society is the existence of permanent relationships between the village residents, and the lack of permanent relationship among the cruise passengers. Therefore, what forms a society is the relationships between people and not the group of people. One can then deduce that this definition of society is not fact though it is a thought. This means that not every thought is fact, for this thought must be applicable to the reality upon which the judgement has been passed.

For instance, it is true to describe Christianity as being a thought; for the sense has transmitted that the father, the son and the holy spirit are one, thus the three are one and the one is three; for the sun contains the light, the heat and the celestial body, thus all of the sun is one thing and yet it is three things. Likewise God: He is the father, the son and the holy spirit. The belief in God responded to the human nature, i.e. the religiosity instinct, thus it was a thought. However, its applicability to reality or its lack of it, is what indicates whether it is a fact or not. When applying it to reality, one realises that the three are not one, nor is the one three, for the three are three and the one is one. As for the sun, the fact that it has light and heat does not mean that it is three things; it is rather one thing, that is the sun. The light is one of its qualities and not a second thing, while the heat is also one of its qualities and not a third thing. The fact that this responded to human nature has no value whatsoever, because the religiosity instinct requires satisfaction and its

satisfaction may occur in an erroneous or queer manner and it may occur in a sound manner. Proving whether God is one or three is established through reason and not through human nature, though the harmony of this rational thought with human nature is a requisite. Hence, this thought is not applicable to the reality of God, thus it cannot be fact and consequently the Christian faith is not fact.

Also, stating that matter is self-evolving, thus creation and generation occurs and describing this statement as being thought is correct; because reality transmitted that matter transforms from one condition to another through a host of fixed laws, and through this transformation, new things are generated, which did not exist before, thus this is judged to be creation and generation.

However, the applicability of this to reality is what proves whether it is fact or not. When applying this to reality, one observes that this matter has not created things out of nothing, but from something already existent. One also observes that the laws are imposed upon it and it cannot overstep these laws, thus its function cannot be deemed a creation, nor can it be a creator. Hence, this thought is not applicable to the reality of the Creator, nor to the reality of creation, thus it is not fact.

Likewise are all the thoughts that exist or will exist in the world; being deemed as thoughts does not necessarily mean that they are facts. The thought must rather be applicable to reality in order for it to be fact. And in order to recognise whether the thought is fact or not, it is imperative to apply this thought to the reality it denotes. If it is applicable to it, it will then be fact and if it is inapplicable to it, it will not be fact.

Hence, the thought about facts does not mean carrying out the rational process only, but it means carrying out the rational process and applying the thought that resulted from the rational process to the reality that it indicates, and if it applies to it, it will be deemed as fact and if it does not it will not be deemed as fact.

It would be wrong to say that one may be unable to recognise the applicability of certain things to reality because these are impalpable; it would be wrong to say this because the requisite of thought is to sense reality. That which is not a palpable reality cannot be a thought, thus it cannot be fact.

For instance, Allah is not an idea, but rather a fact, for the sense has transmitted His effect, which is the creations from nothing, to the brain and through the senses. This made us judge His existence. Hence, the existence of Allah is a fact. As for the essence of Allah, it does not fall under the senses, thus we cannot judge it. Hence, there is nothing in terms of facts that are established by reason, that is not

within the reach of the senses. The fact must be within the scope of the senses and it is imperative to think about it through reason.

Therefore, the thought about the fact is the appliance of the thought to the reality it indicates. If it applies to it, it will be fact and if it does not, it will not be fact.

The thought about facts is an indispensable matter to all people, individuals, peoples and nations alike, especially those who shoulder responsibilities, no matter how small these were, for thoughts are often the cause of error and the cause of deviation. Hence, it would be wrong to consider thought, any thought, to be fact; it rather should be taken as being a mere thought. Then the process of applying it to the reality it indicates occurs and if it did apply to it, it would be fact; otherwise, it would not be fact, even if it were a thought. Therefore, the thought about facts could either be from scratch by carrying out the rational process in order to arrive at the thought, then applying this thought to reality, thus deducing whether it is applicable to that reality or not, in which case it would be deemed as fact, for otherwise, it would be imperative to search for the fact, i.e. search for the thought that applies to the reality it indicates; or it could be from other than scratch, but through the acquisition of the existent thoughts and searching for the facts within these thoughts, by embarking upon the process of applying the existent thoughts to reality in order to arrive at the facts.

It is worth mentioning in this context two important points:

1. The fallacies that occur about the facts.
2. The fallacies that prevent the arrival at the facts.

As for the fallacies that occur about the facts, these are either due to the similitude that occurs between the facts and the thoughts; thus this similitude is used as a tool to obliterate the facts, or due to the use of one fact in order to obliterate another fact, or due to the misgivings raised about one of the facts, suggesting that it is not a fact or that it had been a fact under certain circumstances and that these circumstances have now changed, and so on.

For instance, it is a fact that the Jews are enemies to the Muslims and it is also a fact that the Jews are enemies to the people of what is factually known as Palestine. These two facts are similar and intertwined; however, the fallacy made the fact pertaining to the animosity between the Jews and the people of Palestine as the prominent fact and the remarkable one. Hence, this similitude or intertwining has been used to obliterate the fact concerning the animosity between the Jews and the Muslims.

The thought stipulating that freedom is adopted by America is fact; also, the thought stipulating that the presidents of America are selected by the capitalists is fact as well. These two thoughts are similar because they both reflect the reality of America. However, the fact about freedom has been used as a means to obliterate the fact that it is the capitalists who select the American presidents. Hence, this fact has been obliterated and it became widespread that the most popular presidential candidate is the one who becomes president.

For instance, it is fact that Britain is against a European unity. It is also fact that Britain aims to strengthen herself through a united Europe. Hence, the latter fact was used as a means to obliterate the former fact; thus Britain joined the Common Market.

It is fact that Islam is an invincible force. However, doubts have been raised about this fact until an opinion was formulated stipulating that this was not a fact, or that it was a fact at the beginning of Islam and then times changed and it was no longer a fact. This is how fallacies are used to obliterate facts by using other facts or by raising doubts about those facts, and this is exactly what the West had mastered with regard to the facts that the Muslims have had.

As for the fallacies that divert from the facts, these occur through the generation of certain actions, or by initiating certain thoughts that distract from the facts. For instance, it is fact that the Ummah cannot revive but through thought. However, in order to distract the Muslims from thought, physical actions have been encouraged with the aim of diverting people from thought, such as demonstrations, turmoil and revolutions, and with the aim of preoccupying them with such actions; thus the fact that the Ummah does not revive but through thought has been obliterated and replaced by the thought stating that the Ummah does not revive but through a revolution. Also, in order to distract the Muslims from the fact about revival, a host of thoughts were generated stipulating that revival is achieved through morals, or that revival is achieved through rituals, or that revival could only be achieved through economics and so on. This is how fallacies occur with the aim of diverting people from discovering the facts.

Therefore, one ought to be wary of fallacies, and one should adhere to the facts and hold on to the fact with an iron fist. It is imperative to have depth in the thought and sincerity in the process of thinking in order to reach the facts.

One of the most perilous aspects is the failure to benefit from the facts due to the neglect of historical facts, especially the basic facts from amongst them. This is so because history contains a host of established facts that do not change and it contains a host of opinions that are the outcome of circumstances. Hence, it would

be wrong to refer to opinions that are the outcome of circumstances and it would be wrong to apply them to different circumstances. However, the reality is that history as a whole has been viewed in the same light, historical facts have been neglected and there has been a failure to distinguish between the facts and the events. Hence, facts were neglected. For instance, it is a fact that the Westerners used the eastern coastlines, especially those of Egypt and Al-Sham, as a platform to invade the Islamic State, but their victory over the Muslims is a historical event and not a fact; thus the events were confused with the facts and the facts were neglected as a consequence, until the fact that the eastern coastline of the Mediterranean was a gap from which the enemy crept into the Islamic lands was pretentiously forgotten.

Also, it is a fact that the nationalist idea unsettled the entity of the Ottoman State; it is also fact that the Muslims fought the West in their quality as Ottoman Muslims, not just as Muslims. However, the defeat of the Ottomans in Europe and then their defeat in the First World War is one event from among the historical events. However, the history of the wars between the Ottomans and the Europeans and the history of the First World War were viewed in the same light, thus the facts of these wars have been neglected, i.e. the historical facts have been overlooked and consequently the facts and the events were mingled and the fact were neglected, to the point where the fact that nationalism was the cause of the Ottoman's defeat in Europe and in the First World War was pretentiously forgotten.

All the historical events have been viewed in the same manner and the facts have been overlooked, thus the historical facts have not been exploited though they are the dearest thing a man could have and though they are the highest type of thoughts.

Therefore, the thought about facts is the efficient thought, be it with the aim of reaching them or with the aim of distinguishing them from other than facts, or with the aim of holding on to them with an iron fist and benefit from them. It is the type of thought that generates a major impact in the lives of the individuals, peoples and nations. What use would the thought be if it were not taken in order to act upon it, if it were not grasped with an iron fist and adhered to and if it did not distinguish between fact and non fact.

Nevertheless, the facts are a conclusive matter, they are fixed and do not change. They are also conclusive and decisive and they are unaffected by the different circumstances nor the change of conditions.

It is true that a thought should not be stripped of its circumstances and the conditions surrounding it, nor should it be used as an analogy in an encyclopaedic manner, but this is the thought in its quality as such if it were not fact. Whereas if the thought were fact, then it would be wrong to take the conditions and circumstances into account no matter how much these changed and varied. This type of thought should be taken as it is regardless of the circumstances and conditions, especially that facts are not taken through the scientific method, which is a doubtful method, but rather through the rational method and through the conclusive aspect of it; this is so because facts are related to the existence, not to the essence nor to the attributes. The applicability of the thought to the reality it indicates must be a decisive applicability, in order for it to be a fact. Hence, it is imperative to think about the facts and it is imperative to hold on to them with an iron fist.

As for the thought about styles, it is the thought about the temporary manner by which the action is performed. The style is determined by the type of the action; thus a style would vary according to variation in the type of action. It is true that styles may be similar and that the one style could be useful in several actions, it is however important to think about the type of action for which the style is being utilised when thinking about the style itself, even if the styles were similar and even if the known style were useful for this new action. Hence, it is imperative to think about the nature of the action when thinking about choosing a style for it, regardless of the similarity in the styles and irrespective of the presence of other styles that would be useful of this action. This is so because similarity could divert one away from the effective style and because the presence of a style that is useful for that particular action may impede the performing of the action. For instance, the style of publicity for an idea is similar to the style of calling for this idea; each one of these styles relies on displaying this idea to people. However, this similarity may mislead the carriers of the call and it may also mislead those who advertise the idea, for the style of publicity would fail in the long term if used as a style when calling for an idea, and the style of calling for an idea would make the publicity fail if it were used to advertise an idea. This is so because the style of calling relies on explaining the facts as they are, whereas the style of publicity relies on embellishing and bedecking the idea, though it is imperative for both styles to give a good display.

Also, the style of appointing a ruler in the democratic system, which consists of making people elect the ruler, is useful in appointing the ruler in the Islamic system, where people elect the ruler. However, when adopting a style to appoint a Khalifah for the Muslims, we ought to think about the reality of the rule in the system of Islam, namely that it involves appointing a permanent ruler and not a ruler for a specific period of time. Hence, it would be imperative to think about the

type of ruling in Islam when thinking about designing a style to appoint a Khalifah; for instance, only those who are suitable for the Khalifah would be short-listed by the representatives of the Ummah and those who are unsuitable would not be allowed to stand for the post. Then people would be invited to elect whoever they wish from among the short-listed candidates and then people would be requested to give their pledge of allegiance to the candidate whom the majority of Muslims chose him as a Khalifah for the Muslims. It is true that the pledge of allegiance i.e. the Bay'ah is a method to appoint the Khalifah and not a style, but the manner in which the pledge of allegiance is delivered is however a style. Hence, it would be insufficient for the style to be useful with regard to the new action as it was useful in other actions; thus, in order to approve a style for an action, it is imperative to think about the action when thinking about the style, for the thought about the action when thinking about designing a style to perform the action.

The style is a specific manner through which the action is performed, and it is a temporary manner; contrary to the method, which is a constant manner through which the action is performed. The method never changes nor differs, and it does not require an inventive mentality in order to perform it, for it is conclusive. This means that it is either conclusive itself, or its origin is conclusive. As for the style, it could fail when utilised in performing an action, and it could also change; it also requires an inventive mentality in order to perform it. Therefore, the thought about the styles is higher than the thought about the methods. The method might be deduced by an inventive mind, but it could however be used by an ordinary mind. As for the style, it requires an inventive mind or a genius mind in order to reach it, though its utilisation by an ordinary mind could be productive.

Hence, the method is not necessarily produced by the inventive mind, but it is necessary for the style to be devised by the inventive mind or the genius mind, regardless of whether the person is educated or not, because devising a style is not related to knowledge and education, it is rather related to the intellectual process that occurs in order to reach it. Therefore, people differ when it comes to solving problems, because they solve them with the help of styles. For instance, a person may attempt to solve a certain problem, but finds it difficult, thus he may avoid it or declare his inability to solve it, or he may think that it is a problem that cannot be solved. However, a person who has the mentality of solving problems would change the style if he were dealing with a problem that is hard to solve; or he may resort to several styles. If he is still incapable of solving the problem despite the various styles that he used, he would not avoid the problem nor would he declare his inability to solve it, nor would he despair from finding a solution. He would rather persevere and wait for a while, i.e. leave it to time as they say. Then he would from time to time think again about solving it until it is solved.

