

Presence of Mind

This book has been translated from the original Arabic version



Khilafah Publications

e-mail: info@1924.org
website: <http://www.1924.org>

CONTENTS

Khilafah Publications
Suite 298
56 Gloucester Road
London SW7 4UB
e-mail: info@1924.org
website: <http://www.1924.org>

24 Dhil-Qa'dah 1396 AH
16 November 1976 CE

ISBN 1 899 574 328

Translation of the Qur'an

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

Qur'anic *Ayat* and transliterated words have been *italicised*.

Ahadith appear in **bold**.

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

Spontaniety5
Intelligence and Spontaniety14
The Use of Intelligence and Spontaniety22
Natural Spontaniety and Artificial Spontaniety27
The Problem31
The Reality of the Problem36
The Treatment of the Problem39
Pursuance and Spontaniety42
Pursuance and Spontaniety48
The Truth (Reality) of Spontaniety55
The Effect of Spontaniety in the Ummah57
The Difference between Spontaniety and Quick Observance63
The Way to Create Spontaniety64

SPONTANIETY

Possessing spontaniety is to issue judgements on matters promptly, based on a very quick understanding. As an example, when somebody asks, “Where are you from?” you understand promptly his aim from the question and what lies behind his question. Thus, you would have judged on the question promptly. In such a case, you have used spontaniety. Based on this spontaniety, you can give the answer required in such a situation. As another example, when you hear of the visit of an official to a country, then you will promptly understand the aim of the visit from hearing this news. Thus, you can be said to have spontaniety. Based on this spontaniety, you take the necessary measures in this regard. Also, when you are surprised by an unexpected visit, you can promptly understand the reason for this. Thus, you would have spontaniety; based on spontaniety you can take the measures that conform to this quick understanding.

Spontaniety, in origin, means understanding issues quickly, or quick thinking. However, it should result in a quick judgement on the matter that you are faced with, based on quick understanding. Though in origin, it means quick understanding or quick thinking, its aim however, is to make judgements quickly. Thus, spontaniety is quick judgement on matters. This is because judgement on matters is comprehension, or thinking, as well as being the result of understanding or thinking.

Thus, *al-badeebah* (initiative insight) means the innate (*fitri*) understanding or the natural (*tabee’ee*) understanding.

Regardless of the linguistic meaning of the *badeebah* or *badaabah*, it means, in this context, the natural or innate judgement and the natural or innate understanding. It is said to be natural or innate because it does not need deliberateness and close examination. It rather comes spontaneously and in an automatic way. It is as if just hearing the news or the question or the surprise had provided, by itself, everything required for understanding or thinking, so judgement can be issued instantly. Therefore, spontaniety or quick judgement is incompatible with slow thinking, though it is not

incompatible with deep or enlightened thinking. This is because what matters is speed of thought, not the source. So, in the example of the question, “where are you from?” you think quickly about the questioner, the wording of the question and also the context of the question, thus you deduce the aim of the question. This thinking is deep, because it is not easy to think about the question, the questioner and the context in which the question came. It is difficult to ascertain the purpose of this question. Thus, this spontaneity comes from deep thinking. In the example of hearing of the visit of an official, you think quickly about the visitor, the state he represents, what took place before this visit and what will result from it. From this you deduce the aim of this visit. This is enlightened thinking because you thought of the matters that surrounded the event and what relates to it; then you issued the judgement. So, spontaneity here came from enlightened thinking. With the example of an unexpected visit by an official, which surprises you by its timing, this surprise alone will guide you to the purpose of the visit. This thinking is normal; it is not deep or enlightened. However, the speed of issuing the judgement, based on the speed of understanding or thinking, is what produces spontaneity and not the thinking itself or its type. Therefore, spontaneity results from quick thinking, regardless of the type of thinking, whether it is deep, enlightened or normal. So what is important is the speed and not the source of thinking.

Thereupon, spontaneity is incompatible with slow thinking, but not incompatible with the deep, enlightened or normal thinking. What is important is the speed only and not the depth. Spontaneity is necessary for peoples and nations and for the individuals, groups and parties who are part of these peoples and nations. This is because spontaneity is necessary to engage in life, whether with other individuals, or with other peoples and nations, or with discharging the affairs. This is because success in undertaking life affairs requires two matters: firstly, the speed of issuing judgements on matters and then taking the necessary measures towards them. If you do not do this, you will fail and face matters beyond your capability to bear. As time passes the burden becomes heavier and obstructions increase. This will lead to failure in the course of life.

Secondly, the opportunities offered to a person are the ones which force progress forward quickly, such that long distances are covered. If you do not seize an opportunity, you will lose it. It may not return, so you would lose the use of this opportunity. If the loss of opportunities were repeated, you would lose the speed of transferring from one situation to another. You would stay in the same place and thus become motionless, a failure in the course of life. The reason for all of this would be the lack of spontaneity. Therefore, spontaneity is necessary for success in the course of life. If education and thinking themselves, together with preparation, invention and industry, trading and farming and other matters are for the sake of success in the course of life, then these matters and life itself are pointless if not accomplished with spontaneity. Therefore, one of the matters that the states, peoples and nations pay attention to, in their struggle against their enemies, is to cause paralysis in their actions. There is nothing more dangerous than spontaneity in this matter. Therefore, the states, peoples and nations take care in removing spontaneity from their enemy so as to cause him paralysis and cause him to lose the ability to be productive in work, as well as to miss the opportunities one after the other. It then becomes easy to destroy the enemy, colonise and dominate him, extending influence over his territories. Though the West started the cultural invasion of the Islamic countries and the citizens of the Islamic State, only after it had already extended its authority over it, it started by seducing them in mind and thinking. This aimed to make them lose spontaneity and preoccupy them with thinking. Its success in that was unmatched until they, the Muslims, were almost paralysed. All the people were engrossed in deliberation, pondering and waiting, until they failed in the course of life; they even failed in removing the authority of imperialism and its influence, despite the revolutions and wars they entered against it. Each one of them, in every small or big problem, started to resort to pondering and thinking, until the time passed and the available opportunity was lost. Many opportunities were lost without being seized. So they missed the quick transfer from a situation to another until they immersed themselves in the “automatic” philosophies (al-falsafah al-aaliyyah). They were engaged in them, so that the matter became obscure to them and they lost clarity because of their concern about the automatic

philosophies. Indeed, there are matters that need to be philosophised, which are not the simple ones but the deep ones, such as revival (*nahdalah*), liberation (*tabreer*), the political and military manoeuvres and the like. These matters must be philosophised and studied in depth, without being satisfied with their apparent forms. However, with the clear matters that do not need thinking, trying to philosophise in them only increases their ambiguity and vagueness, such as a chair, cup, plate and the like. With these matters and things, it is not correct to think and philosophise about them; they are rather taken as they are, once they or their names were mentioned. This is what is called the automatic philosophy (*al-falsafah al-aaliyyah*) The automatic philosophising or the automatic thinking thus is the philosophising of the apparent object, of which nothing is hidden; this thing is not understood except by mentioning its name. So the chair is a chair. If you philosophised it or thought about it, it would increase in obscurity and you would become unable to understand it. The more you philosophise the subject, the more you will plummet into vagueness. The West praised the mind, thinking, deliberation, study and calculation and the like until we lost spontaneity. We even went beyond that to the automatic philosophising. It was said to some people; “carry out a venture; why do you not undertake a risk?” Risk means to carry out an action without first making calculation. However, these people philosophised the risk in a form of automatic philosophy. So they said; ‘we do not undertake a reckless venture; we are rather ready to undertake a calculated or studied venture.’ This statement is philosophising the venture, which is a form of automatic philosophy. This is because if the venture was calculated and studied, it would not then be a venture. Thus the attempt to philosophise the venture changed its concept and removed it from its reality. So if the people by themselves started to follow the automatic philosophy, then spontaneity will be far from them.

It is true that thinking is indispensable and pondering is necessary, as it was said in the past “haste is from Shaitan”. But this is only in the matters that need study and scrutiny, not in matters that do not need it. Moreover, matters that need study and scrutiny are studied and examined if there is still time to do so, or if the circumstances are suitable. However, if the circumstances are not suitable for

thinking and such thinking would squander the opportunity or it would lead to disruption, then nothing would save the situation except spontaneity. Therefore, spontaneity is indispensable for nations and peoples, groups and parties in order to succeed in the course of life. Rather its presence is necessary for success in the course of life; it is one of the conditions of this success.

The conditions and matters of life are numerous and diverse, its paths are various, rugged and flat, easy and difficult. At the same time, ‘time is gold’; it is in fact more valuable than gold. So it is very important to take into account the situation, condition and the matter at hand. Accordingly, if the matter requires thinking, then it is necessary to think about it, if it requires spontaneity, then it is necessary to have spontaneity. Thus, every situation is dealt with according to its requirements. We do not say that everything needs spontaneity. There are many matters that do not need spontaneity; thinking is rather important regarding them. However, there are other matters that are harmed by thinking because they need spontaneity. As an example, the definitions, the divine rules and the technical matters are not solved except with thinking. Spontaneity has nothing to do with them; it is rather wrong for spontaneity to enter them. On the other side, for the surprises, all the mischievous questions that are asked purposefully and all the hasty matters, spontaneity is indispensable for all of them. Thinking is unacceptable in them; it rather should be distanced from them. If thinking entered them, then it is possible to increase their vagueness, to remove the opportunity from the people, expose the reality of the thinker or be harmed because of that. Life has matters for which thinking is indispensable, as well as matters for which spontaneity is indispensable and it is incorrect to think regarding them. So, life is conducted and its course is engaged according to the situation. If balaaghah (eloquence) is the agreement of speech with what the circumstances require, then taking up the course of life is the agreement of action with what the circumstances require. If it requires thinking, then thinking is used. If it requires spontaneity, then spontaneity is followed. As thinking is necessary for the course of life, with all of its types, spontaneity is also necessary for life. We do not criticise thinking, for it is necessary for life. We rather criticise the automatic resort to thinking and the

absence of spontaneity from life.

Thinking is one of life's necessities. If it is true that man is an animal (creature) endowed with the faculty of speaking, it is also true that man is a thinking animal (creature). What distinguishes man from other creatures is thinking. The mind, in its true meaning, is thinking. The animal, although it has a brain, does not think, for it does not have a mind. This is because the presence of the brain alone is not enough for the thinking process to exist; rather there are other requirements. Therefore, thinking itself is one of the characteristics of man. Thus, there could not be a man without thinking, i.e. without the mind. Thinking itself can't be absent from man. Therefore, attacking thinking is irrelevant. The attack is rather focused on the slow thinking, i.e. on the lack of spontaneity. This is because quick thinking or spontaneity is necessary to proceed in the course of life, as well as to achieve success in this course.

Spontaneity has three matters to discuss: Firstly, what is it? Secondly, what is its practical reality? Although its definition or knowing what it is guides to its practical reality; but this is different from the reality. When you are, for example, surprised with a matter that requires you to determine your position towards it, then in this case spontaneity is quite evident, but it is not spontaneity. This is because in spontaneity you need to issue a judgement regarding it swiftly and very quickly, in a way that this position determines the measures that have to be taken towards this surprise. For example the surprise at a question that you did not anticipate, or finding an enemy in a place you did not expect, or of a problem you did not expect to occur. The surprise or the reality is the subject of action or spontaneity, but it is not spontaneity itself. The third matter is to provide examples about these two from life, about the reality in which spontaneity took place and about spontaneity itself. As for examples of measures taken in such cases, though they are beneficial they are not necessary. This is because the measures can vary with varying realities, or with the spontaneity in the same issue.