Hence, the person who possesses the mentality of solving problems does not think that there are problems that cannot be solved, he thinks rather that every problem must have a solution. The cause of this is his reliance upon his capability in generating the styles that solve the intricate problems.

Therefore the thought about the styles is one of the inventive or the genius minds' characteristics; thus problem solving is dependent upon the thought about the styles.

As for the thought about the means, it is equivalent to the thought about the styles and comparative to it. It is the thought about the material objects that are utilised to perform the actions. Hence, if the thought about the styles is what solves the problems, these styles would be worthless if the means utilised did not lead to the solution. Although the perception of means comes via thought, the experiment on the means remains a vital element in recognising its potential. Hence, it is inevitable for the one who thinks about the styles to think about the means as well. Otherwise, all the styles would not be productive if the means utilised were not compatible with the styles in terms of strength, especially that the means are a vital part in the productivity of the styles.

For instance, the design of a plan to fight the enemy is a design of a style, though it is a plan, for the plan itself is a style. Hence, if the design of the plan were 100% correct, but the weapons available did not match the weapons of the enemy, the plan would definitely be doomed to failure, even if the fighting men were stronger than the enemy's men, and even if the fighting men were twice the size of the enemy's men; the plan would still be without a doubt doomed to failure. The plan of war is a style, while the men and the weapons are means aimed at executing this style; thus if the thought about the means were lacking when thinking about the means, or if the means were not of the type by which the style is executed, the thought about the styles would then be worthless, and the styles that one had thought about would also be of no value, for the means would not be productive unless they were thought about when thinking about the style and unless they were of the type utilised to execute the style itself.

Hence, it would be wrong to think about the means without thinking about the styles and it would be wrong to think about the means except in the light of the style that is being thought about.

However, although the style may be unknown to the thinker, the means are even more obscured to every thinker. This is because the styles can be decided by merely thinking about them; whereas the means must be thought about and they

also must be tested, in order for the test to determine whether the means are sound or not and to determine whether it is suitable for the type of the style or not. For instance, the non industrial countries purchase their weapons from the industrial states and they train their armed forces on the use of these weapons with the knowledge of the industrial states experts. However, they in fact did not test these weapons, nor did they test the training of the soldiers. Hence, no matter how many plans they devised, they would not be choosing the means that are of the same class of these plans.

It is true that they receive the military training from the military states and from the industrial states, but the military training and the devising of plans and the like from among the military knowledge remain a style and it would sufficient to merely think about it. However, the means must be subject to test and experiment in order for the thought about the means to occur.

For instance, to establish a bloc or a party upon an idea in order to spread this idea among the people or the nation and to adopt the assumption of power as a method to execute this idea entail certain actions. The party or the bloc would fail in achieving its objective if it were to target the scholars in order to turn them into party members and if it were to target those who have influence in their respective milieux or in society in order to win them over for party membership, for if it were to succeed with the scholars in spreading the idea, it would not be successful with them in assuming power, and if it were successful with those influential figures to assume the reins of power, the authority would not be based upon the idea and the idea would not be spread. Furthermore, forming the majority of the party from either of the two sections or both of them together would shorten the life of the party and the party would fail to achieve its objective; it would continue to proceed on the path of ruin until it perishes. This is so because these means, which in this case are the persons of this type, have been thought about via reason alone, and thought was not conducted via the experiment as well as reason. However, if the historical facts about this type of party structuring were taken into account, then the means would be thought about via reason and via experiment as well. Hence, taking the historical facts in this matter and using the means according to the historical facts would be a productive thought about the means and a productive way of testing these means and determine their suitability to the relevant styles. The historical facts make it incumbent upon the bloc that is built upon an idea to target the people or the nation in order to spread the idea, regardless of the individuals; thus it would accept any individual who accepts this idea and who accepts to be affiliated to this bloc in his quality as a individual of the public or an individual of the nation, irrespective of the level of his education and irrespective of his position. This is the only thing that guarantees the success of the party or the bloc and helps it achieve its objective.

Therefore, the means may be obscured and they may not be discovered if thought about in isolation from the thought about the style that it is meant to execute. They may also be obscured and not discovered if they were not tested. Hence, it is imperative to think about the means and this thought must occur when thinking about the styles. It is also imperative for the testing of these means to occur in addition to the thought about them, in order to guarantee the success of the means and in order to achieve the aims, i.e. in order for the styles that utilise the means to be fruitful.

As for the thought about the objectives and the aims, it should start first of all by determining what is wanted, i.e. specifying what is aimed for. This specification is necessary in order to arrive at the fruitful thought. To specify what is wanted is not an easy matter, for the declined nations and peoples do not know what they want, and seldom do they recognise what they want. The individuals who are declined in the thought and even many from among those with high level of thought do not specify what they want and some of them are unable to specify what they want. As for the peoples and the nations, they are subdued by imitation due to the presence of the herd aspect or what is referred to as the herd instinct conspicuously, which stimulates group forming. They tend to be dominated by a lack of close examination of thoughts. Hence, a host of erroneous thoughts are formed amongst them and consequently they acquire a host of unsound information and they tend to forge ahead without determining an objective, or without intending to specify an objective. Hence, they are dominated by a lack of specification of objectives.

As for the individuals, they tend to neglect the objectives and the aims due to the lack of purpose. Hence, they tend to proceed in their thought without an objective. Hence, their thought is not fruitful and they do not proceed towards a specific objective, despite the fact that the specification of the objectives and the aims is essential in making the thought fruitful. This is so because the thought or the action is generated for a specific matter, i.e. for a specific objective. This is why one finds that every man is a thinker but not every man is capable of achieving the aims.

The objective and the aims differ when people differ. The objective of the declined nation is to be revived and achieving all types of satisfaction is the objective of the elevated nation. The primitive people are content to have as their objective preserving their status quo; whereas the elevated people make their objective the betterment of their situation and the generation of change. The person who is declined in the thought has as his objective satisfying his vital energy and the people with the elevated thought have as their objective the betterment of their class of satisfaction. Therefore, the objectives and aims differ according to the difference of people and the difference in their level of thought. Nevertheless, no

matter what the objectives and aims are amongst peoples and individuals, the fact remains that perseverance in achieving the aims and the seriousness in pursuing them would only be in the near objectives and the easy aims. Satisfying the hungers, as far as satisfaction is concerned is an easy objective, even if it were not near. Hence, the energy of perseverance in satisfying it is found in almost every person, though this energy may vary from one person to another. To endeavour to eat or to endeavour to feed one's family or to endeavour to possess something or to seek safety and the like are all objectives found in every person. However, to endeavour to revive oneself or to revive one's people, or to endeavour to elevate one's status or to elevate the status of one's people or nation, all these objectives require perseverance and serious pursuance in order to achieve them, and this is not within the capability of every person. One could start the journey and then he may fall short of achieving the objective due to the hardship and due to one's patience running out. One could also start to strive, but not seriously, and he proceed in the action but not seriously as well; thus he may continue to proceed but without achieving an objective, despite the fact that he did not tire nor did he lose patience, but he was however was not serious in his progress. Achieving remote objectives requires first and foremost, seriousness, then patience and pursuance.

Individuals are more capable to persevere than groups, i.e. people and nations, because the vision to them is clearer and stronger than that of the groups. This is so because the gathering of people weakens their thought and weakens their vision. Hence, the vision of the individual is stronger than that of a pair, and the larger the number, the weaker the vision. Hence, it would be wrong to set for peoples remote objectives, for they would not proceed towards achieving them; even if they did proceed, they would not do so seriously and they would not reach the objective. Therefore, the objective set for peoples must be a close objective and possible to achieve, even if this led to setting a close objective as a period, so that when this period is achieved, they move to another one and so on. This is so because the groups are likelier to opt for what is feasible and they are less prepared than individuals to endure great hardships. Peoples cannot turn what is rationally possible into an objective, but they can visualise what is effectively possible and they can vie towards achieving it. As for the individuals, they are generally capable of visualising that what is rationally possible is also effectively possible and they are also capable of having a distant vision. They are also more steadfast in hardship, more resistant in the face of problems and better equipped for the distant periods.

However, whether the objectives and the aims were laid to the nations, or the peoples or the individuals, it would be wrong for their achievement to require several generations, or to require an effort that is beyond human capabilities, or to

require non-existent means or means whose procurement is impossible. The objective should rather be achievable for the generation that works towards achieving it, an objective that is achievable through the normal human effort and whose means are existent or can be procured. This is so because the objective is an aim targeted by the very person who endeavours towards achieving, and one would not endeavour to achieve it if he were certain that he would not achieve it. Since he endeavours towards achieving it, he would then require the means through which he can achieve it, for if he did not have the means by which he endeavours, he would not endeavour to achieve the objective, even if he pretended to do so, i.e. even if he deceived himself. He would also endeavour to achieve his objective with his human power, and if his human power were not sufficient to proceed in the endeavour, he would not thrive towards achieving the objective at all, for man could not be assigned more than he could bear; he could not even work beyond his own powers. Therefore, the objectives must be possible to achieve by the same person who endeavours to achieve them, with his own normal effort and with the means available to him, no matter how distant these objectives were.

The objective of thinking must be determined and the objective of the action must also be determined. The objective must be visible to the eyesight and illustrated in the mind, otherwise, it would not be an objective.

If the thought and the action of the individuals must be for an objective, the peoples and the nations must also have an objective or objectives. However, the objective of the peoples and the nations must not be distant; they should rather be proximate. If the objective were nearer and more achievable, it would be better and easier to yield results and it would be better for the thought and the action. It is true that it would be hard to envisage that peoples and nations are capable of setting for themselves objectives or to design for themselves collective aims, but thoughts do spread among these peoples and nations. Peoples and nations do form opinions and they do embrace doctrines. Hence, these thoughts, opinions and doctrines would be theirs. Also, a host of objectives would dominate them, either as a result of thoughts, opinions and doctrines, or as a result of life's experience, or as a result of the deprivation or satisfaction that they experience. Hence, a host of objectives would be formulated. These would be reflected in either abolishing deprivation or improving the satisfaction. Peoples and nations do have objectives, even if they collectively could not formulate objectives. However, their objectives as a whole are of the type that can be effectively possible to achieve, and not of the type that is rationally possible, nor visualised as being effectively possible.

It is worth mentioning that there is a difference between the objective and the ideal. The ideal is the ultimate objective and it is only requisite in the endeavour to

obtain it and achieve it. It is not necessary for the ideal to effectively possible to achieve, but it is however necessary for it to be rationally possible. Hence, the ideal is other than the objective, though it is in itself an objective. The difference between the ideal and the objective is that the objective should be recognised before undertaking to achieve it, and should be constantly perceived while performing the action. One should also endeavour assiduously towards achieving it and persist until it is effectively achieved. As for the ideal, it should be merely noticed while thinking and while the action is performed, and all the thoughts and the actions should be for the sake of attaining it. For instance, the pleasure of Allah (swt) is the ideal of the Muslims and that of every Muslim. Some of them may adopt the entry to Heaven as their ideal. While others may adopt the avoidance of Hell as their ideal. However, these two matters and the like are not the ideal, though it would be sound to deem them as being the ultimate objective, for they are objectives to earlier objectives, and yet there is another objective after these. The ultimate objective that has no objective after it is the pleasure of Allah (swt). Hence, the ideal of the Muslim is to gain the pleasure of Allah (swt). This is why it has been said about one of the pious and devoted people: *“What an excellent servant Suhaib was. Even if he had no fear of Allah, he would not have disobeyed him.”* because his objective from not disobeying Allah (swt) was not out of fear from Allah to punish him, but his objective was to seek His pleasure. Though he had not felt fear, he did not commit a sin, because his abstention from sin was to seek His pleasure not out of fear of His punishment. Hence, the ideal of the Muslims is to gain the pleasure of Allah (swt) and not to enter Paradise or to avoid being thrown in Hell.

Therefore, though the ideal is an objective, in its quality as the ultimate objective, or the objective of objectives, it is however other than the objective and the aim. What is referred to in terms of thought and action being for a specific objective, does not mean the ideal, but rather the objective that is effectively achievable even if there were one or more objectives beyond it. Hence, the objective must be determined and achievable by those who thrive to achieve it, not by the future generations. The means of achieving it must be available or potentially available practically and realistically. Hence, it is not the ideal, but rather the aim that one intends to achieve. Therefore, it is imperative for the thought about the objective to be realistic and practical, i.e. to be achievable at the hands of those who seek to achieve it.

A question may be asked here: The age of nations is not measured by the one generation but by several generations, and the planning for the future of the nation must be long term so as to be achieved by the future generations. So how can we say that the objective must be achieved by the same people who seek it?

The answer to this is that the age of nations is not measured by generation, nor by decades as is imagined. It is rather measured by decades. A nation is transformed and shifted from one situation to another in one decade. The practical thought can be given to the nation and it can be attached to the nation in one generation, no matter how much resistance it endures, provided the thought and the work are serious. Hence, a nation does not require several generations nor several centuries. Rather, every thought and every action requires less than a decade in order to come to fruition, for in the one decade the transformation of the nation occurs; and if the nation is subjugated by her enemy, she would need more than one decade, but with resistance, she would not need more than three decades. Hence, the movement or the action of the thought must yield results at the hands of those who vie to achieve this thought or that action, and not at the hands of the future generations. Therefore, the objective must be of the type that is achievable by the ones who seek it. This is the condition of the thought about the objective, and it would not be an objective if the ones who seek it cannot achieve it themselves.

As for what is said about planning for the nation and make the future generations proceed to achieve these plans, just like what the vibrant peoples and nations do, this type of planning is not an objective, nor is it deemed as specific thoughts, but rather general guidelines and general thoughts, designed by way of assumption not on the basis that it is an objective. Hence, such plans cannot be deemed as an objective, but rather general thoughts, provided they existed. The objective however, is exclusively the matter that is achieved by the ones who seek it. This is the objective and this is the thought about the objective; other than this is mere assumptions and theories and not a thought about the objectives.

Thought can either be superficial, or profound or enlightened. The superficial thought is the thought of the common people, while the profound thought is that of the savants. As for the enlightened thought, it is mostly the thought of the leaders and the enlightened from among the savants and the common people. The superficial thought is merely the transference of reality to the brain, without researching anything else and without attempting to sense what is related to it and link this sensation to the relevant information; also, without attempting to search for other information related to it, thus producing a superficial judgement. This is often the case with the groups, the declined in thought, the uneducated and the uncultured from among the intelligent persons.

The superficial thought is the blight of peoples and nations, for it prevent them from achieving revival and from leading an affluent life, though it enables them to lead a serene life. The cause of superficial thought is the weakness of sensation or the lack of information, or the weakness in the quality of linkage in man's brain. It is not man's natural thought, though it is the primitive thought. Mankind differ in

the power and the weakness of sensation, the power and the weakness of the quality of linkage and they differ also in the amount or the type of information they have, whether these were information acquired through learning, or reading, or acquired from life experience. The difference in these matters means that the process of thinking is conducted according to them. In essence, most people should be strong in terms of the brain and the quality of linkage, apart from the few who were born weak or they suffered a weakness. Also, most people in essence should have their information refreshed on a daily basis, even if they were illiterate, save for the odd ones, and those are who nothing catches their imagination and never lend any attention to what they receive or read in terms of information. Hence, the superficial thought is not natural, but rather queer. However, the fact that individuals have got used to superficial thought and they have contented themselves with its outcomes, coupled with the fact that matters which were superior to what they held were never deemed necessary, all this turned superficial thought into a habit; thus they pursued this pattern of thought and, relished it, and their taste became crystallised upon it.

As for the groups, they tend to be dominated by superficial thought even if it were a group of innovative thinkers. This is due to their lack of thinking ability as a group. Hence, superficial thought is prevalent in life. Were it not for certain individuals from among the people or the nation, who are gifted with an extraordinary ability of sensation and linkage, it would be hard to envisage any revival, or any material progress in life.

Superficial thought has no treatment amongst groups. However, the level of reality and events could be elevated and groups could be supplemented with elevated thoughts and rich information; thus the level of their thought could be raised. It would remain nevertheless superficial, even if its level were high. This means that the people or the nation could undertake the actions stemming from an enlightened thought, but their thought remains somewhat superficial. The groups cannot think in a profound or enlightened manner no matter how high their level of elevation and progress became. This is because in their quality as groups they are unable to conduct a profound study, nor could they acquire an enlightened thought. Hence, in order to raise the level of their thinking, one should not attempt to deal with the thought of the group, but rather deal with reality and the events upon which the sensation of the group falls; also, it is possible to deal with the thoughts and the information that are placed in the group, thus the superficiality will be uplifted, but not eradicated. Nevertheless the level of the groups' conducts would be elevated.

As for the individuals, their superficiality could be eradicated, reduced or turned into a rare occurrence. This is carried out by firstly eradicating their current habit thinking habit through education and culturing and drawing their attention to the

triviality of their thinking and the triviality of their thoughts. Secondly, they must increase the experiments they carry out themselves or increase the experiments that they witness, and they ought to be given the opportunity to live several events and sense a diverse, progressive and variable reality. Thirdly, by making them live with life and adapt to it, they would abandon superficiality or superficiality would abandon them and they would become non superficial.

The more such individuals proliferate within the nation, the easier and nearer to leading the nation towards revival it becomes. Despite the fact that these individuals live amidst the nation, receive the available information, sense reality and the existing events, and despite the fact that they could not outpace their era, nor are they of a different class to that of their nation, they could however be ahead of their nation and steer it from one situation to another. This is because they visualise the facts of the refined life in a realistic manner, by responding to the truthful thoughts, endorsing the sound opinions, embracing the conclusive thoughts, distinguishing between the various opinions and discerning the reality of opinions. Hence, they acquire the perceptual sensation, i.e. the sensation that emanates from knowledge and perception and they acquire the perceptual logic, i.e. the comprehension resulting from sheer sensation, for although they have senses like other people and they have brains like other people do, the quality of linkage found in their brains is however superior to that of other people. The fact that they concern themselves with linking the sensation to previous information in a sound manner, this makes them more perceptive of matters than others, i.e. their thought is distinguished from the thought of other people. Hence, they develop the perceptual sensation and this will in turn elevate the perceptual logic. Therefore, individuals are more susceptible than the groups when it comes to abandoning superficiality, though their susceptibility would be of no value if it were not taken up and adopted by the groups.

This is the treatment of superficiality; that is the treatment of individuals and making the nation acquire what they have reached in terms of thought and adopt it. In addition to this, the realities within the nation must be updated and the refined thoughts must be implanted amidst her and made available to her. This process must also be simultaneous, for the work towards relinquishing superficiality in the nation would be valueless if it were not coupled with the treatment of individuals. Likewise, the treatment of individuals would also be valueless if it were not proceeding alongside the work within the nation in order to discard the superficiality that she suffers from. This is so because the individuals are an integral part of the nation and the nation is composed of the group of people who are bonded by a specific way of life. A people are composed of the group of people who are of the same origin and who live together. Hence, the individuals are from among these peoples, be it within the nation or within the one people and

they cannot be separated from the nation nor can the nation be isolated from them. Therefore, the process of abandoning superficiality and the work within the individuals and the nation must be conducted simultaneously so that superficiality could be abandoned by everyone.

As for the profound thought, it is the process of thinking deeply, i.e. to delve into the sensation of reality and the information linked to this sensation in order to perceive the reality. Hence, the profound thought is not to content oneself with the mere sensation and the mere primary information to link the sensation, as is the case in the superficial thought. One would rather repeat the sensation of reality and attempt to sense out of it more than he has the first time, either by way of experiment or by way of repeating the sensation; he would then attempt to search from more information in addition to the primary information and then he would once again link the information to reality in a thorough manner either through repetitive experiment or through yet another linkage. Hence, one would acquire from this type of sensation and this type of linkage, or this type of information, a host of profound thoughts, regardless of whether these were facts or not. By repeating this process and getting used to it, the profound thought would be generated. Hence, the profound thought is the non contentment with the first sensation, the primary information and the initial linkage. It is the second step after the superficial thought. This is the thought of the savants and the intellectuals, though it is not necessarily the thought of the educated, for the profound thought is to delve into the sensation, the information and the linkage.

As for the enlightened thought, it is the very profound thought but coupled with the thought about what surrounds reality and what is related to with the aim of reaching the true results. In other words, the profound thought is to delve into the thought itself, whereas the enlightened thought is to have beside the process of delving into the thought, a thinking around the profound thought and what is related to it for a deliberate aim, that is to attain the true results. Hence, every enlightened thought is in fact a profound thought. The enlightened thought cannot be generated from the superficial thought. However, not every profound thought is an enlightened thought. For instance, when the nuclear physicist conducts a research into the splitting of the atom, or when the chemistry scientist conducts a research in the composition of substances, or when the scholar studies the deduction of rules and the enacting of laws, they, and other persons like them, tend to research these matters in a profound manner, and were it not for the profound research, they would not be able to attain these remarkable results. However, they are not thinkers in an enlightened manner, nor is their thought deemed to be an enlightened thought. Hence, it comes as no surprise to see the nuclear physicist praying to a piece of wood, i.e. to the cross, despite the fact that the simplest of enlightenment demonstrates that this piece of wood does neither harm nor good,

and that it is not part of what is worshipped. It also comes as no surprise to find a learned jurist believing in saints and submitting himself to a man like him so that he forgives him his sins. This is because the nuclear physicist, the jurist and their like think in a profound manner but not in an enlightened manner. Were their thought enlightened, they would not pray to the piece of wood, nor would they believe in the existence of saints, nor would they seek forgiveness from men like them. It is true that the profound thinker is profound in what he thinks about and not in other than that, for he could be profound when thinking about splitting the atom, or drafting a law, but he could be trivial when it comes to thinking about other matters. This is true, but if the thinker were to get used to being profound in his thought, this could make him profound in most of what he thinks, especially with regard to matters related to the greatest problem or the viewpoint about life. However, the lack of enlightenment in his thought would make him get used to profound thought and the superficial thought, or even the trivial thought. Therefore, the profound thought alone would not be sufficient to revivify man and elevate his intellectual level; it would be rather imperative for this to occur to be enlightened in the thought so that the elevation in the thought could be generated. Although enlightenment is not essential when it comes to reaching sound results in thought, as is the case in the experimental science, law, medicine and the like, it is however essential in raising the standard of thought and in making the process of thinking produce thinkers. Hence, the nation cannot achieve revival through the mere presence of savants in experimental science, nor through the presence of scholars and jurists, nor through the presence of doctors and engineer. The nation does not achieve revival through the presence of those and their like, she will rather achieve it through having enlightenment in the thought, i.e. if she had enlightened thinkers.

Enlightenment in thought does not necessitate the presence of education; in other words, it is not necessary for the enlightened thinkers to be educated, for the Bedouin who said: *"The droppings indicate the presence of camels and the traces indicate the presence of walking."*, is an enlightened thinker, and the orator who said: *"Caution does not save one from fate, and patience is a cause of victory."*, is also an enlightened thinker. However, poet who said: The Khalifah has died o man and Jinn as if I ate in Ramadhan. He is not an enlightened thinker even if he were an educated scholar. The wise man who said: *"The pinnacle of wisdom is the fear of Allah"* is not an enlightened thinker, for the pinnacle of wisdom is perceiving the existence of Allah (swt) and not the fear of Allah. Hence, the enlightened thought does not require knowledge, nor does it require wisdom, but rather to think profoundly and to roam around the matter and what is related to it with the aim of reaching the truthful results. Hence, the enlightened thinker could an illiterate person who can neither read nor write, and he could also be educated and a savant. The enlightened thinker cannot formulate enlightened thought unless he has the

enlightenment when thinking. The politician is an enlightened thinker and the leader is an enlightened thinker, but both of them require the enlightenment when thinking about everything, so that the thought is enlightened. Hence, it is no wonder to see the great leaders and the great politicians praying to a piece of wood and seeking forgiveness from men who are below them in terms of enlightenment, for this particular thought of theirs does not have any depth nor any enlightenment; it rather stems from habit and imitation or from imposture and hypocrisy. All this is not depth nor enlightenment, because the enlightened thinker does not relate to imposture and hypocrisy, nor does he allow habits and traditions control him.

The thinker must be serious in his thought, regardless of whether he is superficial, profound or enlightened. It is true that the superficial thinker is not helped by his superficiality to be serious, but by relinquishing frivolity and by renouncing his habits he could be serious in his thought. Seriousness does not require depth, though depth drives one towards it, nor does it require enlightenment, though enlightenment necessitates seriousness, because seriousness means the presence of purpose and the endeavour to achieve this purpose, in addition to the perfection in illustrating the reality of what is thought about. The thought about the danger is not a study of the danger itself, but rather to avoid it, and the thought about food is not a study of it, but rather how to acquire it. Also, the thought about playing is not a study of it, but rather to play, and the thought about a trip is not a study of sightseeing, but in order to enjoy the trip; even the thought about walking aimlessly is not a thought about this walk, but in order to chase away boredom. Also, the thought about drafting a law is not a research into the law itself, but rather for the sake of drafting this law. All this is thought, regardless of its type; it is either a thought about the thing or a thought about utilising that thing. The thought about the thing would be in order to recognise it, the thought about utilising that thing would rather be for the sake of making use of it, and in both cases, frivolity must not interfere with either of them, nor should the habit of thought control the thing or its utilisation during the process of thinking. Hence, if frivolity were discarded and the habit were shunned, the serious thought would be generated, because at that time, it would be easy, if not inevitable to generate the purpose and the endeavour to achieve that purpose, and it would be also easy and even inevitable to generate the vision for the reality that one aims at, i.e. the reality of what is thought about.

Therefore, seriousness can be found in the superficial thought as well as the profound thought and the enlightened thought, though in essence, seriousness should occur in the profound and the enlightened thoughts. However, seriousness is not a requisite for thought. In fact, most of people's thought is devoid of seriousness, for they perform their actions by way organisation habit and by virtue of continuity. Frivolity in their thought is existent in a conspicuous manner.

Therefore, seriousness must be simulated and purpose would be its basis. Simulation is in this context the same as purpose, thus it must be said that seriousness is unnatural, even if we were to note that some people are serious by nature.

However, the seriousness we mean in this context is not the absolute seriousness, but rather the seriousness that is at the level of what is thought about, for if it were below the level, it would not be deemed seriousness. The person who thinks about marriage and does not attend to what achieves it, is not serious in his thought about marriage, and the person who thinks about business and then spends all what he has earned from the sales, is not serious about business. Likewise, the person who thinks about becoming a judge and then endeavours only to be appointed in the judiciary, is not serious about becoming a judge, but rather serious about becoming an employee, and the person who thinks about feeding his dependants and then spends his time playing and roaming the markets, is not serious in his thought about feeding his dependants, and so on.