After understanding the difference between spontaneity and thinking, it is necessary to know how to initiate spontaneity in people, i.e. how to develop spontaneity in the people. This is

particularly the case with those who do not have spontaneity. The answer to this matter depends on the fact that people are of two types. Firstly, there are the people of scientific research and their like. The task of these people is the involvement in thinking, such as the people of scientific research and the non-conventional politicians. Secondly, there are ordinary people, i.e. other than the first type, whether they were educated or not, as well as the conventional politicians. This is because the original task of the people in the Ummah is either thinking or material actions, without the presence of something else. The position of each of these two types differs to the other. Thus the action with each type should be different, regarding initiating spontaneity with it or developing spontaneity with it. This is because the one who is used to thinking is different from the one for whom thinking is new. Therefore, the work will vary with them. As for the ordinary people, including the conventional politicians, the work towards initiating spontaneity in them is easier than with those whose original task is thinking. This is because with these people the thinking is new and not original. Since they are thinkers innately, for man is a thinking creature, the task with them is simply habituation, i.e. to initiate the habit of spontaneity. So it becomes a natural process, even in their normal work. For example, the carpenters, the masons, the labourers, the craftsmen, the farmers, the simple people and their like, all need to be given examples from their work or profession to which they can relate. Then the process is gradually increased in them through more complicated examples, given in a repetitive way. This would make spontaneity in them habitual and natural. It is, for example, said to them, "if you faced a surprise in your work, how do you solve it?" If the answer were correct many times, then it would become easy to move to more complicated questions. If only one answer was given, right or wrong, but was not repeated, then one needs to agree with him about the right answer so that it is repeated, or to correct the wrong answer so that it is not repeated. This repetition is continued until the matter becomes sound and then the task is carried out related to more complicated examples. Questions about a sudden problem need not always be verbal; it could rather be in illustration or writing. What matters is the training through presenting thoughts to the people collectively and to avoid training them as individuals. Everything that produces collective training or

presentation of thoughts to the people should be followed, whether this is in a written form, such as leaflets, books, letters, and booklets and the like, or it is verbal, like talking, speeches, conversation, advice, direction and the like. Both of these two forms allow presentation of thoughts to the people and collective training. What matters in this is the subject of talking or the subject of writing, where it should be thought, and then action in accordance with this thought. Undoubtedly, it should be a thought that is not subject to argument between the presenter and the people. It should rather be indisputably correct for both of them. In other words it should be a concept (i.e. well understood) and not merely a thought. This is because the aim is not to convince of the thought. It is rather to see how one acts, and how one takes the thoughts by which one treats and solves the problems. Thus, the way according to which one acts and the manner by which one takes the thoughts is the subject of treatment. In other words, it is the matter about which or through which the sense of correctness or the sense of error is known. Along with this is the repetition, pausing, help on repetition, then moving to more difficult and complicated questions. The common people do not need the initiation of spontaneity in them except by making it a habit or natural for them. Then spontaneity will exist in the people. It is preferable that the thought is detailed and defined, not obscure or vague - such as asking, "If you faced a problem, how do you solve it?" Instead it is said to the farmers, for example, "if there was no rain, and you can not undertake industrial irrigation, what do you do regarding your crops?" If he answered quickly, then he has spontaneity. If he did not answer, or answered slowly but after study, then he has no spontaneity. This detail in the question is preferable with such people. But with the ordinary people, it is not important because the people take the matters without complication and they understand what they can of the ambiguous and the vague. So what matters is their answer or the follow up of their answer. Therefore, there is no difficulty in customizing the people to spontaneity and in creating it in them. However, difficulties exist with other people, i.e. with those who work in scientific research (academics) and unconventional ideological politicians. The difficulty exists with those whose work is thought or science and not the material actions. They need great attention regarding them and regarding initiating spontaneity within

them. This is because, though it may exist in some of them, the basis of their work is in that which has no material existence. Therefore, their subject must be discussed, for it is the discussion point.

It may appear at first that man's facing of danger is the reason for the existence of spontaneity, due to the frequency of surprises and the abundance of the occurrence of matters that need spontaneity. It may also seem that practice or training and habits are the matters that initiate spontaneity. It is true that these two matters help in initiating spontaneity, but neither one of them nor both combined, initiate it. This is not the case with those who work with thought, like doctors, engineers or teachers and their like, nor with those who carry out physical work, like the carpenters, blacksmiths, labourers and their like. This is because man's living in dangers aids spontaneity. Practicing it and being accustomed to it make it natural and develop it and help in initiating it. However, none of these ever initiate it as spontaneity or as quick thinking.

We said before that initiating spontaneity with those who carry out physical work, who are the great majority of the people or the nation, is by collective training. In other words, it is by initiating the thoughts that initiate it, such as asking a man about what he does or why a surprise occurred to him? This is beside similar questions. Initiating it with those who work with thought, such as the teachers and the ideological politicians, is easy. It is simply done by urging them to use spontaneity. Though spontaneity is one of the profound matters, in which it is valid to involve philosophy and thinking, nevertheless it is at the same time, of the routine matters, i.e. it falls within the routine philosophy. Therefore, it is enough to be requested as such, i.e. it is said to those who work with thought that it is necessary that they have spontaneity. Then they would understand from spontaneity what it means and what it is, without the need for entering into the details or answering to questions, or even the need for explaining the meaning of spontaneity. This is because these people work with and in thought. Due to the fact that much of their work is in thought, science and knowledge, they become used to that; so it manifests in them due to this habit of resorting to thinking for solving every problem. Therefore, slowness

of thinking or slow thinking that requires study, scrutiny and calculation, manifests often in them. If it said to them, it is necessary that they have spontaneity, they hasten in thinking and thus spontaneity develops with them from this speed in thinking. Therefore, it is enough merely to encourage those who work in thought to have quick thinking. This is done by saying to them that they must have spontaneity. Thus, spontaneity is created in such people who work with and in thought, like the teachers and the ideological politicians and their like, by urging them to use spontaneity. In other words, it is enough to tell them that they must have spontaneity, for spontaneity to exist. They do not need much difficulty or new matters. They rather work in and with thought, so they do not need anything else. It is because they practice this work and it is their daily work, so they develop, due to the habit and training, the attribute of thinking or the characteristic of slow thinking. Thus, they say about everything presented to them, “this requires study and examination and investigation,” though it might not be the case. In order that they become used to quick thinking and they distinguish between that which needs study and that which does not need study, they are asked to have quick thinking, i.e. they are requested to have spontaneity. Quick thinking itself is spontaneity. This quick thinking, if not obstructed by a barrier, would produce, immediately, the judgement on the matter quickly. One would know then that this is spontaneity or from spontaneity regarding that which does not need study or scrutiny. If there were a barrier or an obstruction in the issue, he would know then that it needs study and scrutiny, because it is not among the type of issues that require spontaneity.

INTELLIGENCE AND SPONTANIETY

Most of the people are intelligent. It is rare to find amongst them those of extraordinary intelligence or the stupid, or idiotic. These rarities are not being judged here. Therefore, this discussion is about the common people, or the majority of the people. This is not a discussion on extraordinary intelligence, because the basis of extraordinary intelligence is spontaneity, so it must exist in these people naturally. As for the stupid people and the idiots, their

treatment is useless; as it was said in the past, “faalij laa tu’aalij,” which means if it is in semi-paralysis, don’t treat it. Therefore, we do not target them nor pay attention to treating them. They will continue to be stupid whatever efforts are spent on them. Nothing will benefit them regarding spontaneity; whether it is the treatment of those of them who work with physical matters, like the carpenters and blacksmiths, or those who work with and in thought, like the teachers and ideological politicians. This is because, despite their work in these fields, this does not add anything to them; for the problem is in the innate nature, i.e. the way they were created. Thus, treatment should be for the common or the majority of the people. Though intelligence needs definition, it is however like the term spontaneity. So, it can be of the type that needs definition or of the automatic (aaliy) type. Making all of intelligence of the automatic type is better. However, it is better to define it, for it may be beneficial. If we defined intelligence, we still take it as automatic. It is thus enough to utter the word intelligence for us to know what it is. Most people differentiate between the intelligent and the non-intelligent; they differentiate between the extraordinary intelligence and the ordinary intelligence, just by knowing the word intelligence alone and by seeing or accompanying the people.

Intelligence is the speed of sensation and the speed of linking. Any other definition would only be entering into the details, which is of no use. The mind transfers the reality to the brain through sensation, beside previous information to explain this reality. This definition of mind explains intelligence. The speed of sensation means the speed of transferring the reality to the brain. The previous information means the linkage. Therefore, intelligence is quick sensation and quick linkage. Thus intelligence is a type of mind, a type of thought and a type of thinking. So what applies to mind, thought and thinking applies to it. If one examines this closely, he finds that it is dependent on sensation and linkage. The speed of this represents intelligence, i.e. it represents the action of the distinguished mind or the distinguished thought or the distinguished thinking.

Therefore, intelligence is spontaneity. The stupid or foolish people are not the subject of discussion because it is difficult or impossible

to treat them, nor are the extraordinarily intelligent people the subject of treatment because they have natural spontaneity. Treatment is for the common people and the remaining majority of the people; they have enough intelligence for spontaneity, but they also need treatment. The treatment of spontaneity treats the speed of sensation and the speed of linkage, i.e. it treats the intelligence. Therefore, intelligence and spontaneity are equivalent such that one is inseparable from the other. Thus, the presence of intelligence as such is necessary to create spontaneity. The absence of intelligence negates any work to create spontaneity, or even spontaneity itself is negated.

Those who carry out the physical work and those who work in thought and with thought, are both equal in intelligence, for they are of the common people. The intelligence does not mean the type of work that the brain undertakes, though it is connected with intelligence. It rather means the working person himself, the level of his readiness to accept the treatment and quick pursuance of this treatment. Both those who are asked, in the process of treatment, to be spontaneous and those who are trained in spontaneity by questions have intelligence. So this intelligence is used in the treatment. This is either by the person using his intelligence by himself, like those who work in and with thought, or by making the questions presented to the person the type which touch intelligence in order to make him use this intelligence by necessity. Therefore, it is said about the person who directs the question that he used intelligence. This is because by the selection of the kind of questions that touch intelligence it seems as if intelligence has been used. The truth is that in both cases, the person himself used intelligence. In the case of those who work with and in thought, the person himself uses intelligence from the start. In the case of those who carry out physical work, the person is provoked into using intelligence. In both cases, it is the same. That is, the person uses intelligence by himself. However, one might use this intelligence without indication, direction or provocation, or with indication, direction or provocation. This is the difference between them. Therefore, spontaneity means intelligence, and intelligence means spontaneity. Thus, there is a complete connection between intelligence and spontaneity. This is because intelligence

creates spontaneity; the use of intelligence manifests it. Spontaneity does not come about except with the intelligent and its presence means the presence of intelligence. Thus, though intelligence and spontaneity are two different matters, they are one united thing. The use of intelligence is the basis in spontaneity. Accordingly, the use of intelligence is the basis in initiating spontaneity in the people. This is the case regarding those who carry out physical actions, where initiating spontaneity or the use of intelligence needs direction or incitement. It is also the case for those who work with and in thought, i.e. those where initiating spontaneity or the use of intelligence by them does not need direction or indication. How can intelligence be used? How does its use by the person proceed? The answer to the first question is as follows. Intelligence is quick sensation and quick linkage, of a sensation that arises from a reality, whether it is a physical or intellectual reality; this creates the first step towards using intelligence, which is the sensation. The speed of this sensation comes from the alertness to the sensed things, i.e. from the thing that is sensed. Alertness to what the senses encounter is indispensable. This alertness is that the reality that one's sensation encounters draws one's alertness. So, for example, you might be driving a car and see some fluid flowing in the road. If your alertness made you realise that it is petrol, which you know can burn very easily, then the alertness to the flowing petrol and the realisation that it burns means that you have spontaneity in recognising the approaching danger. Therefore, your thinking will be about measures to take to escape from the road. If you had such spontaneity and took immediate measures to flee, then you could escape the danger without delay, i.e. with extraordinary speed. However, if you were not alert to the fact that it is petrol, then this would not bring awareness to the fact that it will burn. This would lead you to continue down the street and end up in the middle of a fire when the petrol ignites. This is because of not having spontaneity, i.e. not being alert to the fact that the liquid was petrol and that it will burn. Thus, you may be injured or the car might catch fire, for you cannot save yourself or the car from the fire. This would result from the lack of spontaneity. So the speed of sensation results from the alertness, or is due to it, and is what initiates the use of intelligence. As for the speed of linkage it comes, in the mentioned example, from using the previous information

that petrol burns easily. What allowed the use of previous information, or its quick linkage with the incident, is alertness to the fact that what is flowing in the street is petrol and not sewage or water. Thus quick sensation that came from attention is the reason for making the linkage, and consequently the quick linkage. It may be said that the danger - of burning - is what quickened the linkage. The answer to this is that the danger motivates you to take needed measures, but it does not motivate you to make quick linkage. Quick linkage comes from attention to the fact that the flow in the street is petrol. Your understanding that petrol burns is previous information, which is linked or is quickly linked. So the cause of the speed in linking is that the (sensed) reality before you obliges you to link; this is what initiated the speed. Thus the linkage, or the speed of linkage, is treated after you examine what was flowing in the street. Thus, you would have quick sensation and quick linkage. This is the use of intelligence. Thus, the use of intelligence is alertness to the sensed reality and then linking with it the previous information you have about it, which then creates quick alertness. Thus, the use of intelligence created the alertness. Therefore, it is said that spontaneity is the use of intelligence, or the result of using intelligence. Thus, the basis is the use of intelligence.

It might be said, "It is preferable to say that it is necessary to use intelligence so as to develop or initiate spontaneity." After that, one would say that to create spontaneity with people one would have to encourage them to use intelligence. The answer to this is that using the intelligence is the origin and the result. Besides, it is not an easy matter. Therefore, there must be a pointer or a stimulator to create spontaneity. It is otherwise enough to make the name of spontaneity an automatic matter so it can be known without the need to philosophise or think. This is most likely to create spontaneity or it is what creates spontaneity. As for the use of intelligence, besides being a matter of analysis, philosophy and thinking, it is difficult to fully understand it. So, leaving it to come spontaneously is better than making it the origin and the cause. Thus, one finds that endeavours to create spontaneity are a must. It might create spontaneity if one is presently preoccupied with it and it might not create it if one is preoccupied with something else; in both cases intelligence is used. Therefore, intelligence is always

used. However, in the case of spontaneity, one uses it when preoccupied with it or its study. Therefore, one should not be concerned with the use of intelligence, but rather preoccupied with other things, allowing it to come naturally, spontaneously and unintentionally, without intention or action.

The use of intelligence is very important, particularly for spontaneity. However, its use in spontaneity is only achieved if this use of intelligence took place spontaneously, naturally and unintentionally. This is because pursuance of it distances spontaneity instead of bringing it closer. Pursuance also makes the use of intelligence a cause for the lack of spontaneity, instead of being a cause for its existence, though intelligence is what creates spontaneity. Therefore, we say spontaneity does not result from the direct use of intelligence; it rather results from pointers and stimulators; or it comes from uttering the word spontaneity, although the use of intelligence creates spontaneity. We said spontaneity does not exist, nor we concern ourselves with initiating it, except in the intelligent people. What is meant by this is those with normal intelligence and not the extraordinary, the stupid or the foolish. The intelligent people represent the vast majority of the Ummah. These intelligent people, whatever their work may be, are the ones with whom it is necessary to create spontaneity, as an important matter with which to engage in life's affairs. This is because life is full of surprises. The teacher, for example, is in the business of imparting specific information to the students. This action is a purely intellectual work, i.e. it is work with and in thought. Thus, the surprises that occur could occur during the lesson itself, whether new information he did not know or he knew in a different way, might emerge unexpectedly, so he must act towards it. If one lets him self think, study or investigate, this might make the matter more vague. It might even cause ambiguity in information that is already clear. Surprises might also occur from students. So the teacher might discover intelligence in a stupid or foolish student; the opposite might also happen. A student might also put questions he learnt or were given to him, but the teacher might think they are from the student himself. Physical surprises might also occur from the students, such as if one of them fainted, or if a student left and did not return, or other such events. If the

teacher had spontaniety and such surprises occurred, he would take the action that leads to a favourable end or the right result he seeks. If, however, he didn't have spontaniety he would find himself in trouble, or he would take action that would lead to the opposite result, other than the measure he wanted or required in the subject matter. Therefore, teachers must have spontaniety. This is because the surprises that occur from them, to them or in front of them require that they take measures that save them from such surprises. If they didn't have spontaniety, they will become confused or take harmful measures. This leads them and the Ummah to destruction and harm. Similar to the teacher is the engineer, doctor and the ideological politician, every person whose work is in and with thought. Surprises occur to such people in the thought itself, in the physical actions related to it, or in the material itself which one uses, such as the student with the teacher, the sick person with the doctor, or the house or the map with the engineer, etc. Therefore, spontaniety is necessary. The same applies to the labourers, merchants, farmers and crafts people. They are highly likely to face surprises in everything in their practical life, whether in the work they perform or in other issues. It is necessary to take measures towards such surprises. The benefit or harm of these measures, their usage at the right time and place, or delay from the right time, all depend on the reality. There is quite a difference between the two cases. The action varies according to the people, whether they have spontaniety or not. In order to correct this action and make it a sound one, it is necessary to create spontaniety in all the people, whether they are those who work with the material or with the thought. As a result, the benefit which one aims to achieve will be realised. Since these people are intelligent, their spontaniety varies with the intelligence they have, in terms of strength or weakness. Therefore, the basis of spontaniety and its creation is the intelligence of the person. Thus intelligence, or the presence of intelligence, is one of the necessities of spontaniety. Without intelligence there is no spontaniety and it cannot be created. Intelligence is the basis and it counts for everything in life. Moreover, intelligence is a requirement for an action to be chosen. It is true that the action is taken based on spontaniety, or based on the use of intelligence. However, though the stimulator for the action is spontaniety or the use of intelligence, it is in pressing need

for intelligence. This is because the action is the result, the fruit and the benefit of spontaniety or use of intelligence. Therefore, it is very important. So it needs intelligence, i.e. natural intelligence. In the example of the petrol, the driver took the decision of leaving the street the moment he noticed that what was flowing on the street was petrol. He linked that with his previous information that petrol burns easily. However, his driving away from the spillage, though inspired by the presence of the danger, or spontaniety or the use of intelligence, could be a problem itself. There might be an obstacle in the way, maybe one that prevents escape, or one that makes it difficult. Therefore, intelligence is necessary to overcome this. This action needed intelligence. Therefore, the natural intelligence is necessary in or for taking action: when it is said that intelligence counts for everything in life, this is completely true. It is necessary in spontaniety and in using intelligence and also in taking necessary action. Taking measures without intelligence might increase the trouble and it might save from trouble. Either of these two cases depends on the presence of intelligence. The only thing that takes the measures that save from trouble, like driving away from the road in the previous example of the petrol, is intelligence. What makes the measure itself increase the trouble is the absence of intelligence. How would a person gain by realising that what was flowing is petrol, linked this quickly to the fact that petrol burns easily, but then continuing down the road hoping to find an exit, without using intelligence or without having enough intelligence to help him to overcome the difficulties of leaving the road? In such a case he would not overcome the difficulties. Thus, he advanced further hoping to find an exit, thus increasing in trouble and falling into destruction. Therefore, the existence of intelligence is necessary to take an action. Thus, intelligence is essential for spontaniety and in taking the measure resulting from spontaniety. This is because taking this measure depends on intelligence. Choosing a certain measure to escape the problem or the predicament or the anxiety is essential. He chooses; rather, he must choose. However, this choice depends on the intelligence. If he were intelligent, he would choose the required measure. If, however, he were not intelligent, he would take a measure that increases his difficulties. Therefore, the presence of intelligence is crucial in taking the measure, in order to choose the measure that saves, not

the measure that increases trouble. Thus, intelligence is necessary for spontaneity; it is also necessary for taking a measure. It is rather essential in everything, because intelligence is the origin and it counts in everything in life.

THE USE OF INTELLIGENCE AND SPONTANIETY

It has been mentioned that intelligence is what creates spontaneity. It has also been mentioned that the alertness to the sensation or to the sensed matter is where spontaneity starts. Moreover, we said that spontaneity is reflected in taking the measure that is the fruit of spontaneity. We defined the use of intelligence as the speed of sensation and the speed of linkage. It remains to be known how the speed of intelligence occurs or how the use of intelligence occurs. Spontaneity is the use of intelligence. Thus spontaneity does not come naturally. It is rather a quick, but arduous process. Its cause is the attention to the sensed matter, or to the sensation. The ordinary person is intelligent and he has enough intelligence to have spontaneity. Though spontaneity is related and connected with intelligence, it does not however create it. This is because intelligence is natural in man and it exists with every man. However, intelligence is a rational process. It includes everything required by the rational process or everything that applies to it. The reality is imprinted on the brain, or the sensation carries the reality to the brain. The brain gathers together the previous information and the sensation. Thus the rational process exists. Since man is a speaking animal (and therefore a thinking animal), then every human being, as such, undertakes the rational process. This means that man is intelligent or he has a level of intelligence sufficient for him to issue a judgement on matters. Intelligence, however, is more than the rational process. This is because it is manifested in the speed: speed of sensation and speed of linkage. If such speed existed, the intelligence would exist; if it did not exist, the intelligence would not exist. The speed should be present in both of them, i.e. in the sensation and in the linkage. The speed of linkage only exists if one had previous information about the sensed matter. Once sensation occurred this information comes, because sensation brings it or requires it. This is what should

occur and it is termed the speed of linkage. This speed of linkage occurs naturally if the information is available, where sensation brings it; it can bring it at an outstanding speed. Therefore, speed of linkage does not require anything except sensation. It does not need any other factor. As for the speed of sensation it only comes through attention, or the speed of attention. Thus, the speed of attention is the first and principal pillar for the use of intelligence. Thus the matter is based on the attention or the speed of attention. Therefore, care must be given to the attention or the speed of attention, for it is the one thing that creates the use of intelligence and consequently creates spontaneity. Spontaneity requires the use of intelligence which itself requires attention or the speed of attention. Therefore, the speed of attention is the common factor between spontaneity and the use of intelligence, or it is the principal condition in creating the process of the use of intelligence. Creating the process by which intelligence is used and hence creating spontaneity both depend upon it. Thus, it is necessary to study attention, or the speed of attention, so as to understand the use of intelligence and consequently to understand spontaneity, how it exists and how it is formed in man.

Attention is to target the examination and recognition of the sensed matter. Without this targeting, attention cannot occur. In the previous example, the driver saw fluid flowing on the road. If he did not intentionally aim to know what it was and instead overlooked it, he would not have attention, consequently neither the use of intelligence nor spontaneity would occur. So the intentional acquisition of knowledge about a matter, in terms of what it is, is the basis of the whole process. Thus, the first thing is the intentional acquisition of knowledge of the nature of the sensed matter, or to carry out a serious, arduous, but swift movement for that sake. This is because everything depends on this knowledge. Thus the knowledge or aiming to have knowledge is the basis. An example of that is the story of Sulaiman's division of the child claimed by two women, where he discovered who the mother of the child was quickly and spontaneously. Each of the two women claimed the child to be her son. So Sulaiman realised that the real mother of the child was the one who would give it up for any person to take in order to keep it alive; despite her preference

to take it and keep it alive, she would sacrifice in order that it is not killed. In contrast, the woman who was not the mother of the child would not care for dividing it. That is why he proposed to the two women that the child be divided between them, i.e. to kill the child, for its killing would show who the mother was. Had he explicitly proposed the killing of the child, the woman who was not the mother might have pretended to be concerned about the child. However, he did not propose killing it openly. He rather offered the killing in an implicit way. So he proposed dividing the child between the two women. The real mother then rejected this and the woman who was not the mother accepted it. Thus he knew the real mother of the child. The sensation that the division of the child means killing it was only came from the real mother, which is why she rejected the proposal. Thus, this rejection from the mother and the acceptance from the fake mother quickly reached the mind of the judge, Sulaiman, i.e. he sensed the rejection and acceptance intellectually. The previous information came once he received this sensation, so he knew that the one who rejected the division of the child was the mother and accordingly he ruled in her favour and gave her the child. This knowledge of the mother's identity was a result of spontaneity; spontaneity only came from using the intelligence; the use of intelligence only came from the attention; and the attention is the thing that initiated the sensation and the speed of sensation. This naturally led to quick linkage, i.e. the previous information coming swiftly to the mind. Spontaneity occurred after the use of quick linkage together with quick sensation. This is because the use of intelligence occurred and the required measure, i.e. the verdict for the mother that the child is her son, occurred as well. The incident of Sulaiman is a good example of sensation, like the example of the fluid flowing on the ground. Another good example of this is when one knows the aim of somebody asking you, "where are you from?" So any sensation, of any matter, whether it is material or immaterial, is a good example. Thus, sensation is the first step in the process; what initiates sensation is attention. Thus, sensation results from this attention and quick sensation as well. Then a thought evokes another to the mind and accordingly the use of intelligence occurs and spontaneity occurs.