Seriousness necessitates the work towards what is aimed for, and the work must be of the level of what is aimed for. For if one did not work towards achieving what is aimed for, not even to arrive at a specific thought, or if he were to perform actions that are below what he is aiming for, he would not be serious in his thought. The fact that one says that he is serious in his thought is not sufficient to consider him serious, and his simulation of certain conditions or features or movements, be it intellectual or physical, would not be sufficient to make him serious nor would it be sufficient to denote seriousness; he should rather undertake a host of physical actions and these actions must be of the level of what he is thinking about in order to be serious or in order to denote that he is serious in his thought. Hence, it is imperative to undertake physical actions and for the actions to be of the level of what is thought about, in order to generate seriousness in the thought or in order to indicate that this seriousness in the thought is existent.

The declined nations and peoples, and the lazy individuals, or those who avoid dangers, or those overwhelmed by timidity or fear or dependence on others, are all not serious in what they think about, because decline makes one prefer what is easiest, thus he does not attend to what is harder. Also, laziness contradicts seriousness and the avoidance of dangers drives one away from seriousness. Likewise, timidity, fear and dependence on others stand in the way of seriousness. Therefore, it is imperative to elevate the thought, eradicate laziness, to be eager to take the dangers by storm, to distinguish between timidity and what one must be embarrassed by, to be brave and to make self-dependence a second nature, in order for seriousness to exist in individuals, peoples and nations, because seriousness is not generated in an automatic manner, it should rather be simulated.

As for the necessity of having seriousness in the thought, it is because the purpose of thinking is not merely to generate thought, the thought must rather be for the sake of yielding a benefit from it. Consequently, the thought must be for the sake of acting upon it. The thoughts yielded by the savants and intellectuals and the various types of knowledge that are achieved are not merely for fun, nor to merely seek pleasure and enjoyment from these thoughts, but rather for the sake of life and in order to work in this life. Therefore, he who claims that knowledge is sought for the sake of knowledge is wrong; thus, Greek philosophy is of no value because it is merely thoughts used for pleasure and there is no value for any knowledge if one cannot benefit from it, because knowledge is not sought for pleasure, but rather to act upon in this life. Hence, we cannot say that the Greek philosophers and those who imitated them from among the savants were serious in their thought, nor can we say that the later scholars from among the Muslims who had made the science of rhetoric just like philosophy, were serious in their thought, for such a thought is useless in the realm of life, and all it has is the pleasure of study and research. It is true that one does not benefit in the realm of life from the thoughts of poets and writers, but this is only in terms of performing actions, though in some cases a benefit may be drawn, their publications however is in itself a benefit. The reading of the poem or the literal texts in general generates pleasure and vigour. The authors in fact make these texts, though they are in themselves a result of thought, thus it would be wrong to say that they are not serious. Some of them are serious and proficient, though some of them are neither serious nor proficient. This is contrary to philosophy, for thinking about it was in order to reach the facts, and what it came up with is not facts and has no relation to facts. It is also contrary to the savants of rhetoric, who composed this knowledge in the same manner as philosophy, for their thinking was for the sake of acquiring the art of rhetoric, and for the sake of making people rhetorical in their speech, but what came in their work could not possibly generate rhetoric, nor could it have any link to rhetoric; what they yielded was an invite for research and the pleasure of research, without achieving the objective they had produced their works for, because at first they did not target the pleasure of research but something else, thus they had not been serious in their thinking, not because they did not achieve what they had sought, but because the nature of what they had produced could not have possibly led to what they had set out to achieve. Had they been serious in their thinking, they would not have produced this philosophy, nor would they have produced this type of the art of rhetoric; this is because seriousness necessitates the purpose and the purpose leads to the objective. They only had the research as a purpose and nothing else, thus they are surely not serious in their thinking.

Seriousness in the thought does not stipulate a short term nor a long term between the thought and the action, because the action is the fruit of the thought. One may think about going to the moon, and the time between this thought and reaching the

objective may be very long, and one may think about food and it could be a long time between thinking about the food and eating it. One may also think about reviving his nation and the time could be short between his thinking and the occurrence of revival. Hence, the issue is not related to the length nor the shortness of the period, because the period between the thought and the action does not necessarily have to be long or short, for it may be short and it may be long. What is important is for action to be generated as a result of thought, whether this were generated by the same thinker or someone else. Thought must produce action, be it a speech, such as poetry and rhetoric, or actions, such as experimental science, or plans of action in various domains such as politics or war, or physical actions such as fighting, eating or educating among others.

Therefore, thought must be serious if it were to yield the result that it was thought about, whether it effectively produced the result or failed to do so, for seriousness is necessary in the thought and without it, thought would be mere absurdness and frivolity, or monotonous, proceeding on one single pattern due to habit and imitation. Monotonous thought relishes the life according to which the thinker lives and according to which people live, and it discards from the minds the idea of change and the thought about change.

The thought about change is essential for life, because the stagnation of life and the submission to fates is one of the most dangerous blight that makes peoples and nations extinct and obliterated by events and times. Hence, the thought about change is one of the most important types of thought. The thought about change is not agreeable to the slothful, nor is it acceptable to the indolent, because the price of change is dear and because those who allow habits to dominate them deem the thought about change harmful to them and something that would move them from one situation to another, thus the declined and the indolent resist it and the so called conservative, and those who control people and their subsistence oppose it. Hence, the thought about change entails danger and is the most resisted types of thoughts.

The thought about change must begin with basis upon which man lives, whether this were related to changing the dispositions of individuals, or changing societies, or changing the conditions of peoples and nations, or similar. It also should begin with the societies that have no basis or those which based upon an erroneous basis, or with the conditions that do not proceed according to a straight path. This basis, upon which life is based, is what elevates and lowers life and what brings pleasure or misery to man. It is what generates a viewpoint about life according to which man proceeds in the realm of life.

Therefore, one should look into this basis, and if it were a rational doctrine that conforms with man's nature, it would not in this case require changing, nor would the heart of any human being nor the mind of any person would contemplate the notion of changing this basis, because it is the basis upon which life must be built. This is so because change should occur when things are not right and when matters are not straight, and when the error is illustrated in the mind or conspicuous to the emotions of man's vital energy. If reason is certain in a conclusive manner about the soundness of something the straightness of a matter, and if the emotions of the vital energy are satisfied and tranquil, the notion of change becomes completely redundant. Hence, the thought about change does not arise if the basis of life is a rational doctrine that conforms with man's nature. However, if the basis according to which man lives and upon which society is built, and according to which situations proceed, were lacking in origin or existent in an erroneous manner, it would be then frivolous to think about changing anything before thinking about a change in the basis, i.e. before a change in the doctrine that people embrace. Therefore, since the Muslims have been basking in the rational doctrine that conforms to man's nature, it is incumbent upon them to generate a change in the people who either have no doctrines or embrace corrupt doctrines. Hence, it is a duty upon them to carry the Islamic call to all non Muslims people even if this led to fighting, and to engage in battles with the unbelievers, i.e. with those who lack the rational doctrine that conform with man's nature.

The change should start with the basis, for if this basis were changed and replaced by the conclusively sound and true basis, then one would start thinking about changing societies and situations. The changing of societies and situations would be occasioned through the changing of the concepts, criteria and convictions. If the sound and true basis is established, then it would act as the basic criterion for all the criteria, the basic concept for all the concepts and the basic conviction for all the convictions. Once this basis is established, the change of the concepts, criteria and convictions would become possible and consequently the change of societies and situations would also become possible, because with the change in the basis, all the values would change, i.e. the values of things and the value of the thoughts, thus the constituents of life would change. The thought about change must exist within man, or it must be occasioned in man, and every person who possesses a rational doctrine that conforms with man's nature, he also possesses the thought about change, and this could either be in the form of a hidden force within him, or by effectively thinking about change while proceeding in the realm of life.

The thought about change does not mean that it is existent within those who sense the necessity to change their situations, or their thoughts, it is rather existent as long as there exist in the universe a situation that necessitates change. Hence, the change about thought is not confined to one changing his situation, nor changing

his society, nor changing his people and his nation. It is rather existent to change others, i.e. to change other people, other societies and the alien situations. Man has the quality of humanity, which necessitates looking to man wherever he is, be it in his own country or elsewhere, or be it within his state or another state, or be it within his nation or within other nations. Hence, man endeavours to occasion change in any place that requires change.

The thought about change springs from the depth of one's heart and the realities of life drive one towards it; it is even occasioned by the mere sensation of life. Although it is resisted by the forces that feel that change poses a threat, it is however existent even within these forces; thus its existence in man is inevitable. However, making people to think about change could either be brought about through persuasion or through the force majeure. Once the change has effectively occurred or once the value of change has been perceived, the thought about change become easy because it restore in people their sensation of the necessity of change, thus it generates in them the thought about change. Hence, it is imperative upon every Muslim to have the thought about change.

These are ten types of thought or ten models of thought. They are sufficient to give an illustration about thought. Although they include the thought from the outset, the spontaneous thought, the thought through the sensation and the thought through listening, they however include also the thought in perceiving the texts, i.e. the thought about what is read. However, the thought about what is read requires a special study and a special attention. This is because reading alone does not generate thought; one must rather know how the thought about the texts should be conducted when he reads them. This is because reading and writing are means of thought and they are not the thought. Many of those who read do not think, and many of those who read and think cannot acquire any thought, nor can they attain the thoughts expressed by the words they read. Hence, it would be wrong for anyone to imagine that learning to read and write would educate people, or revive nations. Hence, it would be wrong to attend to the eradication of illiteracy in order to educate people, and to channel the efforts towards eradicating illiteracy in order to revive a people or a nation; this is because reading and writing does not nurture reason with anything, nor does it occasion in the heart or in the mind any motive for thought; because thought is occasioned by reality and the previous information. Reading is not a reality which one thinks about, nor is it information by which reality is explained; thus it carries no value in thought; it is rather an expression of the thoughts, thus to merely read them does not generate the thoughts in the mind, nor does it evoke the thought. Reading is merely an expression of the thoughts, thus if the reader is able to perceive this expression, he would then acquire the thoughts, because of his ability to perceive, not because of his reading, and if he does not have the ability to perceive, he will not acquire the thoughts even if he

were to read for hours and even for years. Hence, it is imperative to study the thought about the texts and how to perceive these texts.

The most important composed texts are four: The literary texts, the intellectual texts, the legislative texts and the political texts. The thought about each one of these texts, i.e. their perception, varies from one type of text to the other, though the perception of all of these texts proceeds according to one method, that is the rational method. The scientific texts have not been mentioned because these are almost confined to the savants in experimental science, and rarely anyone else concerns himself with such texts. As for the four mentioned texts, these are put forth to all people, and their perception is within everyone's reach if the means of perception were made available.

The literary texts are designed for pleasure and emotional stimulation, though they may contain knowledge that it useful to reason, thus they focus more on the wordings and the syntheses rather than on the meanings. Although it is imperative for the meanings to be intended by the poet or the writer, the emphasis is however on the wordings and the syntheses. It is true that the wordings denote meanings and the syntheses also denote meanings, but the poet and the writer concentrate their efforts on the wordings and syntheses in order to convey these meanings. It is also true when they say that eloquence is the nice meaning within the nice expression and the nice synthesis, however, although the poet and the writer attended to catching the meanings, they did so with the aim of composing them into a beautiful expression and a beautiful synthesis. Hence, the expression and the synthesis or the composition of meanings represent the manner in which the meaning is exhibited within the expression or the synthesis.

The composition of meanings relies upon the design of wordings and synthesis, and it is also true that the purpose of texts is to convey the meanings, but this is true of all the texts in general; however, in the literary texts, the objective is not only to convey the meanings, but in essence it is to stimulate the reader and the listener, and not to give him the meaning only. Hence, the poet and the writer tend to select the wordings and the syntheses and they tend to deliberately make their words characterised by exaggeration and generalisation, and to pause at the areas of beauty and stimulation, evoking the emotions and generating reactions. Therefore, one finds that the literary texts are characterised by the wordings by which the thoughts are formulated and the images are portrayed, then attention is focused on the images, then by the choice of thoughts. Hence, the concern of the writer is focused on the thoughts that he can formulate and produce in a fascinating and stimulating image. Hence, the main aim is the expression, that is the portrayal or the producing of the image, while the thoughts are a tool or a means. Therefore, the portrayal and the image are what the poet and the writer

devote their attention to, while they attend to the thoughts with regard to their suitability to illustrate the images and the final image they portray, and not with regard to their soundness and veracity. This is so because the objective of the text is not to teach people the thoughts, but rather to evoke their emotions. Hence, attention is focused upon the imagery, i.e. on the expression, and consequently, attention is focused on what formulates the expression, which is the wordings and the syntheses, not on what this expression contains, save for its suitability for imagery, i.e. to produce this moving and splendid image.

This is the reality of the literary texts, and since this is their reality, the previous information required to link the sensation that occurs when reading literary texts must be information related to literary images, so that the meaning of the text is perceived and so that the produced image can be admired according to the aspect in which it is produced. In other words, perceiving the literary texts necessitates previous knowledge about the wordings and the syntheses, i.e. about the process of imagery and what it requires on terms of tools and means; it also necessitates practice on viewing and distinguishing the images, i.e. it necessitates experience on the reading of literary texts in a manner that allows one to acquire a taste and the ability to distinguish and perceive such texts. Hence, he who has no previous knowledge about literary texts would not be able to perceive them, even if he pretended being stimulated or appreciative. The issue is one of taste and such a taste could not be generated without practice experience and variety, i.e. without the frequent and varied reading of literary texts that covers all their types and images. Once this taste is acquired, the text can be perceived, because understanding the literary text is not about understanding its meanings, but rather about appreciating and relishing the synthesis, and through this relish, comes the understanding of the meanings.

If one wished to perceive literary texts, be it poetry or prose, he should not focus his attention on the meanings, but rather on perceiving the wordings and the synthesis and the perception of the meanings comes consequently. Therefore, it is imperative for the previous information to be related to the wordings and the syntheses and not to the meanings. In order to acquire such information about this, one should read the literary texts frequently and attempt to critique them and endeavour to acquaint himself with the secrets of their syntheses until he acquires the taste for these texts. Once the taste is generated, the information will be formed. Hence, the perception of literary texts does not require lessons and academic attainments, nor does it require information about the meanings contained in the texts. It rather requires the development of a taste in the first instance, and this taste is developed through frequent reading of literary texts, until one acquires a rapture from reading them, thus one will have developed his taste. Perceiving literary texts does not require a knowledge in grammar and

syntax, nor does it require a knowledge in the science of rhetoric, which includes connotation, eloquence and figures of speech, nor does it require the knowledge of philology and composition. Though it would be desirable to acquaint oneself with such topics, it would be on the other hand undesirable to delve into them. In order to perceive literary texts, only one thing is required, that is to read the texts frequently, until the taste is acquired.

This is the method of thought with regard to perceiving the literary texts, namely that their perception requires the presence of a previous taste, i.e. a knowledge about the nature of the texts from which a taste is developed. Hence, the previous information of the literary texts are in fact reflected in the presence of the taste and the way to acquire it is to read the literary texts in frequent manner until this taste is developed.

If this taste were lacking, the perception of the literary texts would not be possible, i.e. the thought about them would not be fruitful. It is true that one could end up perceiving the thought that the literary texts contain and he could acquire the vision which these texts aim for, but he would not come up with a perception, nor with a cognisance, because he would not have relished them and acquired their taste, and if he did not relish them and acquire their taste, then he would not perceive them. To perceive the literary text is to be stimulated by it, to be excited about it and affected by it. This could not occur unless the reader had a taste for these texts, thus what is required to perceive the literary texts is the presence of taste.

As for the intellectual texts, the basis of their construction is the rational knowledge and attention is focused on the meanings in the first instance and then on the expressions and the synthesis, which is the language of reason, not the language of emotion. The purpose of the intellectual text is to convey the thoughts, especially the facts, with aim of serving knowledge and stimulating the minds. The wordings and the synthesis in the intellectual text are characterised by precision, specification and investigation. The intellectual text is built upon reason, irrespective of emotions, and upon the spread of intellectual facts and the branches of knowledge which requires effort and thorough study. Hence, intellectual texts are completely different from the literary texts. This is because the literary text does not delve into the facts and the various branches of knowledge, nor does it attend to feeding reason with thoughts; it rather attempts to bring these facts nearer to the minds, but it selects the most important and the most prominent of them; i.e. it selects what it can find in terms of apparent or hidden charm. In other words, it selects what generates an effect and a reaction, while the wordings and the synthesis that convey these thoughts are delivered in a manner that stimulates the readers or the listeners, thus shaking their emotions and evokes in them what this

reaction entails in terms of joy and consent or anger and resentment. This is different from the intellectual text, which is intended to nurture reason with thoughts, for it stops at the limit of the facts and the branches of knowledge, irrespective of whether they shook the emotions or not, for it targets the manifestation rather than the approximation of the thoughts, and the perfection of their projection rather than what they contain in terms of charm. The intellectual texts focus on what generates the conviction of reason and the accuracy of the presentation, and they never attend to what this may evoke in terms of resentment or approval, joy or anger; they rather attend to conveying the thought as it is and they make the image of the thought rather than that of the syntheses clear. Therefore, the perception of the intellectual texts differs totally from the perception of the literary texts.

The thought about the intellectual texts, i.e. their perception, cannot be generated without the presence of previous information about the subject of the text. If this previous information were lacking, the text could not be perceived, because it expresses a specific reality, thus if one did not have previous information by which this reality is explained, under no circumstances would he be able to perceive the text. In order to understand the intellectual style, the import of the previous information must be perceived, for if these were merely familiarised with, without the reality of their import being perceived, it would be impossible to perceive the intellectual text. This is because the intellectual text expresses a thought that has a reality and a meaning. It is not a mere thought. Hence, if the comprehension of the thought were confined to what it denotes, and not a perception of its reality, nor an insight into its meaning, it would not be deemed as previous information with which reality could be explained, it would rather be sheer information that do not have much use in the process of thinking. i.e. they are not useful in perceiving the intellectual text. Hence, the presence of previous information is not the only condition in the thought about the intellectual text, but also the presence of a perception of the reality of the information and a true visualisation of their denotation. When one reads an intellectual book, be it a study of a thought, or a study of a topic, or a research in a matter, the texts of such a book are Arabic texts, and its expressions and synthesis are also Arabic, and he is fluent in Arabic but his fluency in Arabic would not help him perceive the denotations of these thoughts that have been composed with these expressions and synthesis, though it may help him perceive the meanings of the expressions and the synthesis. Hence, in order to perceive these thoughts, one must have the previous information about them, and the reality of this previous information must be also perceived, and their meaning must be visualised; otherwise he would understand the text in a linguistic manner. The comprehension may be conformable with what the thoughts indicates and it may be contrary to it, but in any case, it would not be a comprehension of the thought, but rather a linguistic understanding.

For instance, when one reads the following text: *“It is incumbent upon the politically aware person to engage in a struggle against all the trends that conflict his own and against all the concepts that contradict his own, while struggling to establish his own concepts and implant his own trends.”*, which is an intellectual text, he would need more than the linguistic understanding in order to perceive such a text, and more than delving into the meanings of its wordings and synthesis in order to grasp its meaning; the reality of political contrivance from a specific angle must rather be clear to him and the denotation of such a reality must be illustrated.

It is also imperative to have the reality of the trends and what they denote perceived and illustrated. The reality of struggling against these trends with one’s own trends and the reality of implanting one’s own trends in people must also be perceived and illustrated, and so on. In other words, in order to understand this text, it is imperative for the reality of the previous information pertaining to political awareness, struggle, the trends and the concepts to be illustrated and for its denotation to be perceived. If this did not occur and the information remained abstract, or if their denotation were noted as meanings, not as a reality, then it would not be possible to perceive this text.

If the text were not perceived, one could not benefit from it even if it were memorised by heart. Hence, the intellectual texts are like a building; one cannot remove a brick from it and keep the shape of the building as it is. Hence, in an intellectual text, one cannot shift one letter from one place to another, nor can he replace one word by another; the text should rather be preserved as it is, because the reality sought after, i.e. the denotation of the thought that one aims to convey, is a specific reality and a specific picture. If something were to change in that reality and in that picture, the understanding could either completely or partially change. Understanding the intellectual text necessitates perceiving its denotation and perceiving its denotation necessitates preserving its wording and synthesis.

An intellectual text could be composed with what a literary text is composed; thus one can notice its effect on the emotions in addition to the exploration and crystallisation of facts; nevertheless it remains an intellectual text and not a literary text. The avoidance of evoking the emotions is not a requisite of the intellectual text, but attaining the facts is, irrespective of whether the emotions were evoked or not. Hence, if the intellectual text were to evoke the emotions, this would not make it a non-intellectual text, it would rather remain an intellectual text as long as attention is directed towards the thought and as long as the thought remains the main purpose of the text. If it were noticed that an intellectual text evoked the emotions, the perception of the text would not be different from another text where

the emotions are not evoked. In order to perceive such texts, one requires previous information about the thoughts, a perception of their reality and an illustration of their denotation.

It is true that the intellectual texts may be suitable to all people and that they are capable of conveying the thoughts to all people, irrespective of their cultural background; although they are profound, thus all people can understand them, the profundity of such texts however is not within the grasp of all people, though each individual may take whatever he can understand from them. Indeed people acquire from these texts whatever they can perceive, but not all of them can think about them or perceive them, because the intellectual texts could not be perceived if one lacked the previous information, that are of the same level, about these texts, and if the reality of their thoughts were also not perceived and the denotations of their thoughts were not illustrated; in this case, one would not be able to benefit from these texts, nor would he be able to execute the thoughts contained within. The fact that all people are capable of acquiring whatever they could from these texts, each one according to his faculty of comprehension, this does not mean however that all people are capable of perceiving these texts, for those who lack the previous information of the same level, would under no circumstances be able to perceive such texts.

It could be said here that the previous information are sufficient to formulate the thought once the sensation is generated, and this means that for the intellectual text to be perceived, it would be sufficient for man to have previous information by which the reality contained in the text is explained. In answer to this, we say that since the purpose of the previous information is to explain the reality contained in the text, and it is impossible to explain this reality unless the information were of the same level as the reality, for if the previous information were merely linguistic, they would only be sufficient for the linguistic explanation, and insufficient to explain the thought. Likewise, if the previous information about the authority explain it as being the power, this would not be sufficient to understand the meaning of authority; it could even confuse the perception of the meaning of authority. Also, if the previous information about society is explained as being composed of people and relationships, they would not be sufficient to perceive what is society in a manner that leads to changing it or protecting it, because these previous information are not of the level required to convey the meaning of society. Hence, in order to perceive the intellectual text, one has to have the previous information that are of the level of the thought contained in the text, not just have any information about it.

It could be argued that if having the previous information to the level of the thought is a prerequisite to understand the intellectual text, what would be the

prerequisite to perceive its reality and to illustrate its denotation? The answer to this is that the purpose of perceiving intellectual text is not to merely seek pleasure from it, nor to merely acquaint oneself with its meaning. The intellectual text is perceived in order to be adopted, i.e. in order to act upon it; otherwise, it would be of no use and its existence would be of no value. This is so because thought is perceived so that it could be acted upon, not just for knowledge. The adoption of the thought could only occur if its reality is perceived and its denotation is illustrated.

Therefore, in addition to the previous information, the intellectual texts stipulate three conditions:

1. The previous information must be to the level of the thought that one aims to perceive.
2. The reality of the previous information must be perceived as it is, and in a manner that determines and distinguishes it from others.
3. The reality must be illustrated in a sound manner that reflects its true image.

If these three requisites were not met, it would not be possible to perceive the intellectual text, i.e. it would not be possible to perceive the thought; in other words, it could not be adopted, because perceiving the thought means adopting it, not just understanding its meaning. The nearest example of this would be the thoughts of Islam, doctrines and rules alike; when Islam descended upon the Arabs, in instalments and according to situations they understood and adopted it, not because their language had enabled them to understand it, but rather because they had perceived the reality of its thoughts and they visualised the denotations of these thoughts; thus they adopted these thoughts after they had acquired this perception and this visualisation. Hence, it affected them and transformed them radically, and as a result, the value of things changed from their viewpoint; the value of certain things increased and the value of other things decreased. The components of life became different from their viewpoint. However, when those Arabs began to lack in their perception of the reality of the thoughts and when they began to lack in their visualisation of these thoughts' denotation, they consequently lost the understanding of these thoughts, i.e. they no longer adopted them; thus these thoughts no longer affected them. Despite the fact that there exists amongst them a host of Muhadditheen who are more learned than Malik, and a host of scholars who are more knowledgeable than Abu Hanifah, and Mufasssireen who are more acquainted than from Ibnu Abbas, none of them is even close to those who were in Madinah during the lifetime of Malik, nor to those who were in Madinah during the lifetime of Ibnu Abbas, nor to those who lived during the era of Abu Hanifah. This is not due to negligence in the comprehension previous information the thoughts, but rather due to the lack of perception of their reality and the lack of visualisation of their denotation. Therefore, in order to think about

the intellectual texts, it is insufficient to merely have previous information of the same level of the texts, for it is imperative for one to have in addition to this, a perception of their reality and a visualisation of their denotation.

The perception of intellectual texts is not solely in order to adopt them, but also to reject them and fight them in some cases. Hence, the purpose of the intellectual texts in origin is to adopt them; if they were however not part of what should be adopted, they would either be part of what is discarded or part of what must be fought. Hence, if there were no perception of their reality and no visualisation of their denotation, the matter could lead to deviation, thus what must be discarded and fought is adopted and what should be adopted is discarded and fought, or treated as sheer knowledge, neither taken nor discarded. Therefore, it is imperative to perceive the reality of the intellectual texts and to illustrate their denotation if one were to comprehend them and to take the appropriate stance towards them, either to adopt them or to abandon and fight them. To stipulate the perception of the thoughts' reality in manner that specifies and distinguish them and to visualise their denotation in a sound manner, is what immunises the thoughts from slip-ups and deviation, and what makes one decide his stance vis-à-vis these thoughts correctly, otherwise, the harm caused would not be confined to the thoughts being perceived for sheer knowledge, it could also distract one from performing a host of vital actions in his life, and it could make him slip up and deviate, or go far astray. The nearest example to this is what the study of Greek philosophy did to many Muslim scholars, and what the Capitalist and Communist thoughts did to many Muslims. All of this was due to the fact that reality was not perceived in a manner that specifies and distinguishes it and due to the fact that the visualisation of the thoughts' denotation was not sound.