Thus, attention is the basis of the whole process. As regards to how this attention occurs, it occurs by the effect of life, i.e. it occurs naturally. It is true that alertness initiates it and directs to it, but vigilance is one of the necessities of life, though it does not exist except in the living things, i.e. the truly living things. If somebody has no vigilance, this means his life is in apathy, sleep or death. Such a person is not asked to be attentive, accordingly he is not asked to use his intelligence, for it does not exist in the first place as long as he is not characterise with life. One of the necessities of life is that the living person has vigilance. Once vigilance exists, attention can be created. It is not true to say that vigilance initiates attention. It is rather said, "If there is vigilance, attention occurs." Nor is it true to say that vigilance occurs because it is one of the necessities of life. However, attention occurs due to vigilance. Since vigilance is natural, thus attention occurs through vigilance, i.e. it occurs by the presence of life. Thus, attention is the basis and not vigilance. This is because vigilance exists in the living creature as long as there is life or vitality in it. However, attention occurs through intent and pursuance, i.e. by intentionally looking at the sensed matter and paying attention to what it contains and to its essence. Once this knowledge is complete, the process of the use of intelligence is performed, or the process of spontaneity is performed. Therefore, everything depends on the validity of this knowledge. In other words, the validity of the process of using the mind, of spontaneity, of the judgement issued about the matter and of the measure taken towards what occurred, all depend on the validity of the knowledge obtained about the matter. Therefore, the importance of the validity of the information outweighs, to a great extent, anything else. This is because the proof of its validity is the one thing that would save or destroy, cause success or failure, give life or death. Thus, the validity of information is one of the important elements of the subject.

In the example of the sensation process of the fluid flowing on the ground, if it was water and he thought it to be petrol, then he took a great risk by evasive measures, where he might be exposed to something more dangerous. While if he continued driving, he would not have been harmed, for it was water, not flammable petrol. The fact that he aimed at knowing the nature of the fluid,

realising that it was petrol and not water means that he became certain of the identity of the sensed matter. Based on this assurance, quick linkage also occurred. All of that depended on the correct understanding of the sensed matter, through attention towards it or the intentional knowledge of it. Therefore, the use of intelligence is not like the use of other things. It is rather both complex and profound. Its complexity comes from the intentional knowledge of it and the attention to it. This is complex because things are similar. Differentiating between them is considerably complicated; it requires speed in order to reach such knowledge. The fact that it is profound comes from quick sensation - a matter that is not easy. This is because it needs attention, together with its correctness and soundness. This is a profound matter; because it is not enough that only quick sensation occurs. It is rather necessary to know about that speed of sensation and where it came from. Did it come from the attention or from something else? Or did it come automatically, like quick linkage? These are profound matters. Therefore, the use of intelligence is complex and profound. It is an arduous, but quick process. Therefore, it is feared that the use of intelligence might be a deceptive operation. So, instead of being a guiding process, it might be misleading. Therefore, it must be a sound and correct process; it should fulfil its conditions, or the conditions of its validity.

The Arabic word for using intelligence is like the word for spontaneous intuition (*badeeha*); i.e. it is better that the meaning of these words be automatically (*aaliyyah*) accepted, without being subject to philosophising, which is the origin in using them. It might also be a complicated and deep process, which must fulfil the conditions of its correctness, which makes them philosophised and in need of thought. Though this is a process that includes thoughts and complexities, it is in itself is a thought; it is however a simple thought and thus improper for it to be involved with complications. Therefore, it is better or more appropriate to make it automatic in meaning. Thus, it is called the use of intelligence and nothing more. What is understood from the use of intelligence is what is understood from uttering the words. This is enough for action and for preventing error. This is because what is understood from uttering it alone is enough to undertake the process of the use of

intelligence, i.e. it is enough to use intelligence. This is because the word ‘use’ (*isti’maal*) means the intentional aim of using, ‘intelligence’ is already known. Thus, the word “using” (*isti’maal*) intelligence is better to remain automatic (*aaliy*) and not to be involved in philosophy or thinking. So it is said, “*isti’maal udh-dhaka*,” which means the use of intelligence and nothing more.

NATURAL SPONTANIETY AND ARTIFICIAL SPONTANIETY

In principle, spontaniety should be natural, because it comes on its own. The danger or the deliverance from trouble is what makes spontaniety exist; it comes naturally because evading danger requires quick judgement to take quick measures. This is the same with spontaniety in regards to deliverance from trouble. This is enough to say on this subject. However, when the West invaded the Islamic world and the Muslims, it came with thoughts that call for slow thinking and avoiding haste in rushing to judgement. When the West invaded the Islamic countries politically and occupied them, it started to apply practically the process of slow thinking and study, so the Muslims imitated them, as the imitation of the strong by the weak is intuitive. Therefore, the thoughts that were adopted without caution and vigilance came to be applied practically and so this resulted in slow thinking. Everything started to require study and scrutiny. Even the automatic matters that should not be philosophised or thought about became subject to study, thought and research. This resulted in the slow thinking which became natural with the people, particularly those who work with and in thought. They thus lost spontaniety until it almost became non-existent, except in the cases of very great danger. Therefore, it became necessary to use artificial processes to develop spontaniety. The use of intelligence, which is a natural matter and must be natural, was thus in need of an artificial operation. Therefore, it became necessary to simulate a process for using intelligence and a process for developing spontaniety. However, this process, whether for using intelligence or for spontaniety, must change from a simulated process to an intuitive and natural one. This is because spontaniety must be natural; it is not correct that it is always simulated, for simulation is only for the sake of making spontaniety

with man natural and intuitive. Thus, the natural spontaneity and intuition is the basis and it must exist. Simulation is only one of the means to develop natural spontaneity thereafter the simulation is removed. Therefore natural spontaneity is the basis, which must exist; while the simulated spontaneity is opposite to the basis, it must only be used as a stimulating device and as a tool to develop the original (natural) spontaneity. So, when they say “spontaneity”, what is meant is the natural or intuitive spontaneity; the term is not used except for this type. This is because spontaneity is quick judgement on a matter; it only comes about naturally, not artificially. This is because simulation deprives it of benefit and of providing the required measure, for simulation is a state that lies between slow thinking and quick thinking, which is and must be a temporary state. It is also a means and not an end, so it must be a means and continue to be so. Accordingly, we find natural spontaneity as the basis, or it must be and continue to be the basis. Therefore, discussion is only about natural spontaneity and not about artificial spontaneity. Since, in reality, the people in this region (the Middle East) and the Muslims in particular continue to adhere to slow thinking, spontaneity is still distant from them. Therefore, it is necessary to develop the simulated spontaneity and it is necessary to work for it and with it. Thus, it is necessary to discuss simulated spontaneity as a means and a tool, not as an objective in itself.

The process of simulated spontaneity starts with the use of intelligence. The use of intelligence itself, though it should be natural, became artificial, due to the cultural invasion and the political invasion. Therefore, it is necessary to start with the simulated use of intelligence, i.e. to have simulation in using intelligence and in developing spontaneity. Thus, we have to start by using simulation in everything, i.e. it is necessary to have deliberateness and premeditation in order to initiate simulation; simulation is necessary in order to use intelligence and consequently in order to develop spontaneity. Continuance and pursuance in this action is also necessary, in order that spontaneity becomes natural after the use of intelligence becomes natural.

Since simulation is deliberateness and intent, then it is necessary to have such deliberateness and intent. The question that arises

now is, “What do you do deliberately and intentionally?” The answer is that one starts with the use of intelligence. Since the use of intelligence starts with attention, then it is necessary to have deliberateness and intent in attention. Though this might result from training and education, it is also better coming naturally. Therefore, it comes through the presentation of thoughts and making the people adopt them once they are convinced of their validity, i.e. once they adopt them as concepts. So it is said to the people that they must have deliberateness and intent in their attention. Thus, when they face any matter they will aim at deliberate and intentional attention and then understand the matter. In other words, they start to use the intelligence in an artificial way. Then eventually it becomes intuitive to them. With repetition and time, this creates spontaneity in them. Therefore, deliberateness and intent is the first pillar, but not by training and education, it is rather by giving thoughts to the people so that they become concepts for them. In other words, thoughts are given to them accompanied with their proofs, whether given verbally, or in a way that makes their evidence clear from mentioning them only. Once they became concepts, their adoption and use of them becomes guaranteed, thus guaranteeing the process of the use of intelligence. Once this is secured, then spontaneity will exist. Its existence might be artificial at the beginning, but with repetition and time it will become natural. Therefore, deliberateness and intent guarantee development of natural spontaneity, not only simulated spontaneity.

The previous example of the petrol and the driver is spontaneity, but it came from the unexpected danger, or from getting into trouble. It might also come from intent and deliberateness. So if deliberateness and intent existed, i.e. if attention existed with the people, then once they got into such a situation, like the example of the petrol, they would become attentive in examining the fluid that flows on the ground. This may be based on deliberateness and intent if they understood that, or from the danger itself or the trouble they fell in. If this attention was because of the danger or the trouble, then this is outside the scope of our study. However, if it was based on intent and deliberateness, then this is the subject of study. That is, this deliberateness and intent initiates attention, consequently it initiates the use of intellect or the use of intelligence

and thus spontaneity occurs with them.

In the example of the verdict of Sulaiman al-Hakeem to divide the child, the deliberateness and intent occurred by the result of the division and the impact of this verdict on the two women. In other words, attention or use of intelligence occurred from the result of the division and its impact on the two women. What the person expected from the use of intelligence then resulted, that is the rejection by the mother of the child and the acceptance by the other woman. This rejection and acceptance is what the person expects from using the intelligence. Thus, spontaneity results from knowing which of these two women is the real mother of the child. This spontaneity resulted from the use of intelligence. The use of intelligence resulted from attention. The attention resulted from intent and deliberateness. Thus, intent and deliberateness is the first step you must start with in the whole process. Though this process changes from one situation to another and from one state to another, it however proceeds in its designed course. Thus, its change or its steps are natural and not artificial, because it proceeds according to what was expected of it. Though it was artificial, the perfection of its simulation made it seem quasi-natural. Therefore, it inevitably leads to a natural matter, i.e. the natural use of intelligence and consequently, natural spontaneity. Thus, if it continued in this form, its use will be precise and its results will be natural, or according to what is expected of it. Therefore, it will not be long before its use leads to the use of intelligence naturally and for spontaneity to become natural.

Therefore, nobody should think that simulation in using intelligence and in developing spontaneity is a hard matter, or that it takes long time before it leads to natural spontaneity. The matter, rather, depends on the precision in simulation. If simulation was precise and what is expected occurred, then natural spontaneity would be achieved. It would become a habit from the first simulated exercise, rather than from the first real work, without any sign of its artificial origins. Thus, all the issues become natural from the first moment and the first step. Though an artificial spontaneity occurred, i.e. the first exercise, followed by natural spontaneity, they all however seem natural, even the first one. This is because

simulation disappears because of the precision and because what is expected occurs automatically. Thus, it occurs as if it is natural, so nobody sees in it the sign of simulation or artifice.