Let us take the Greek philosophy that was known to the Christians of Al-Sham and Iraq. The Muslims used to carry the Da'awah to Islam to those Christian, especially after they came under the authority of Islam, and the Christians used to refer to the Greek philosophy and Greek logic in their discussions with the Muslims; thus the Muslims used this philosophy and this logic in their response to those Christians, without perceiving the thoughts that this philosophy contained, and without discerning the contradictions that come into the premises of logic. Hence, this study, which was for the purpose of spreading Islam, has led some Muslim scholars to study it for pleasure while other Muslim scholars studied it in order to respond to the Christians and to prove the soundness of the thoughts of Islam. as for the first group of scholars, they proceeded in the path of the Greek philosophers and they adopted the Greek philosophy, thus it became their culture; they embraced the opinions of this philosophy, while taking Islam into consideration according to these philosophical thoughts. Hence, the Muslim philosophers came into being, some of them slipped up and deviated, and others

went far astray and became misguided. Both parties, the deviant and the misguided, left Islam and became Kuffar. Hence, all the so called philosophers of the Muslims or the philosophers of Islam are Kuffar, with no difference between Ibnu Sina and the Al-Farabi, nor between Ibnu Rushd and Al-Kindi.

As for the other group of Muslim scholars, those who studied the Greek philosophy and the Greek logic, they were divided into two sides: one side adopted the Greek philosophy as a basis and interpreted the thoughts of Islam according to what conforms with the thoughts of this philosophy, then implemented the philosophical thoughts upon the thoughts of Islam. Those were Al-Mu'tazilah. The other side took it upon themselves to criticise and oppose Al-Mu'tazilah. They set about attempting to correct and respond to the thoughts they were spreading. Those were known as Ahl-us-Sunnah. A debate broke out between these two sides and they became engrossed in this debate which diverted them from carrying the call to Islam, and neglected the main task that Allah (swt) has imposed upon them, namely carrying the call to Islam to non-Muslims.

The matter did not stop at that, for as a consequence of this, other groups came into being, such as Al-Jabriyah, Al-Murjiah and Al-Qadaryyah among others. This led to the birth of sects and cults, thoughts and groups among the Muslims. This caused a major confusion, and the Muslims turned into tens of sects and tens of schools of thought. All of this was because the Greek philosophy was introduced to the Islamic lands and many Muslims set about studying it without a perception that determines distinguishes its thoughts and without a sound visualisation of their denotation. Had it not been for the strength of Islam itself and the sincere and loyal stance of Ahl-us-Sunnah Wal-Jama'a, who stood up to these thoughts, demonstrated the reality they really indicated and illustrated their denotation in a sound manner. They brandished the sword against the disbelievers from among these sects and schools of thought, and had it not been for this, Islam would have withered and vanished because of the Greek philosophy and what I generated in terms of thoughts and opinions.

As for the Capitalist and Socialist thoughts, their dangers is an evident palpable matter, and the deception of their thoughts has engulfed many Muslims. The error of their concepts has spread amongst the masses of the Muslims, and we needn't establish the evidence, nor mention examples of the erroneous and misguided thoughts. The palpable reality in the Islamic lands, especially for those who witnessed the post-World War Two era, demonstrates to us the extent of the damage that these thoughts have inflicted on the minds of the Muslims, and how this diverted them from the work for Islam.

Therefore, the thought about the literary texts must be accurately perceived. The previous information on their own is not sufficient, for it is imperative for the information to be at the level of the thought and the perception of their reality must be existent in a manner that determines and distinguishes it. The illustration of their denotation must be sound, thus depicting a true picture of that denotation.

Indeed Islam has not prohibited the literary study. It has rather permitted it. Islam does not prohibit the adoption of thoughts; however, it has made the Islamic doctrine a basis for the thoughts and a criterion for their adoption or their rejection. Islam does not allow the adoption of a thought that contradicts this basis, though it is permitted to read the text that contains it. Islam does not allow the adoption of a thought unless this intellectual basis allows its adoption. Hence, in order to perceive that the thought contradicts or agrees with the intellectual basis, one must first perceive the reality of the thought in a manner that determines and distinguishes it and illustrate its denotation in a sound manner before being able to take a stance towards this thought. Otherwise, one would not be able to compare the thought to the intellectual basis and thus one cannot take the correct stance towards the thought. Hence, the thought about the literary texts, whatever they are, necessitates the presence of previous information at the level of this thought if one wishes to think about the literary text. In addition to this one must have a perception that allows him to determine and distinguishes the thought and to illustrate it in a sound manner that gives the sound picture of the thought.

As for the legislative texts, it would be insufficient to content oneself with understanding the wordings and the synthesis and what they denote, if one were to grasp what these texts contain. Also, perceiving the legislative texts do not only require previous information of any kind, but rather it requires two matters:

1. To recognise the denotation of the expressions and the synthesis.
2. To recognise the meanings which these expressions and synthesis indicate.

Then one should move on towards utilising specific information in order to comprehend the thought, or too deduce the thought. Recognising the meanings of the expressions and the synthesis requires knowledge of the language, in terms of expressions and synthesis. It also requires the knowledge of certain terms. Then comes the perception of the thoughts and the laws. Although this may be applicable to every legislative thought, we however refer exclusively to the Islamic legislation when we address the topic of thinking about legislation, and not just any legislation. This is because in our quality as Muslims, we are not allowed to study other than the Islamic legislation, nor are we allowed to read it. When legislation is read, it is with the intention of adopting what it contains, not with the intention of pleasure. When legislation is contemplated and studied, it is with the

intention of adopting it, and we are forbidden from taking anything from other than Islam as we are forbidden from taking anything but the Shari'ah rule. Although we are permitted to read other than the legislative texts, such as the literary texts, the intellectual texts and the political texts, we are however forbidden from reading or studying other than the Islamic legislative texts. The literary texts are read for pleasure and when we read the intellectual texts, we would have already adopted the intellectual principle as a criterion for what they carry in terms of thoughts. The political texts are read in order to establish how the external affairs are managed. Hence, there is no impediment in reading, exploring, studying and thinking about such texts. As for the legislative texts, they are read and studied with the aim of adopting from them, and since we are forbidden from adopting other than the Shari'ah rule, we are consequently forbidden from reading, studying and thinking about other than the Islamic legislation. Thoughts are built upon the doctrine, which acts as a criterion for their soundness or error, thus determining the stance taken towards them, be it adoption or rejection. However, the Shari'ah rule emanate from the doctrine; in other words, they are deduced and adopted from the doctrine. Hence, whatever emanates from this doctrine and was a Shari'ah rule it is the rule that is exclusively adopted and whatever does not emanate from the doctrine, it is categorically rejected, irrespective of whether it conformed or contradicted the doctrine. Hence, we do not adopt what agrees with Islam, but rather what is exclusively Islam and nothing else. This is so because the Shari'ah rule emanates from the doctrine and is adopted from it; it is not built upon the doctrine, whereas the thought is built upon the doctrine. Hence, when Allah said "*Iqra*" i.e. "*Read*", He made it permitted for us to read in an absolute manner. However, when He ordered us to adopt life's solutions, He confined to the Shari'ah rules and linked it to belief. Allah made the adoption of anything other than these rules as an adoption from disbelief. Hence, legislation related texts specify the reading we do; the permissibility of reading is specific to other than legislation related material. As for legislation, i.e. the rules and solutions, they do not form part of this permissibility, due to the presence of texts denoting the prohibition of adopting anything other than these rules and solutions. Hence, we do not read, study or think about other than the Islamic legislation, and consequently, when we explore the thought about legislation, we confine it to Islamic legislation and nothing else.

Not only the thought about legislation requires knowledge of the Arabic language and the Islamic thoughts, it also requires knowledge and comprehension of the reality, knowledge of the Shari'ah rule, then the application of this Shari'ah rule upon reality. If the rule is applicable, then it becomes the rule of that reality, if it is not applicable, then it would not qualify as the rule that applies to this specific reality. Hence, another rule that applies to that reality is sought. Hence, the thought about legislation is not within the ability of all people, because it requires several

matters related to the expressions and the synthesis and related to the legislative thoughts, i.e. related to specific information, namely the legislative information. It also requires the perception of reality, i.e. the reality of the rule that is obtained or deduced. Hence, the thought about the legislative texts requires more than attending to the expressions and the synthesis, as is the case with the thought about literary texts and more than attending to the events, realities and circumstances, as is the case with the thought about political texts. Rather, attention must be given to the expressions and the synthesis, the denotations and the thoughts, and the events and realities for which one seeks to obtain a ruling, in one go. In other words, it requires all that which is required for the other texts, and it requires profoundness and enlightenment at the same time, for profoundness would not be sufficient; though enlightenment would be sufficient because it is always derived from profoundness.

The thought about the legislative texts differs according to the purpose of the thought. This is so because the thought about the legislative could either be to adopt the Shari'ah rule, or to deduce the Shari'ah rule, and there is a difference between the two. Although the thought about the mere recognition of the Shari'ah rule requires knowledge of the meanings of expressions and synthesis, it does not however require knowledge of the grammar and morphology, nor does it require an expert knowledge of the Arabic language or rhetoric. Reading Arabic would be sufficient, even if one cannot write. Reading the text in Arabic and perceiving what one reads would be sufficient for one to acquaint himself with the Shari'ah rules from the texts. Although this requires knowledge of the Shari'ah thoughts, i.e. previous information about Shari'ah, it is however sufficient for one to have basic information necessary for the knowledge. Hence one needn't have knowledge of the foundations of jurisprudence, nor a knowledge of the Qur'anic verses and Ahadith, for it would be sufficient for him to perceive the Shari'ah rule from others merely through reading. One needn't also know exactly what the reality is; it is sufficient for him to know that such and such rule fits such and such reality. Hence, when one reads in order to recognise the ruling of tinned meat, he only needs to know that dead meat is forbidden and that tinned meat is dead meat because it is not slaughtered according to Shari'ah. Likewise, when he read in order to recognise the ruling of cologne, it is sufficient for him to know that intoxicants are forbidden and that cologne is an intoxicant, and so on. Therefore, the thought aimed at acquainting oneself with the Shari'ah rule, from the Shari'ah texts, requires the presence of previous information that are sufficient to explain the reality of the rule that one is seeking to acquire.

As for the thought aimed at deducing the Shari'ah rule, it requires more than sheer reading in order to deduce it. It requires knowledge of the three matters put together, namely the expressions and synthesis, the Shari'ah thoughts and the

reality for the thought, i.e. for the ruling. This knowledge must enable one from deducing the ruling, not just recognising it. Hence, one must be learned in the Arabic language, in terms of grammar, morphology, rhetoric and the like. He must also be well versed in interpretation, Hadith and the foundations of jurisprudence. It is also imperative for one to be well versed with the reality for which he aims to deduce a ruling. Being a learned person does not necessarily mean that he must be a Mujtahid in these subjects; it would be sufficient for him to be generally versed with such topic. This is so because he could ask about the meaning of a word or refer to a dictionary. He could also ask a learned grammarian or refer to a grammar or syntax book in order to learn the parsing of a sentence or the declension of a word. He could also refer to a scholar of Hadith or to a Hadith book in order to acquaint himself with a Hadith; likewise he could ask someone well verse about any reality he wishes to perceive, even if he were a non-Muslim, or to refer to a book that explores that reality. Hence, being learned does not necessarily mean that he should be a Mujtahid or an expert, but merely to be acquainted in a manner that enables him to carry out the deduction. This is what is meant by having to have specific information, i.e. ample information that enables him to carry out the deduction. Therefore, although deduction requires more information than those required for acquainting oneself with the Shari'ah rule, it does not however mean that one must be a Mujtahid in all the three subjects requires for deduction; one should rather have sufficient information about these three subjects that enable him to undertake the deduction. Once he becomes able to deduct, he can be deemed a Mujtahid. Therefore, deduction or Ijtihad is within the reach of all people, especially now that people have access to books on the Arabic language, the Islamic Shari'ah, and on life's realities. Therefore, as the knowledge of the Shari'ah rules is available to everyone, likewise the deduction of the Shari'ah rule is also available for all people, though it requires broader knowledge and more information, i.e. more and broader previous information.

If our ancestors made Ijtihad and deduction difficult for themselves and contented themselves with sheer knowledge, thus becoming in majority imitators, while events and realities continued to evolve with no ruling to be found for them, our determination to abide by the Shari'ah rules and to proceed in the realm of life at the highest level in a broad and open manner, makes it incumbent upon us to elevate ourselves from imitation to the level of deduction, now that the books of knowledge and science have become available, and to deal with all of life's affairs with the Shari'ah rules alone. This will only require from us acquiring the necessary knowledge to deduce the rules.

It is true that knowing the Shari'ah rule is an individual duty and that deducing the Shari'ah is a duty of sufficiency; however, the exigency stipulated by the ever-changing events and realities and the prohibition ordained upon us by Islam not to

take any other ruling but the Shari'ah ruling, makes the duty of sufficiency as important as the individual duty. Hence, it is imperative for the Ummah to have a huge number of Muslims capable of performing Ijtihad and deduction.

We gather from this that the thought about legislation is clearly the most important type of thought for the Islamic Ummah, though it is the hardest, be it the thought with the aim to know the Shari'ah rule or the thought to deduce the Shari'ah rule. However, the thought about deducing the Shari'ah rule should not be taken lightly, nor should it be taken with this simplicity; one must rather take it with consideration, care and attention and one should not approach it unless he had all the necessary information for it. One should always note what the thought about the Shari'ah texts requires in terms of sufficient information related to the three required subjects, namely the Arabic language, the Shari'ah matters and the knowledge about the factual reality, as well as the conformity of the Shari'ah rule with that particular reality. Although the conformity does not form part of the necessary knowledge for deduction, it is however a consequence of the sound knowledge of these three matters.

This is the thought about legislation, which stipulates that the information linked to reality must be specific and sufficient to acquaint oneself with the ruling on the reality or to deduce the rule for that reality. If our enemies have succeeded in deceiving us, making us deem honey as the excrement of bees, thus leading us to loathe it and recoil from it, In other words, they made jurisprudence repugnant to us and disdained by us until we turned away from it, it is high time we exposed this deception and viewed that our happiness and our life could not be achieved but through the Shari'ah rules, i.e. we could not attain it except through jurisprudence, i.e. except through the knowledge of the Shari'ah rules and the method of deducing them, especially that other than Islamic legislation, such as civil law among others, is but the law of evil, which Qur'an has conclusively prohibited us from taking.