We are obliged to use the simulation due to the effects of the Western cultural and political invasion, alongside the effect that the agents of the Kaafir colonialist West have on the souls and minds of the Muslims. This led thinking to become study and investigation in everything, until spontaneity was lost. If it were not because of that, we would not need such simulated operations. This is because spontaneity was natural and the use of intelligence was natural. The minds were not then confused with anything. The people used to study whatever needed study and use spontaneity in that which did not need study and examination. They used to use their intelligence every time it was needed, whether in spontaneity or in anything else. Therefore, taking the people back to the origin from which they came or to the level that their fathers and forefathers were at is easy and simple, without need for complication. This is because these are the offspring of those who were before them. All of them had spontaneity as an origin and it alone existed. Therefore, taking them back to that origin that existed with them, even by force, does not need great effort. Therefore, action has to be taken to build natural spontaneity; rather action should be made for it in any way possible.

THE PROBLEM

The problem now is not how to initiate thinking, for thinking exists in people by their innate nature. This is because man is created with a brain and with sensation that transfers the reality to the brain, which is a natural matter. What remains after that is the issue of the previous information and the issue of the reality that the sensation carries to the brain. Thus, the brain and sensation exist with man since his birth, they are both with him from creation and by innate nature. Therefore, initiating these matters does not need any effort or work, for they exist with man innately, i.e. by creation. What are important are the realities that are carried by sensation to the brain and the previous information that explains such reality. As for realities, they are available and abundant. Due to

life in this world, sensation encounters many realities, besides the numerous and consecutive occurrences that are daily incidents. All that the sensation has to do is to carry these realities. Regardless of the excessive number of realities it carries to the brain, it will initiate thinking because the previous information that explains this reality is vast, accessible and easy to use. Therefore, there is no problem in thinking, nor does it represent any problem. How we initiate thinking is not a problem, nor should it cause any problem. The whole problem is from the Kaafir colonisation or the Kaafir West including Russia. The West knew from its study and awareness that thinking exists. So its main attention became how to suspend it, or how to make it unproductive and inactive and then consequently how to make it harmful if it could not suspend it. Nobody can suspend thinking, because the creature is animate, i.e. living, man is a thinking creature and the presence of life is natural. The fact that man is a thinker is thus natural. Therefore, it is not possible to suspend thinking in man as long as he exists, as long as life flows in him. Therefore, the West spent its effort to make this thinking harmful. From this the problem arose. So, the problem is that thinking became harmful. How then can this harm be removed and thinking made useful? The answer to this lies in the current thinking itself. The non-western person thinks, but he exaggerates and becomes excessive in thinking. He thinks about and studies everything and he philosophises everything. This, results in two matters: Firstly, he starts to think about objects by philosophising them. Thus he philosophises the chair, “what is it?” He philosophises the plate, “what is it?” He philosophises the cup, “what is it?” So he takes these things out of their nature, their time and their natural situation. Thus, they become more obscure; rather obscurity surrounds them, thus becoming remote from their true meaning. The listener or the reader becomes unaware of what the chair is, what the plate is and what the cup is. If it were satisfactory for it just to be mentioned, then he would have known it properly. Had he not philosophised it, he would have known it as it is. So what made it vague is the thinking or philosophising. Therefore, it is necessary to remove this philosophising. This applies to the material and immaterial things. If mentioning the ‘risk’ were confined to saying its name only, it would have been known what it was. However, if it were philosophised as a calculated or studied

venture, or as a reckless venture, it would not become a known venture; it would rather change to become a plan. Similar to this are the terms spontaneity, use of intellect, intelligence and the like. The more these words are explained and philosophised, the more vague they become. Therefore, vagueness is only removed from them when philosophising is separated from them, or thinking is separated from them. The harm in thinking, in this context, only came from its generalisation and making it include everything, even the automatic matters. Therefore, thinking in the automatic matters or philosophising them is what harmed thinking. Moreover, the inclusion of thinking in everything made it include spontaneity. In other words it created slow thinking, whilst spontaneity requires quick thinking. However, slow thinking, study and scrutiny are prevalent. Therefore, habituation to it and focusing the taste on it made it the indispensable basis that must exist. Thus, slow thinking became the norm and the basis and the tastes were focussed on it. As such, it became necessary for everything to have study and examination. Thus, there was no place for speed or for the absence of study or the absence of examination. Accordingly, spontaneity disappeared. From this incorrect view, everything needs study and examination, thus spontaneity does not arise nor should it exist. This is because it means thinking without study or examination, a matter that became rejected and disapproved of. Spontaneity became tarnished in their minds. It was deemed that it should not exist and nobody should be characterised with it. Therefore, spontaneity became detested and accordingly non-existent or viewed as incorrect to exist. Thus, the western invasion created this problem. It is not thinking; it is rather what results from thinking that is of harm. Thus, the problem became the harm of thinking and the solution to this problem is to remove this harm. Thus, the question that arises now is: How can one remove this harm from thinking? Thinking exists, it is natural and so it is not the problem. The problem is rather: How can one remove this harm from thinking? The answer to that is that one has to know, before anything else, that the West is an enemy, that there is doubt in all of its thoughts. Therefore, first of all, one must have scepticism regarding all of its thoughts, so no one should not adopt any thought from it except after study and research: What is it? What is the aim of it? What is the purpose of presenting it? Thus,

scepticism about everything that came from the West is the basis; this must be established firmly. Unless scepticism towards the West is established, in everything it exports, particularly the thoughts, then we will certainly continue to be captives to this thinking and we will definitely continue to fall victim to it and to its traps. Therefore, the first step one should take is to suspect the West and have doubt in everything it issues to us, even if it issues that for itself, because it might sacrifice itself for the sake of deceiving us. Deception is the West's basis, even if it deceived its own people and family, for it depends on deception as its strongest weapon. Therefore, scepticism towards it and in everything it issues is the basis and origin; this is what should prevail in the lands of Islam or amongst Muslims.

After this scepticism comes the second matter or the second step, which is the thinking, or removing the harm from thinking. This is because the way of thinking was brought by the West among its deceptive thoughts. Following the scepticism towards what the West brought, should be scepticism towards its urging of us to think and to make the thinking comprehensive. So, we must have doubt in this encouragement to think. Why does it urge us to think, when thinking is natural and innate in man? They have an aim from this encouragement. So one must find the aim and the objective. One must know it and be wary of its consequences. The encouragement to thinking aims at making thinking sacred, making it a goal and detaching it from sentiment and emotions, or making them not active or effective. This is despite the fact that man has intellect and sentiments. So he is not sentimental only, nor intellectual only. Rather he has both of these attributes. However, the leader of the march should have the intellect and not the sentiment. The sentiments are blazing emotions, so they are not good for leadership; besides they burn quickly and die down quickly. Thus, man has intellect and sentiments; the leadership should be given to the intellect and not to the sentiments. Once we reach this point we comprehend the aim of this encouragement to thinking and we cause it to fail in achieving its aim. At the same time we would not discard the sentiments and the emotions; we rather keep them. However, we would use them in their right place, where they should be and where they fit. That is, they should remain directed by the

intellect. Thus, one would have removed the first harm caused by its encouragement to thinking. By this removal, the sacredness of the intellect will be removed; making it the only matter that exists will also be removed if the sentiments exist beside it, even if they were directed by it. Thus, the intellectual divestment of sentiments that the West wants to establish would have been removed, together with harm it causes. Then one would take its encouragement to think in an intellectual way, to make the thinking exist, but in the natural form for which it exists. Another issue arises from its encouragement to think and making this a comprehensive principle. Meaning to think about everything, study everything and scrutinise everything. This means to think about everything slowly. This leads to the abandonment of quick thinking and consequently the abandonment of spontaneity. We thus become accustomed to slow thinking and ignore or despise quick thinking. Slow thinking thus becomes the standard for the validity of thinking. Together with conviction and repetition, this, after some time, abolishes spontaneity and consequently negates its role. We thus fall captive to slow thinking; our enemy will find us unaware and we become blind fools before its hands and remain under its control. Quick problems will then take place while we can't solve them; the fleeting opportunities will be missed, without being seized quickly. So the problems will multiply and opportunities will be lost.

As regards thinking being generalised, beside its removal of spontaneity, it makes the automatic thinking or the automatic philosophy subject for discussion, it in fact makes them a subject for philosophy and thinking. Thus, the vagueness of the ambiguous matters is increased and the clear and obvious matters become vague. Accordingly, we would not be able to benefit from the most simple of matters, which are the automatic matters, i.e. the clear matters, like the chair, the cup and the plate in the material issues; or like spontaneity, the use of intelligence and intelligence in the abstract issues. If the person can't benefit from the automatic matters, which are among the simplest issues, or which are the most easy to utilize, then he will become a person whose presence and work are of no value.

Therefore, the problem is not in thinking; it is rather in removing

the harm from thinking. This is achieved by making it a normal thinking process; where it speeds up when the matter requires speed, like spontaniety, and it slows down when the matter needs slowness, like the meaning of intellect and the meaning of thinking itself. This includes everything that needs thought in order to become clear, like the existence of Allah and the existence of justice. However, it does not include that which does not need thought and thinking, like the automatic matters such as the chair, plate and cup, the intelligence, using of intellect and spontaniety, beside other matters. Thus, the problem is only the removing of harm from thinking and nothing else.

THE REALITY OF THE PROBLEM

The reality of the problem is that the thinking of the people generally in every country, including the ideological politicians and thinkers, became naturally slow. The remedy is to get rid of this problem from its root, i.e. to get rid of the slow thinking which became a habit until spontaniety was lost. Thus, the problem is slow thinking and consequently (lack of) spontaniety. Slow thinking is the problem. The fact that it became habitual and natural became the problem in its reality. Any question, even if it was an automatic one, was philosophised and thinking about it became prevalent among the people. The problem is not thinking, for thinking is natural and recommendable, even obligatory; for thinking in the issue reveals its hidden aspects and explains its secrets, making the person aware of the truth. Thus, thinking, as such, is beneficial and useful. However, the slowness of this thinking - or the fact that it is used in every question, it philosophises every question and proceeds slowly - is the problem in its reality. Slow thinking became the basis for the people, until they lost spontaniety, so when it is used it is only at the moment of danger. Spontaniety is not only for the moment of danger. It is not inevitable that a measure be taken based on spontaniety. Spontaniety rather comes at the moment of danger and at other times; it might require that a measure be taken or it might not. Therefore, spontaniety should be permanent and in all things. So it is not correct for it to exist only at the moment of danger; it should exist in all situations. It does not require measures

in every matter, as some of them need measures and some do not. Therefore, its presence at moments of danger is not enough; it should rather exist in everything. Thus, spontaniety is necessary in everything. Its reality is that it is quick thinking. So, its problem, i.e. the reality of its problem, is slow thinking.

Slow thinking comes from the domination of the Colonialist West over the country and the domination of its thoughts over the people. Much time passed by the people while they remain involved in slow thinking and they practice it. It has now become part of the formation of their mentality and part of their thinking. Thus, slow thinking became the problem, or the reality of the problem. So, spontaniety is not the problem, though its loss was the most prominent result of the problem that the people suffer from. Thinking itself is not the problem either, for it is as necessary to man as life itself, regardless of his level of intellect and his thinking. The problem is rather the slowness in thinking. Spontaniety is the result of the absence of slowness in thinking. Thinking is the natural process that exists in man. So slowness in thinking is the reality of the problem. This slowness was not natural, nor was it innate, or automatic. It rather came as a result of the domination of the West over the lands and the domination of its thoughts over the people. Therefore, the reality of the problem is slow thinking and what make this problem exist in reality are the domination of the Colonialist West and its thoughts. Therefore, a solution should be focused on the problem itself and not on its symptoms or on what is natural in every human being.