Nevertheless, the thought about legislative texts, i.e. the thought about Islamic legislation, is totally different from the thought about any other texts; for if the thought about literally texts requires knowledge of the expressions and syntax, thus requiring a taste formed by this knowledge, and if the thought about intellectual texts requires a knowledge that is to the level of the thought that one seeks to perceive, and if the political texts requires knowledge of events and realities, the thought about legislative texts requires everything that is required by all the types of thoughts. This is so because it requires knowledge of the expressions and syntheses, a knowledge in jurisprudence that rises to the level of the reality, and knowledge of the events and realities upon which the Shari'ah rule is implemented, be it to acquaint oneself or to deduce the Shari'ah rule. Therefore,

we can say that the thought about legislation is harder than any other thought and more indispensable for the Muslims.

This is as far as the legislative thought is concerned. As for the political thought, it is totally different from the legislative thought, though it is of the same type. This is so because the legislative thought is intended to solve people's problems and the political thought is intended to look after people's affairs. However, there is a difference between the two thoughts. Also, political thought totally contradicts the literary thought, because the latter focuses on the pleasure and the elation of the expressions and the syntax, and it exults over the meanings while they are in the moulds of the expressions and being conveyed in the literary style. As for the intellectual thought, this requires some elaboration. This is so because if the political thought were about texts of political science and political research, then in this case political thought and intellectual thought would almost be of the same type, for they are identical and similar to a great extent. However the intellectual thought stipulates that the previous information be at the level of thought being researched, even if they were not of the same type, but merely related to it. As for the political thought, the previous information it requires must be within the same topic, not just related to it, because this would be insufficient. Therefore, the thought about political texts is one type of the thought in the intellectual texts.

However, if the political thought were related to a thought about the news and events and a linkage of the events, this contradicts all the other types of thought and not one of its principles applies to it; it is virtually not linked to any principle; this makes it the highest and the hardest type of thoughts. It is the highest because it is a thought about objects and events and it involves thinking about all types of thought; thus it is the highest. It is true that the intellectual base upon which all the thoughts are built and from which the solutions emanate is the highest type of thought, however this very base is in fact a political thought and a political idea, and if it were not a political idea and a political thought, it would not be a sound base and it would not be fit to be a base. Therefore, when we say that the political thought is the highest type of thought, this includes the intellectual base, i.e. that which is suitable to be an intellectual base. As for the fact that it is the hardest type of thought, it is because it has no basis upon which it could be built and measured; hence, it confuses the thinker and makes him at first prone to frequent errors and a prey to imagination and mistakes. If he did not undergo the political experience, and if he did not remain constantly alert and did not pursue all the daily events, it would be difficult for him to conquer the political thought. Therefore, the political thought related to the news and events is distinct from all other types of thought and outshines them in a manifest manner.

Although the thought about political texts includes the thought about the texts of political science and those of political research, the real political thought however remains the thought about the texts of news and events; thus the composition of the news is deemed as true political texts. If one were to acquire political thought, he ought to think about the texts of the news, especially their composition and the manner in which this composition is perceived, because this is what is deemed as political thought, not the thought about political science and political research. The thought about political science and political research yields information, exactly like the thought about intellectual texts, it also yields a profound or an enlightened thought, but it does not turn the thinker into a politician; it merely turns him into a learned in politics, i.e. an expert in political research and political science. Such a person may be suitable to become a lecturer but not to become a politician, because the politician is the one who perceives the news and events and their denotations and who arrives at the knowledge that enables him to work, irrespective of whether he is acquainted with political science and research or not. Although political science and political research contribute to the perception of news and events, this contribution however is confined to the acquisition of the type of news when one is linking these news, thus they do not constitute a requisite for political thought.

However, and with great sadness, since the emergence of the idea of separating religion from the state, with its champions tilting towards the issue of compromise, the West, namely Europe and America, was the sole issuer of publications and books in political science and political research, on the basis of its viewpoint towards life and on the basis of compromise and on the basis of the formalities that yield the thought of compromise which was generated for the sake of conformation and reconciliation. Also, when the communist idea emerged and then embraced by Russia, the communist state, it was hoped that a host of political researches would emerge on the basis of a fixed thought rather than compromise, i.e. the middle ground. Alas, Russia remained attached to the West. Hence, the political science and political research continued to proceed in the same trend, with a difference in the form but not in the content. Hence, we could say the political researches and political sciences that have emerged up until now are researches that cannot reassure reason about their soundness and sciences that resemble what is referred to as psychology, built upon intuition and guesswork, in addition to being based on compromise. Hence, when one is thinking about the texts of these sciences and researches, it is incumbent upon him to be in constantly wary of the thoughts and constantly heedful of gliding with their mistakes. Although we would prefer that such texts are treated like Western legislation, thus one would refrain from reading and teaching them, because they contain what is related to legislation rather than politics, but since they fall under the type of intellectual researches and

since they contain political researches, there would therefore be no harm in reading and studying them, but with alertness and caution.

Let us take some of the thoughts as examples of what the political researches on the West contain. For instance, leadership in the West is collective and it is represented by the cabinet headed by a prime minister, the East also adopted this, gave it another form and championed the collective leadership. This contradicts reality and is based on compromise, because the tyrannical monarchs of Europe were individuals; the masses were resentful of the monarchs' tyranny and they deemed this to be due to the individualist leadership, thus they said that leadership is to the people not the individual and they incorporated this notion in the ministerial cabinet. This is a compromise, because the ministerial cabinet is not the people nor is it elected by the people, and because it is the prime minister who assumes the leadership of the ministers; hence, leadership does not belong to the people, nor to the individual, but rather to the prime minister and to the cabinet. Therefore this system represents a middle of the road solution between leadership being to an individual and being to the masses. It is not a solution to the issue of leadership, but rather a reconciliation between the two parties. Furthermore, the reality of the progress indicates that the leadership remained individual in all the types of democratic systems. Leadership is either assumed by the head of state, such as the president of the republic for instance, or the by the prime minister himself. Hence, the reality of leadership is that it can only be individual and it cannot be collective under any circumstances. Even if it were made collective or called collective, the process of ruling itself would turn the leadership into an individual leadership, because it can only be individual.

The West has also made sovereignty to the people; thus it is the people who legislate and rule. It is the people who possess the will and the execution. This in fact contradicts reality and is based on compromise; because the despotic monarchs possessed the will of disposal and the decision making. They were the ones who legislated and ruled. The masses became agitated due to the tyranny of those monarchs and deemed the cause of this to be those monarchs' monopoly over the willpower, the decision making, and consequently over the legislation and the ruling. So they said that sovereignty belonged to the people, thus it is the people who legislate, and it is the people who rule. Hence, they handed the power of legislation to a council elected by the people and handed the power of execution to the ministerial cabinet and the prime minister or the head of state. This in fact is a compromise, because although it is elected by the people, the council of deputies does not legislate; it is rather the ruler who legislates. It is also the cabinet or the president of the republic who rules; and although he is elected by the people, this does not mean that people are the effective rulers; people merely choose the leader. Thus, this is deemed a compromise. Furthermore, they claim that

sovereignty belongs to the law and they deem the sound ruling as being the one where the law is sovereign. Hence, this system is a compromise and a self-deception. Besides, the reality of ruling is other than this. The reality of the sound ruling is for the people to choose their rulers and for the sovereignty to be for the law. Hence, there is no sovereignty for the people and no ruling for the people whatsoever.

The West deems the ruling to be one thing and the sentimental and religious matters to be another. They deem the authority of the church to be different to that of the state, and the compassionate works, such as charity work, helping the needy and comforting the injured and the like, these are not part of the state's concern. This is based on the idea of separating religion from the state and on compromise and it is contradictory to reality, because the despotic monarchs used to control the church and they never used to show any compassion towards the injured, the sick and the needy and their like; this is why the masses became agitated. Hence, the compromise was to separate the church from the state and to separate the charitable deeds from the state. Then the church authority came into being besides the state authority. Charity organisations and the Red Cross organisations and the like were established. However, since the reality of ruling is to look after people's affairs, and since religion is part of these affairs, and the compassionate deeds are also part of these affairs, the state does govern the churches, though in a camouflaged style, and does also govern the charity organisations and the Red Cross institutions in concealed styles. Therefore, this theory is in fact contradictory to reality, even though it appears that the separation exists between the ruling and those institutions.

These were three thoughts that serve as an example demonstrating the error of the political thoughts found in the political studies of the West. If this was said about the political studies related to the systems, the same could also be said about the political studies related to things and realities. Although these studies contain some facts that one's mind could not possibly attempt any deception in them, they are however full of issues that contradict realities and full of deceptions. For instance, when they talk about the British policy being based on three issues: Britain's relationship with America, Britain's relationship with Europe and Britain's relationship with the former British colonies or what is known as the Commonwealth, this talk of theirs is sound because it is a description of a reality that cannot be the subject of deception. However, when they talk about the British policy with regard to its conduct in alliances and with regard to its stance vis-à-vis friends or foes, and its viewpoint towards peoples and nations, not only their talk is crammed with deceptions and perversions, it is also contradictory to reality and outrageously distorting of events and facts. The same applies to their talk about any other state, be it a western state or otherwise, and be it a historical talk about

past issues or about current events happening before our eyes. They have the craftiness to deceive and distort the facts that even discerning observers would fail to spot. Therefore, the thought about any political science and any political studies, must only be conducted with awareness administration caution.

As for the political thought related to events and current affairs, it is the thought that soundly reflects the true sense of the word; it is what makes the thinker a politician. This thought requires five basic combined matters:

First: It requires pursuing all the events and current affairs that occur in the world. In other words, it requires pursuing all the news; and due to the disparity in the news, in terms of importance and insignificance, in terms of coincidence and intention and in terms of abridgement and elaborateness, one will eventually be able, through practice and in time to pursue the news, not all the news, but merely what is imperative to know within the chain of knowledge.

Second: This type of political thought requires information, even if these were primary and brief, about the essence of the current affairs and events, i.e. information about the denotations of the news, whether these were geographical, or historic, or intellectual, or political information, or similar, so as to enable one to ponder over the reality of the situation or the event, i.e. over the true sense behind the denotations of the news.

Third: Events must not be of their circumstances and they must not be generalised. Divestment, generalisation and exhaustive analogy is the blight that affects the perception of events and incidents, i.e. the discernment of the news. It is imperative for every event and incident to be taken with its circumstances as a whole whereby no detachment whatsoever between the event or the incident and its circumstances is made, in addition to confining the incident to its own surroundings, thus it is not generalised upon every similar incident, nor is it exhaustively compared; each incident is taken individually and judgement is passed on it in its quality as an individual incident.

Fourth: The incident and the event must be identified; i.e. the news must be thoroughly scrutinised; hence, the origin of the news, the time and the place of the event and the incident must be identified; one needs to also scrutinise the circumstances in which the incident or the event has occurred, the purpose behind its occurrence or behind its coverage in the news, the extent of the news coverage in terms of abridgment and elaboration, its veracity or falsehood and so on, because this scrutinising leads to making the distinction. If the scrutinising were deeper and more comprehensive, the distinction would be clearer. Without this distinction, one could not digest the event or the incident, for he would fall prey to

deception and error. Therefore, distinction is an important component in taking the news and even in listening to the news.

Fifth: The news must be linked to information, especially to other news items. It is this linkage that leads to passing the soundest judgement on the news. If the news were not linked to what it ought to be linked to, error would inevitably occur, if not even deception and trickery. This may occur if a news item related to international politics were to be linked to domestic politics or vice-versa, or if an economic news item were linked to economics, whereas in fact it is related to political matters, even though it is of economic nature; or if a news item related to Germany were linked to German politics, whereas in fact it is a matter related to America. Therefore, linking the news item to what is related to it is of utmost importance; this linkage ought to be sound and for the purpose of perception and discernment, with the aim of acting upon this perception, not just for sheer knowledge.

It is imperative to generate these five matters for the thought about political texts could be achieved, i.e. for political thought to be occasioned. It would be wrong to say that these matters are numerous and hard to achieve, because generating these five matters is not difficult. This is so because the aim is to acquaint oneself and not to acquire extensive knowledge; it becomes easier with time and is not achieved in one go. It also comes through pursuance and not through study and scientific research. It is true that study and scientific research are more helpful in achieving the ability, but they are not essential in political thought, nor are they indispensable for the politician, for they are complementary and secondary; what is important in all of this is pursuance and once pursuance is occasioned that other four matters are naturally generated. Hence, political thought is in essence built on pursuance and once pursuance is generated, political thought is naturally generated.

Therefore, despite its complexity and high stature, political thought is within the reach of every man irrespective of the level of his thought and his reason; the ordinary, the intelligent and the genius are all capable of thinking politically and of being politicians, because it does not require a specific level of perception nor a specific level of knowledge; it rather requires pursuance of events and current affairs, i.e. pursuance of the news. Once this pursuance is undertaken, the political thought is generated. However, it would be wrong for this pursuance to be severed; it should rather be constant, because the events and current affairs constitute a linked chain, if one ring were missing, the chain would be broken, i.e. the link would be severed and one would be unable to link and perceive the news. Therefore, it is imperative to maintain the chain intact in the political thought, i.e. the constant pursuance is a fundamental requisite in political thought.