Since it is proven that (lack of) spontaniety is not the problem, rather it is a symptom of the problem, the solution should be focused on the problem and not on its results. Its symptoms are not treated on the basis that they are the problem, nor are they part of the way to solve the problem. Rather the problem itself has to be treated, which is the slowness of thinking. Its treatment requires the treatment of the domination over the people, whether the domination of the West or the domination of its thoughts. Therefore, understanding the nature of the problem is crucial, so that the solution does not become useless and futile, or focussed on other than the problem. Thus, understanding the nature of the

problem is a crucial matter. Since the nature of the problem is slowness in thinking, then slowness in thinking is the basis and it represents the nature of the problem. It is true that the domination of the West over the countries and the domination of its thoughts over the people is the basis, but this basis does not mean that the problem cannot be solved until this domination is removed. Rather, it is possible to treat it while this domination is present, by addressing the thinking itself, moving it from slowness to speed and from deliberateness to haste. The problem is not the domination of the West, though it is the origin of the problem. Rather, the problem is slowness in thinking; so the problem is what has to be treated, though we should be heedful of its origin. This means that the West, through what it spreads of deception, alongside what it dispatches of deviation in the name of science, culture, civilisation and guidance and other similar names, is the problem and the basis of the problem. However, the domination of the West is only through their imposition of terms or their styles. So the question is not related to removing this domination; it is rather related to the people, i.e. the aspect is related to the domination. It is true that domination is the origin of the problem. It is also true that the styles of domination have changed, for other more hidden and more effective ones. However, the problem is the basis, which is the aspect related to the people. This means spontaniety is entrusted to the people. It is charged with them themselves. By the effect of their changing intellect, which develops from one state to another, effort must be focused on it. It is true that domination is the basis, but domination can't exist without the concepts of the people. So the concepts of the people are what perpetuate the domination, or put an end to it. However, they are not the problem, nor are they the origin. The issue is to change the domination over life. Therefore, relating the matter to the West or to the domination is an escape from the problem. Instead matters must be directed towards the problem, which is developing spontaniety. This is done through the people and not through the domination. In other words, it is through changing the concepts about the matters of life and not through removing the domination. Thus, changing the concepts is the basis. Therefore, it is not correct to escape from the problem by directing these matters to the domination or to the West. Rather, matters must be directed

towards people, i.e. towards changing the concepts, particularly changing the concepts about the crucial matters in life. So in the attempt to create spontaniety, it is not correct to turn towards the West, for it is the origin of the problem. Nor should one turn towards the dominant Western thoughts, because it is these that created the problem. Rather, care must be directed towards the people to change their concepts; the Ummah must be called to work to remove the domination. Thus, the origin of the solution is changing the concepts of the people, not changing the domination.

THE TREATMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Slowness in thinking is the problem. This slowness comes from the domination of the West over the country and the domination of its thoughts over the people. Therefore, it may seem at first to the mind that the treatment of this origin is the solution to the problem. However, after close examination, two matters are noticed: firstly, this is an over-simplification of the problem. Secondly, this means escape from treating the problem. Therefore, this origin has only to be noted during treatment, but the solution does not depend on it. As for the simplification of the problem, the West and its domination is the source of all the predicaments, including slowness of thinking. Focusing the treatment on the basis means that its removal would remove the slowness. Though this is true as a whole, it needs pursuance. Thus, the lack of observance of pursuance is a simplification of the problem. So, the problem is the removal of the basis and the presence of pursuance. The presence of pursuance is necessary, even if the basis is removed. The pursuance is what leads to the removal of what the basis left, not the basis itself. Therefore, pursuance is the origin of the treatment and not the removal of the basis. So pursuance is the solution whether the basis, which is the domination of the West, remained or not. However, the removal of the basis reduces the pursuance and makes it more effective. Accordingly, pursuance is what the treatment starts with. Pursuance is what removes the effects of this basis. Thus, pursuance is necessary before anything else.

Thus, the treatment of slow thinking is pursuance. Pursuance is

inevitable, for there is no solution without it. Therefore, the true treatment of the slowness in thinking, i.e. of the absence of spontaneity or its development, is pursuance. Pursuance is focused on slowness of thinking as follows:

Firstly: It is necessary to present many things to the people and to the individuals so that they think of them. Through their thinking about these things and about what occurs in front of them, slowness in thinking might be noticed. This observance or sensation of the slowness is taken as the starting point in the treatment. So we should take such observance or such sensation and study it thoroughly until we understand its reality. For example, we present to the people something, like their future, their current situation or their history. We find them analyse this future slowly until it slips away from their hands. They also analyse their reality and their history in the same manner. This is despite the fact that analysis of the future is different to the analysis of the reality and to the analysis of history. However, their use of slow thinking and the fact that it became innate to them, makes them take a long time in analysis and they philosophise the automatic things, until the future, the reality or the history becomes vague instead of increasing in clarity. This slowness in thinking is the prominent phenomenon in all of them. So we do not discuss what we presented, whatever it is; rather we take the phenomenon apparent in all of them. We hold it, seize it and attack it strongly; we explain that it is one of the most prominent faults, making it loathsome to the people, to the point that it is right to say to them that honey is the excrement of the bees. If they disliked slowness in thinking, i.e. they hated slow analysis, inclination in them towards speed in thinking would appear. This tendency is the first sign of recovery. If this tendency does not appear clearly, then we have to create it in them. This can be through allusion, or by quick treatments and the effect of the speed. Thus this tendency will exist in some of them, if not in all of them. However, it will not take a long time before it exists in all of them. Thus, presenting the matter and attacking the apparent phenomenon would lead us to the tendency towards speed. This would be the first indication of success. The treatment of slowness does not result from explanation and demonstration, or through speeches and writing books. It rather results from the use of a

limited number of words that contain actions, or through the actions themselves. This is pursuance. Accordingly, pursuance is a limited number of words and apparent actions.

Secondly: It is necessary to follow up the presentation and the insistence in this pursuance, until boredom appears to the people or the individuals from this pursuance, as if they were to say, “please, it is enough”. It is not expected that all of the people will say that it is enough. Nor is it satisfactory that one or two people said that. Rather, it should be felt that the people were fed up with the pursuance. At that point, pursuance is ceased. It is not correct to pursue this until all the people were fed up of it, without feeling or sensing it. Pursuance should not cease just because of a few intelligent individuals, or a small number of the people. It is rather necessary that one follow up till one feels that pursuance would be of no use. At that point one stops pursuance once one felt that. This is because it is supposed that this feeling existed based on a comprehensive reality and not a reality of a few intelligent individuals.

Thirdly: Pursuance has to vary. This means, after presenting to the people their future, current situation and their history, it is necessary to present to them their life, the monotony of this life and its manner. Their way of life is also presented to them and the protection of this way of life, even by the sword, i.e. force. Moreover, the outlook towards the one who disagrees with this way should be without tolerance or negligence; it should even be an outlook that reaches hostility. Other matters are then presented, in a varied way. This should include those matters that require thinking and not automatic ones, like the venture, the chair and the plate. They rather should be of those that need thinking.

Fourthly: One has to be in a state of awareness of the matters when he presents them to the people, aware of their effect and of the people’s thinking regarding them. This is in order that his reflection, i.e. awareness, is a means of testing the validity of the judgements he issues and the correctness of the observances that he expresses. This is also in order to launch the attack in the right place, in the view of the listener and the speaker. If one lost

awareness one would lose everything, for there is no advantage from the pursuance or the repetition or the diversity, without the presence of awareness and reflection. Thus, awareness and reflection are among the necessities for success.

As for the ones who will carry out the treatment, it appears at first to the mind that it should be the leaders, sincere ones or those in charge of the people or individuals. In reality, any person can do that with people or with himself, as long as he followed the four conditions. Therefore, the treatment is not designed for a particular person to undertake. It is rather designed in a general way that includes the leaders, sincere ones, guardians and any possible person from the Ummah. Even if you presented the matter to yourself and treated yourself, you would be treated correctly and it would be enough. Therefore, it must be well known that this treatment is the property of every man; every man can undertake it, even if he was one person and even if it was on himself. So what counts is the treatment, not who carries it out.

PURSUANCE AND SPONTANIETY

We said pursuance treats slowness of thinking. In other words, it treats spontaniety. However, the pursuance that treats slowness of thinking needs the addition of another factor so as to treat spontaniety. This is because though spontaniety results from thinking and intelligence, in reality it might originate from those who are not intelligent. Or it might be present in those who have less intelligence than those who just lack spontaniety. Moreover, quick thinking might occur while spontaniety does not exist. Therefore, to assume that the treatment of spontaniety can occur just by generating quick thinking based on pursuance is overly optimistic, awarding (pursuance) more weight than the reality or the people can afford. The example of the woman's complaint to Omar bin al-Khattab is a practical evidence of this. The woman came to Omar bin al-Khattab to complain about her husband. However, she did not complain explicitly. She rather implied what the one who has spontaniety can understand. She said to Omar, "My husband stands the night praying and fasts in the day." Omar

answered her: "What a good man this husband is!" Then she went away. One of the attendants, who had less intelligence than Omar and less speed in thinking, said to him, "She emphasised her complaint but you did not deal fairly with her." Omar said to him, "How?" He said, "If her husband stands all the night and fasts all the day, when will he tend to her?" Omar said to him, "You said the truth." Then he tried to settle the complaint. Omar did not have spontaniety in this case and speed of thinking did not benefit him. Therefore, though pursuance is focused on speed of thinking, when the creation of spontaniety is intended, something else has to be added. This is the explanation of the evidences that indicate the presence of spontaniety. So what is presented, repeated and diversified creates quick thinking. However, when it treats spontaniety alone and not the speed of thinking, it is necessary to add to it an explanation of the presented things indicated by spontaniety, or things whose understanding indicates the presence or absence of spontaniety. When it is said spontaniety results from quick thinking, then this is true in terms of it being the result of quick thinking. However, this does not mean that this result will necessarily exist; rather it is of its nature to exist. Therefore, the treatment of the speed of thinking treats the creation of spontaniety. However, it might or might not exist. Thus, quick thinking leads to spontaniety, but does not create it. What creates it is quick understanding of what exists in quick thinking, or characteristics that lead to its creation. For example when the poet praised the Ameer with the famous verse, where he said to him:

*"Daring of Amru with the generosity of Hatim
With the forbearance of Ahnaf with the Intelligence of Iyas"*

One of the attendants said, "The Ameer is above your description." The poet quickly understood that the Ameer, with his courage, generosity, forbearance and intelligence was above those whom he mentioned. So he changed the matter into comparison and added the two famous verses:

*"Do not deny that I gave him, by those who are less than him,
A peculiar example in generosity and power
For Allah gave the less, for His Light"*

An example of the niche and the lamp.”

So, this spontaneity made him apologise for his lapse by the form of explanation. Thus, he added the two famous verses to explain that what was understood to be an insult to the Ameer, was a misunderstanding. This is because the matter was not given in its true meaning, but rather a comparison. For Allah, Who is greater than everything, has made the comparison of Himself not with the stronger, but with the lighter and smaller thing. If the poet had no spontaneity or quick understanding of what he had fallen into, then his share would be death, he would have fallen into the danger of criticism when he intended to praise. Thus, he was saved by spontaneity. If he did not have that he would have fallen into danger. Thus, spontaneity results from quick understanding; it cannot come from anything except quick understanding. However, quick understanding does not necessarily lead to spontaneity. The example of the woman's complaint to Omar bin al-Khattab, a man of quick understanding, is evidence that quick understanding does not necessarily lead to spontaneity. In the two famous verses from the poet, spontaneity in them came from quick understanding. Therefore, these events indicate clearly that spontaneity does not come except from quick understanding. To create spontaneity, it is necessary to create quick understanding. Therefore, effort has to be focused on creating quick understanding with the people. However, quick understanding might or might not produce spontaneity. Therefore, other things must be added to create it. That is, something else must be added to what is presented, which is the explanation of the matters included in the presented material. It is not enough that they exist and they are things that can be understood. If one of the attendants in the assembly of Omar bin al-Khattab did not have spontaneity, or he did not draw his attention to what lay behind the words of the woman, Omar bin al-Khattab would have not understood. If the poet also did not notice the validity of the words of the one who disputed his verse, he would have not understood his mistake, so he would not have rectified it with the last two verses. Thus, it is necessary to draw the attention to the matter or the speech, whether this draws to the attention by spontaneity or by what spontaneity requires. Therefore, there must be another matter in addition to pursuance in quick

thinking, if it is intended that this pursuance create spontaneity straightaway, not just quick thinking. The example of this is presenting the future before the people, whether the future of the individual, the Ummah, or the country. Let us take, as an example, the future of a country like Egypt. It is not enough to draw the attention to the standard of living of the people or the social injustices befalling them. This is because whatever is said in this regard will be enough to create quick thinking in the people and they will immediately choose socialism. This is because through its progress it secures the production and thus the standard of living rises and through its rise the social injustice is removed. So quick thinking might lead to the opposite of what is intended. However, added to this, the people are Muslims, Islam does not aim at making living an extravagant life, nor does it intend that removing the social injustices should ruin the values and destroy what the people have of the advantage of intelligence and capability. The loss of this might lead to the wrong choice and the failure in reaching the truth, from spontaneity or from quick thinking. Therefore, there must be added to this that the people in Egypt are Muslims, or adding Islam as a solution to the future of a country, like France, for example. The addition is necessary to create spontaneity and in order that spontaneity be effective and productive, not quick thinking on its own. Though pursuance creates spontaneity, it does not create it definitely and accordingly the productive spontaneity does not exist. Thus, pursuance, even alone, can initiate quick thinking. However, for creating spontaneity and making it fruitful and productive, another thing must be added. This thing is to draw the attention to what is presented; whether by showing the deficiency in it or showing the hidden matters in it, like the example of the woman who complained about her husband to Omar bin al-Khattab.

What should be done first?

It is true that the problem is the people's preoccupation in thinking and their sanctification of thinking. The only way to solve this matter is to make its harm clear. The preoccupation of the people in thinking is recommended and their deviation from it is deviation from the basis of success in life. Respecting thinking is also recommended; it is rather obligatory, for it is one of the highest

values. The destruction of the existent values, or those that must be created will cause harm to the Ummah and to the individuals. Therefore, there must be respect for thinking. In order that we do not cause this harm, i.e. in order that we do not destroy the preoccupation of people in thinking, nor destroy their reverence of thinking, we must correct this thinking. Thus, beside the preoccupation of the people in thinking, we should give this thinking its appropriate reality, or the reality of its subject. So, there should be no thinking in the automatic matters. It is rather enough to see them or hear their name. Thus for the venture, the plate and the chair, it is not correct to make the mind think of them. In other words, they are not subjects for the preoccupation in thinking. In such a way, we would not destroy the preoccupation in thinking, nor destroy the reverence of thinking as thinking. We rather put thinking in its appropriate place. Accordingly, people will turn away from thinking in the automatic matters, whilst they retain preoccupation in thinking and the reverence of thinking. Another example is to make thinking proceed in accordance with what is thought of. If it requires speed then one creates the speed by the pursuance. If it requires slowness, then there should be slowness, such as thinking in politics or thinking in the indication denoted by the thoughts. For such subjects, speed of thinking is not good; rather there should be slowness. So we let thinking proceed in accordance with what is thought of (i.e. in accordance with the subject of the thinking), not in accordance with what we intend from it. This creates quick thinking and the absence of quick thinking. Though speed is required to create spontaneity, with life we must know that it is not everything. Therefore, we must create it as much as is enough for success in the domain of life, without making it dominate over everything. This is in terms of words and events. However, what is intended first and before anything else is to create that in the souls, i.e. the souls should not be preoccupied with thinking and should not sanctify thinking. This should first of all, be performed in a way that does not turn away from thinking and lead to it being treated with unease; nor should it destroy or decrease the reverence for thinking. So one has to start first with the centre of emotion in man and in life, then make the people understand that centre. This centre of emotion exists in men. If people continue to deny this centre of emotion and its effect on

man, man will continue to turn away from the emotion. He would thus be preoccupied with thinking and reverence for it would prevail over emotion and everything else. If treatment of thinking is intended, then it is necessary to focus on emotion, its centre, its effect and the necessity of its presence, for man is composed of both intellect and emotion. When Islam came, it came with the intellect and emotion together. Thus, emotion is an indivisible part of man, just like intellect. Love and hatred, activeness and laziness, sadness and happiness, no man is devoid of these and their like. The intellect is a similar matter. Man's concentration on the emotions alone makes him proceed in life without a controller. Man's concern about thinking alone, or with the intellect alone, deprives him of the capability of resistance in life, because emotion is the instigator, while intellect is the director. So if the movement occurred without direction, it could be destructive. However, if the direction existed without a stimulator or without a motion, it would be in a direction detached from the stimulator and from the motions. Thus, it would not lead to a result. When Islam was the driving force of the Ummah in life, through the intellect and the emotion, she proceeded successfully. When time passed and the events followed one another, the emotion started to be driven with the weakest stimulation, or with the old momentum. So, the director was dispensed with and the emotion became the controller. At that time, the struggle between the Ummah and her enemy became crystallized, i.e. between Islam and Muslims against Kufr and the Kuffar. The Muslims then lost the director, i.e. they lost thinking. Therefore, their actions did not bear fruit and their enemy defeated them. They thought that their enemy defeated them with intellect and thought, but they were defeated because they were preoccupied with the emotions. Therefore, they turned their attention to the thinking and turned away from the emotions. So they lost everything that resulted from thinking. Because of their reverence of thinking they became busy with the automatic things, hence they became slow in thinking for they were preoccupied with it. Thus they lost spontaneity due to the absence of emotion in them. Therefore, the first thing that we have to do is to restore the emotions to their appropriate place, where thinking will return then to its domain: no thinking should be in the automatic things and quick thinking should be created in man. Thus, the issue is related

to emotion and its place, not to the thinking. Therefore, the first thing to do is to re-activate emotion, which is present in man by creation. Thus, the problem is not the people's concern about thinking or with their reverence of it. It is rather to restore emotion to its centre. It is true that emotion remained in man, as well as the intellect; nobody removed the emotions from man. However, the issue is the concern about emotion and the concern about thinking. So, emotion remained in man, but concern about it disappeared. Being emotional was even attacked, while the concern about thinking increased and it replaced emotion. Thus, the disbelievers succeeded in deviating the people from emotion. Since they turned away from it, they turned away from everything less important than it. They accordingly turned away from quick thinking and from spontaneity. They devoted themselves to preoccupation in thinking, until the lack of use of thinking and the loss of spontaneity became apparent and was noticed in most of the people. The origin of that is the loss of preoccupation in emotion and confining themselves to preoccupation in thinking. Since man has emotion and intellect, negligence of one of these two means negligence of the other; also lack of productiveness results from being preoccupied with the factor that was not neglected. In other words, negligence of emotion is negligence of intellect, because without emotion, intellect can't be productive. Though it was not neglected, because of the negligence of emotion, it became non-productive. Therefore, intellect or thinking can't be productive unless emotion existed, not only being present in man but also by being concerned with it. Concern with emotion, together with concern about the intellect, is what restores to thinking its centre and makes it productive. Therefore, to treat the productiveness of thinking requires concern about emotion, besides the concern about thinking.

PURSUANCE AND SPONTANIETY

Pursuance initiates quick thinking or leads to speed in thinking. Speed of thinking is what initiates spontaneity. However, spontaneity is a matter that demands consideration by itself. Regardless of the duration of pursuance and its constancy, regardless of how quick the thinking is, spontaneity will be of no

use in any simulated scenario, unless it was of its own and stands by itself. Evidence for this is the incident of Omar bin al-Khattab. Undoubtedly Omar bin al-Khattab was usually of quick thinking and had spontaneity. However, he lacked them in the incident of the woman's complaint against her husband. Omar bin al-Khattab did not have spontaneity when the woman complained about her husband that he stood the night in prayer and fasted the day, making him negligent of his marital rights. Omar bin al-Khattab did not understand this complaint; he rather believed that she was praising her husband. But one of the attendants was quick-witted, as he understood her complaint. He even understood that she persisted in the complaint. The fact that somebody, in this incident, was more quick-witted than Omar bin al-Khattab, means that spontaneity in a single matter or in a specific incident is separate from other matters and depends on one's capability to understand the events and incidents. Therefore, pursuance creates the concept of spontaneity, but not spontaneity itself. Spontaneity is related to quick thinking, quick understanding of the matter or the incident, together with the presence of the concept of spontaneity being a characteristic of the person. Thus the actions, like quick thinking, and the concepts, like pursuance, are only stimulators to create spontaneity. As for spontaneity, it must come by itself. Since we talk about spontaneity, it must be of its own in the people and in the individual. Its concept is what brings about its benefits or creates the readiness for it. Spontaneity either exists or does not exist according to the circumstances and situations, the form of the speech, or the form of the incident or the statement. Omar bin al-Khattab did not notice that the statement of the woman about her husband to him as Ameer al-Mu'mineen was a complaint about her husband's negligence. The Ameer al-Mu'mineen's lack of understanding of this prevented him from having spontaneity. This lack of observance does not mean that the attendant always had more spontaneity than the Ameer al-Mu'mineen, Omar bin al-Khattab. This is because the observance of this man in one matter might be more than Omar bin al-Khattab's. So it is a specific situation that produces spontaneity, it doesn't indicate the level of intelligence. So spontaneity does not come about with a person who does not carry it as a concept. But in order to come about from the one with whom it is a concept, it is necessary to notice

certain matters and situations in the specific incident. Therefore, spontaneity in the single incident is not an evidence of its presence with the one from whom it came in a spontaneous and natural way, though it is necessary that its concept exist in him. Thus, the subject is to work to create spontaneity in the people by creating its concept. The work that we have discussed to create spontaneity was only to create its concept, or the readiness for it, not to create spontaneity itself. Therefore, it is not true to say that observing a particular matter is one of the subjects of spontaneity; it is rather the basis. This is not true because this is incidental and it may or may not create spontaneity. The basis is creating the readiness in them and not creating spontaneity itself.

What we suffer from is not only the loss of spontaneity; rather what we suffer from is the complete absence of its concept and the absence of readiness for it. So the action should be to create its concept and create the readiness for it. After that, the observance, incidents and styles are left to stimulate its creation. It must be known that we do not aim to make spontaneity exist immediately in the people. This is a matter that, besides being unreasonable, is impossible to achieve. Therefore, action should be taken to create that which develops spontaneity, or to create the right soil for growing it, or create its concept or readiness for it. Hence spontaneity exists in the one who is quick-witted and its existence becomes natural. Muslims in all the Islamic countries did not lose spontaneity completely. Rather they have no more incentive for it, or the soil for growing it. So the action is to generate the atmosphere and create the soil, i.e. to initiate its concept and readiness for it.

The reality of what actually exists.

What actually exists in the people, as individuals, groups and societies, is the preoccupation with thinking in everything and also slow thinking in everything. The people find that every matter needs study, thinking, discussion and examination. This makes the soil in which to create spontaneity infertile, for this makes man gradually move away from quick thinking and makes him prefer slow thinking, study and examination. Therefore, it is necessary to

emerge from this reality and proceed in quick thinking, so that spontaneity can exist. Unless coming out of slow thinking occurs, it is not possible to move to establish spontaneity, nor to create the soil for spontaneity. The treatment should be focussed on spontaneity - not on it itself and the attempt at creating it - but rather on creating the soil that grows it, creating its concept and the readiness for it.

There is a difference between spontaneity itself and the emergence of spontaneity. Spontaneity varies with the age, group or society. For example, in the age of Omar bin al-Khattab, his group and his society (which was directed by Islam), spontaneity existed strongly. Whether spontaneity came from Omar bin al-Khattab, or from some people in his group is not important. What is important is that it existed. We now want to create it in this age, in the Muslim Ummah and in their society that after all is directed by Islam. Whether this later exists with the leaders or with the public is another matter. Nevertheless, it will begin with the intelligent people and it rarely comes from the stupid people.

This whole subject is the treatment of a situation and not the creation of something out of nothing. The present reality is that the soil of spontaneity does not exist, so the aim is to create it first and foremost. Therefore, it is necessary to understand the reality and understand the situation of the people. Then this reality is treated resulting in the situation of the people being treated. The reality is that there exists slow thinking and also the concept of study and examination. This alone is enough to destroy the concept of spontaneity. Therefore, it is necessary to destroy the concept of study and examination in its general form. Thus, the soil and atmosphere need to be targeted first and foremost. After that spontaneity will follow.