Political thought is not confined to individuals; it is rather found within groups as well, i.e. within peoples and nations. It is unlike the literary thought, nor like the legislative thought, which are occasioned solely by individuals, not by groups. Political thought is an individual thought and a collective thought as well. It is occasioned by individuals and groups alike. Hence, it is found within peoples and nations and it is also found in individuals such as rulers and politician. In fact, it would not sufficient for political thought to be existent amongst individuals; it must be existent amongst peoples and nations, for without it, a sound ruling system could not be generated, revival would not be achieved and peoples and nations would be unfit to convey the ideologies to other people. This is so because the ruling belongs to the people or the nation and it is existent within the people or the nation; no force can take it away unless the people or the nations hand it over. If the ruling were to be usurped from a nation, this would only be for a while, because the nation would either hand it over, thus allowing it to continue, or it would persist on regaining it, thus the regime would be toppled. Since the ruling is to the people or the nation, or existent within either of them, it is then imperative for this people or this nation to have political thought. Therefore, political thought is more of a necessity to a nation than it is to the rulers, and more necessary for the righteousness of the ruling than it is for the generating of the ruling. This is why it is imperative for a people or a nation to acquire a political culture and to have political thought. In other words, it is imperative to supply the nation with political information and political news and to allow for the knack of listening to political news to be developed naturally, not artificially, and to supply the nation with what is sound in terms of political culture and in terms of news, lest it fall prey to deception. Therefore, it is politics and political thought that breathes life into a people or a nation; otherwise the nation would be like a deadened body, idle and with no growth.

However, error in perceiving politics and the aberration that results from misconstruction of politics occurs when the thought about political texts is conducted in the same manner as the other texts, be it literary, intellectual or legislative; hence, one may think about the expressions and the synthesis for instance, and they may be perceived as they are, or, one may think about the meaning contained in these expressions and synthesis and these meanings are perceived as they are as well; or, one may think about the denotations of these expressions and synthesis, and this is when error or aberration occurs. This is so because the thought about political texts differs totally from the thought about any other text. The error and the danger in political thought occurs when one fails to distinguish between the political texts and the other texts. The real meanings of the political texts may be found in the texts themselves or in other than the texts. They may also be found in the wording of the expressions and the synthesis, as is the

case in the treaties for instance, or in the official statements. They may also be in the meanings not in the wording, or they may be in the denotations not in the meanings nor in the expressions. They may be even concealed behind the meanings, expressions and denotations; they may be even totally contradictory to the texts. Hence, if one fails to perceive what the political texts means from its content or otherwise, then the text would not be perceived in any case, thus resulting in error and aberration in the thought about the political text.

Furthermore, the biggest threat to political thought is to strip an event of its circumstances, or to generalise it or to subject it to exhaustive analogy. The political text must not be detached from its circumstances in any way, for these form part of it; it would also be wrong to generalise a political text and to introduce a exhaustive analogy to it nor even analogy. In addition to the fact that the circumstances are part of the text, the text is related to a specific event, hence it should be taken exclusively for that specific event; it must not be generalised nor compared, be it in an exhaustive manner or otherwise. The text must be used for the specific event only. Therefore, detachment or abstraction and analogy, be it exhaustive or real, pose the danger of error and aberration on political thought. For instance, an official may make a statement form which an understanding is deduced. He may then later make the same statement from which something else is deduced which may be different or even contradictory to the first understanding. Another official may give a statement about a real matter, i.e. a true statement, but it may be viewed as a false statement with the aim of deceiving others. He may on the other hand make a false statement, and it may be viewed as being genuine, reflecting the real meaning of the context, and people may think that the lying is intended to conceal something. An action may be undertaken in accordance with the statement, or contrary to the statement, and so on. Hence, it is the circumstances and the surrounding conditions that shed light on the statement and reveal what is meant by it, not the political text itself. Therefore, it is only according to this aspect that the political thought could be close to soundness; i.e. only if the circumstances were an integral part from the text or the action, and only of the event is taken on its own, devoid of any generalisation and analogy.

The Islamic Ummah has suffered a great deal due to the abuse in political thought and incurred numerous setbacks and calamities. For instance, when Europe was fighting the Ottoman state in the 19th century, it used to fight it with political actions more than the military actions, though some military actions occurred, but these were complementary to the political actions. For instance, the so called Balkan crisis was generated by the western countries through the political statements. Hence, the stated that the Balkan states should be freed from the Ottomans, i.e. from the Muslims; however, they did not mean by this that they were about to fight the Ottoman state, but they were aiming at generating strife and

disturbances in the Balkans. Hence, they generated the idea of nationalism and liberation, which the Balkans adopted and set about instigating rebellions against the Ottoman state, which in turn carried out a series of military actions in order to quell those rebellions, while taking into consideration the position of the other states in an attempt to conciliate those countries, though they were the sponsors of the rebellions and the ones who deceived the Ottomans and engrossed them in dealing with the rebellions with the aim of depleting their forces. Therefore, the error of judgement by the Ottoman state and its aberration in political thought caused it to lose the Balkans. Then the idea of nationalism hunted the Ottoman state and crept into its own backyard, until it destroyed it altogether.

This was contrary to Russia, or the Soviet Union, who faced the same crisis in Eastern Europe during the fifties. America had called for the liberation of Eastern Europe from communism and started supporting those countries and peoples covertly and overtly. However, Russia did not adopt the stance of the Ottomans and realised that this idea of liberation was a war against Russia, or the Soviet Union; hence she did not reconcile with America but rather took her as her number one enemy. When the Polish revolution erupted, Russia annihilated it and never gave it a chance to succeed. Also, when Bulgaria rebelled, Russia crushed the rebellion mercilessly, tightened her iron grip on Eastern Europe and braced herself to fight America in case she moved to support Eastern Europe secretly and openly. This led to America's prompt failure. This American failure, coupled with her perception of Russia's political stance and of her political understanding, has forced America to forsake the idea of fighting communism and weakening Russia and to conclude a host of treaties with Russia and coexist with her. All of this was not down to Russia's power, but rather down to her sound political thought.

Also, when America realised in the late sixties that the state of Israel that she had established was about to slip away from her grip and that Britain was about to recover that land by transforming the so-called state of Israel into another entity known as Palestine, she started referring to the Palestine crisis as the Middle East crisis and set about undertaking a host of political actions aimed at enabling her to oversee the crisis alone. America went on to adopt the slogan of peace and the notion of solving the crisis as a means to complicating the issue further. She continued this political deception until both the Arabs and the Jews threw themselves into her embrace. She pursued the style of fallacy and the style of deception until she depleted the faculties of the Arabs and the Jews. Then, instead of solving the crisis, America moved towards transforming the region from a situation of tension and war into a situation of relative calm and peace, so that she may concentrate the region according to the status that she had devised and in order to chase the British away from the region for good, so that she may dominate

and spread her influence unilaterally over the whole region, through strengthening the so-called state of Israel.

Hence, the Middle East crisis was just like to the Balkan crisis. The Arabs and the Jews fell into the trap just like the Ottomans and the people of Southern Europe did, due to the political deception. If the Muslims were to fail to generate the political thought aimed at perceiving the Middle East crisis, just like Russia perceived the Eastern Europe crisis, the fate of the Middle East would be the same as the fate of the Balkans.

Therefore, the misapplication of political thought is what destroys peoples and nations and what destroys or weakens the states. It is the misapplication of political thought that prevents the subjugated states from breaking free from the shackles of colonialism and prevents the declined nations from achieving their revival. Hence, the thought about political texts is extremely important and its outcomes may be terrific or tremendous. The threats of error or aberration in the political thought could be devastating. This is why it is imperative to give utmost care and attention to political thought because it is indispensable to people's survival.

However, although political thought is the hardest and highest type of thought, it should not be confined to individuals, for individuals carry no clout no matter how numerous they are and no matter how sound or ingenious their thinking is; this is because once deception in political thought creeps into a nation or a people, the genius of individuals would be of no avail in terms of reversing the situation. In political thought, geniuses are valueless, no matter how numerous they are and no matter how ingenious their thinking is. If aberration were to gain mastery over a nation or a people, its current would sweep everything and the nation would fall prey to deception; it would be devoured by the enemies, together with the geniuses. The success of Mustafa Kemal in destroying the Islamic state and in removing the Khilafah at the beginning of the twentieth century, and the success of Jamal Abdul-Nasser in the fifties and the sixties in preventing the liberation of the Arabs, though they were eager to achieve liberation, act as vivid examples demonstrating that once the misapplication of political thought overwhelms peoples and nations, the ingenuity of the geniuses is of no avail, even if they numbered thousands, as long as they remain individuals. Therefore, the misapplication of political thought does not pose a threat to individuals, but rather to peoples and nations. It is therefore imperative to give political thought among peoples and nations top priority. It is true that if political thought were generated among individuals and proceeded in the straight path, it may through them be able to stand up to the enemies and expose their deception; however, this would only be possible if the thinking of those individuals were conveyed to the people or the nation, if it were

of the same calibre and if it were to turn from a thought among individuals into a thought among the nation; hence, those individuals would become part of the nation and not mere individuals, thus turning the nation as a whole into a thinking nation, not just few individuals within the nation. If the individual thinking did not turn into a collective thinking and if the thought of the individuals did not turn into a thought of a nation, this thought would be worthless and the individuals would be insignificant. The political thought of the individuals cannot stand up to the enemies and cannot face their deception, no matter how numerous they were and no matter how sublime their ingenuity was. What stands in the face of the enemies is the thought of the peoples and the nations, i.e. the political thought that is generated amongst peoples and nations.

It is true that the ingenious individuals are in fact ordinary people just like the others and they do not differ in terms of their humanity from any other human being. People view those individuals in an ordinary manner, because their ingenuity is neither visible nor palpable, nor is it sensed. Therefore, when their ingenuity moves and when they initiate their thoughts, people fail to notice their qualities and to perceive in their initiatives any superiority or ingenuity, for if they were educated, many like them are also educated, and if they were intelligent, many like them are also intelligent. If attention were drawn to their thoughts, it would be by other individuals who attend to their initiations with the aim of being like them or with the aim of using this thought to raise their status within their society and their milieu, or with the aim of exploiting it for personal gains or for egoistic objectives. If the thought were to remain as such and did not spread among groups, it would remain individualistic no matter how numerous the individual thinkers were, and even if their thought were unique and appealing to everyone coming across it. Therefore, in order for this political thought to be fruitful and to become capable of resisting the enemies, it must be turned into a collective thought and move away from the shell of individualism and the cocoon of isolation. If it were turned into a collective thought and transferred to the people or the nation, then the force that stands up to the enemies and the powerful seed that yields the tree of revival would be generated.

This is the fruitful political thought, namely the collective thinking, not the individual one; in other words it is the thinking of the people or the nation, not that of the individuals, even if they were geniuses. Therefore, it is imperative to culture the nation politically, train her and teach her the political thought so that it becomes the thought of the nation and not that of the individuals.

This is the political thought. It is a thought related to the political sciences and the political studies; a thought related also to political events and political affairs. The primary thought is valueless; it is no more than a knowledge of the thoughts.

Whereas political thought is useful and fruitful. It is the type of thought that generates a radiant influence and a major impact. Therefore, if political thought in political science and political research were a positive aspect that yields benefits to individuals from among political savants, the political thought in events and incidents is a duty of sufficiency upon the nation. It must be generated within the nation, especially among those who possess this thought, be it learned or otherwise.

Finally, this was a summarised view on the topic of thought, in its quality as such, that we offer to the Islamic nation, in the hope that its study would generate thought within this nation, so that this thought could transfer her towards becoming once again the best nation sent to mankind, especially that ten centuries have lapsed with the nation being alienated from thought, though she has attempted to acquire it several times. The Islamic nation was burdened in the fourth hijri century with scholars who worked towards suspending thought within the nation and propagated the danger of thought on the nation and its harm to Islam and the Muslims; this was when a group of scholars, such as the one known by “Al-Qaffal”, called for the closure of the door of ijtiḥād (exertion) and worked towards prohibiting it. They convinced the masses of the dangers of ijtiḥād. The Muslims assented to this call and implemented it. Scholars started to feel uneasy about ijtiḥād and the intellectuals became wary of it. People started to be averse to the presence of mujtahideen and public opinion throughout all the provinces of the Islamic state adopted this viewpoint. Hence, thought was suspended and people were confined to imitation and cancelled their reasoning. They no longer dared to perform ijtiḥād. Hence, ijtiḥād was prohibited, knowing that the aforementioned thought is in Islam, which led people to refrain from thinking and they got used to this suspension of thought. The nation has only resumed thinking in this century, due to the fact that man is by nature a lazy creature. Hence, ten centuries have lapsed with the nation’s thinking suspended. It is not easy for a nation whose thinking has been suspended for ten centuries to the thought evoked again and to perceive the value of thought and thinkers. Therefore, millions of books like this one could not guarantee the ability to move the nation towards thought and to steer her towards making thought as a second nature. However, the painful events pulverising and squashing the nation have started to instil hope in the return of thought to this nation, especially now that certain groups have started to think and other groups are attempting to think, now that the love of thinking has become embodied within thousands, who do not shy away from thinking and who have turned into a vivacious and dynamic thought. Hence, the magnitude and the horror of the events, coupled with the embodiment of thought into individuals, to the point where it started to spread amongst people in the marketplaces, generate a radiant hope in transferring thought from individuals to groups, thus turning into a collective thought rather than an individual one, and into the thought of the nation

rather than the thought of individuals. This will turn the Islamic nation into a thinking nation and will restore her as the best nation sent to mankind.