The creation of spontaneity has already been discussed in terms of the concepts that initiate it. However, it is necessary to have the soil and atmosphere for spontaneity. No matter how numerous the thoughts may be, the soil and the atmosphere are the origin. These are related to the soul and the outlook towards everything. The soil means the soul is prepared for treatment and is aware of the

dangers of this sickness; the atmosphere means the presence of a public opinion about that. Thus, the subject regarding its basis is the outlook towards the matters of life. If the view were that everything needs an opinion, study and examination, then spontaneity, i.e. quick thinking, would not exist at all. So it is necessary to remove this view firstly from the souls of the people. It is necessary to change this view radically. Then the treatment ensues. So the origin is the soil, which is the basic outlook towards the matters of life. This view has to be changed and thus the soil will exist. Changing this view is not easy, for people have become consumed in thinking. They viewed thinking as the matter that leads to the correct opinion. So, thinking became necessary for them. Thinking, whether it was slow or quick, is the preferable basis, or rather the basis that is hoped for. Therefore, treatment should not be focused on thinkers, for it is contrary to their reality and not what is required. Treatment should rather be focused on the type of thinking, whether it should be slow or quick. This would lead to abandonment of the reverence of thinking. Thinking is encouraged, but it is blameworthy for its slowness, which leads to slowness in results. Thus, the treatment occurs. Thus, souls should not be turned away from thinking; they should rather be directed to quick thinking. In this way one will generate the concept of spontaneity when one generates quick thinking. As for whether it exists or not, this is another issue which we do not need to address, for it is not the subject of study. Thereupon, the reality of the problem dictates to us how to follow the path to create the soil and then to create the atmosphere. The reality of the problem is that people sanctify thinking, they mark it high and believe that study and examination should exist. The reality of the problem is the study and examination; therefore treatment is focused on this reality, which is the treatment for it. It is not correct that treatment be aimed at thinking itself. It should rather be for the study and examination, because not every problem requires study and examination. The automatic thinking, for example, is harmed by study and examination. The chair, which is an ordinary object, does not require study and examination. Rather all that needs to be said about it is that it is only a chair, without adding anything else. Though it is a designated matter, its reality becomes obvious by the mere mention of its name, without study and examination. What was

said about the automatic thinking is also said about many thoughts. Thus, study and examination of everything is a mistake. The correct approach is to view the matters of life objectively. If the matter requires study and examination, then it is studied and examined. If it however does not need that, then it is incorrect for it to be studied or investigated. By such means we arrive at the treatment and spontaneity.

Circumstances surrounding a matter are what decide the need for study and examination. For example, the West made both Lebanon and Israel bridgeheads (for intervention) on the eastern side of the Mediterranean adjacent to the Islamic countries. This was undoubtedly a planned matter. However, does the destruction of this bridgehead need study? The circumstances themselves decide this. If the circumstances imply that the West is heedless of this bridgehead and it is possible to destroy it without trouble, then in this case study and examination would obstruct and delay the destruction; or it would be in the interest of the West more than in the interest of the Ummah. Therefore, it should be viewed based on its true reality. There is a difference between the fact that the West established this bridgehead, but neglected it and the fact that it was afraid that it could be destroyed, but was not yet destroyed. In the case that it is neglected then the matter does not need thought. When, however, the West mobilises its forces to prevent the destruction of the bridgehead, then in this case, the matter must be studied and examined. If it is not studied and examined, then a disaster would occur. So the issue is not a matter of study and examination. It is rather a matter of circumstances. If the circumstances require study and examination, then it is necessary for this to take place. If they however do not require this, then it is not correct to become engaged in study and examination. Rather there should be a move towards quick action due to spontaneity in understanding. Therefore, the circumstances arbitrate.

This is the first point. As for the second, love for quick thinking must exist with the intelligent people. It is not enough that they examine the circumstances to understand whether a matter is of the type that requires study and examination or not. They should rather be accustomed to quick thinking. This is not by undertaking

study and examination of the matters before them, but rather by undertaking the type of thinking; for they, by the nature of their intelligence, are inclined to quick thinking, quick judgement and settling the matters quickly. This alone is enough to deal with them in a specific or exceptional way. In origin, everything should be examined to see if it is in need of thinking. If it then requires study and examination it is studied and scrutinized. However, if it is not in need of that, then it is improper to study and scrutinise, because this may cause harm and delay. As for the intelligent people, it is said to them it is necessary to have speed in every thought. So they are treated in a special way. Thus, they are helped to jump quickly from slow thinking to quick thinking, i.e. to spontaniety. The others would imitate them and thus their treatment will be special. It might also be an exceptional treatment, not benefiting them only, but rather giving a general benefit, which is what is intended.

In summary, the society is taken as a whole, where the concept of study and scrutiny is removed from it. This is through the giving of examples for everything that requires study and scrutiny and the things that do not need it. If the examples were given through the same question, under two different cases, then this would be better. However, the intelligent people in society, who are prominent and well known, are treated in a special and exceptional way. This facilitates the treatment of the whole of society. This is because what matters is removing the concept of study and scrutiny from the souls, regardless of the paths followed to achieve this.

If the soil existed or was created and the trust in creating the soil reached the level of reliability, then creating the atmosphere would be easy. This is because if one couldn't create the atmosphere, then the reliability that study and scrutiny did not exist nor will exist, would on its own create the atmosphere. Thus, creating the soil creates the atmosphere. We must not concern ourselves with creating the atmosphere, i.e. creating public opinion against study and scrutiny. It is rather sufficient that we make the society, particularly its intelligent people abandon the concept of study and scrutiny. Removing the concept of study and scrutiny in everything is the cornerstone. If it is broken and removed, then the treatment has taken effect. If it was not attacked and removed, then every

effort in treatment will be in vain, or perhaps even harmful.

THE TRUTH (REALITY) OF SPONTANIETY

Regardless of the details and the elements of spontaniety, its reality is the speed of thinking and the speed of judgement. If the woman said to the Ameer ul-Mu'mineen that her husband stands the night in prayer and fasts the day, quick understanding that this is a complaint would lead to a quick judgement based on it being a complaint. This is spontaniety. The Ameer ul-Mu'mineen did not have spontaniety, so he considered this to be praise for the husband. Thus he did not understand, nor did he make judgement with anything on her statement. One of the attendants had spontaniety when he quickly understood that this statement was not praise, so he was quick in judging this statement as being a complaint. Therefore, he had spontaniety.

Thus, the reality of spontaniety is in the speed in understanding the speech, the action, or anything else, and quick judgement on it. This speed of understanding and speed of judgement is spontaniety. It might occur to the mind that quick understanding is quick judgement, but the reality is that quick understanding prepares for the judgement; it is not the judgement itself. The fact that the attendant understood that statement as being a complaint prepared him to judge on it as a complaint. This understanding was not the judgement, it was rather the understanding only. The understanding before the issuance of the judgement does not need any reaction or response. Rather it is an understanding only. If there was a judgement, then action took place and the matter was settled. The basis and the result are in the judgement and not the understanding. Understanding is only a rational process. The man who had spontaniety understood that this woman spoke about her husband; he understood that she spoke to the Ameer ul-Mu'mineen, so the rational process occurred in him in understanding that this was a complaint. Thus, the judgement was the result of understanding, and understanding was only a rational process. Therefore, there must be quick understanding and quick judgement before issuing the judgement, so that spontaniety exists. Thus, spontaniety is quick

understanding followed immediately by quick judgement. In such a way spontaneity exists. Accordingly, the reality of spontaneity is quick understanding and quick judgement, in such a way that quick understanding would prepare for the judgement or quick judgement. Therefore, it must precede rather than come after the judgement. Judgement cannot dispense with it, though its presence indicates the presence of judgement.

If understanding is necessary, then judgement is also necessary. If the understanding existed, then definitely judgement existed. Thus, the origin is the understanding. Had Omar bin al-Khattab understood that the woman complained about her husband, he would have heard her statement as a complaint. He heard it however as praise and therefore he did not take notice of her problem. So, the situation remained as it had been and her complaint was of no use; for though she complained, she however complained with an expression not understood by the one whom she complained to. That is why her complaint was not heard. Due to the absence of spontaneity towards that complaint, the complaint was abandoned and not observed, as if it had not existed. Therefore, it should have been understood that she meant to complain and not praise, in order for the understanding of the complaint to have been realised. This is important practically with people who are shy of expressing complaints explicitly, or they fear that the complaint may be rejected. Therefore, spontaneity should be employed with the people so as to fulfil their aims. The aim of the woman was to remove the injustice from her, which no one could remove except the Ameer ul-Mu'mineen. The aim of Omar bin al-Khattab was to remove the injustice from the people, as Ameer to the Mu'mineen. He, however, did not understand that she complained about her husband and so he did not achieve his aim in removing the injustice. Rather the injustice remained as it had been. So the husband continued to stand the night in prayer and fast the day and the woman remained deprived of her marital relationship and rights. Thus, as a result of the absence of spontaneity the injustice remained. Therefore, it is necessary to understand the reality of spontaneity, that it is quick understanding and quick judgement. Unless it is understood in this manner, it will not exist. The result of this will be the presence of injustice and the risk of falling into

danger. Therefore, it is necessary to understand the reality of spontaneity so that it exists.

THE EFFECT OF SPONTANIETY IN THE UMMAH

The Ummah is a group of people gathered by one 'Aqeedah from which its system of life emanates. Since this is the definition of the Ummah, then the jurists are part of the Ummah, whether they were Arabs, Turks or other non-Arabs. This is because they are gathered by one 'Aqeedah from which the systems of life emanate. The Ameer ul-Mu'mineen is also from the Ummah, because he is linked with the people by one 'Aqeedah. The people are from the Ummah, even if they were individuals, because they are bonded with the Ummah by one 'Aqeedah. The people might be gathered by nationalism (qawmiyyah) or tribalism (qabaliyyah) and the entity they have exists for the common good. Yet though spontaneity exists in the individuals, it does not exist in the people or in the entity. This is because there is no concept for the people, for there is no concept from nationalism and tribalism that leads to solutions that emanate from it. The fact that no concepts can emanate from it as a system for life cannot be explained to all the people in the same style, for their understanding varies. Therefore, there is no effect from spontaneity in people, nor in entities. Though these have a system, it does not emanate from the general concept. Though the system might exist with everybody, it would not be suitable for spontaneity to develop in him or her, because it does not emanate from the general concept. In order that spontaneity develops with the individual or individuals they must be gathered by an 'Aqeedah from which a system emanates. Therefore, with the Arabs, the Turks and the other non-Arabs as they are, it is not possible to develop in them, as a whole or as individuals, spontaneity or to have any such effect on them. This is because there is no bond between them except the bond of blood and bond of entity. It is not possible for a system to emanate from any one of these bonds and therefore it is not possible to develop spontaneity in them. Thus, spontaneity is developed in the Ummah and influences the Ummah, but it is not developed in the people and does not influence the people. To develop spontaneity and its effect

in the individuals, these individuals should be part of the Ummah, so that it becomes possible to generate a system from the 'Aqeedah that they embrace. Accordingly, spontaneity cannot be developed in the Arabs as a people, based on nationalism, nor it can have an effect on them. There must exist an 'Aqeedah from which a system of life emanates, so that spontaneity is developed and for it to have an effect. This is because the speech or the action is directed towards a concept, so as to remove the injustice or get rid of the danger. Quick understanding and quick judgement take place in the concept. The example of the woman's complaint about her husband refers to a concept concerning justice for the woman and the giving of her rights. This concept comes from the system that emanates from the 'Aqeedah. If the concept did not exist, then spontaneity would not exist and consequently neither would its effect. The example of the car driver's understanding that the fluid is petrol refers to the concept that it is not correct for him to be in danger. If he was one of those who do not care, then the concept would not exist with him and consequently he would not understand what the fluid is, for it does not concern him. Thus, the concept is the matter that stimulates understanding and it is the matter that has an effect. Therefore, it is necessary when developing spontaneity and creating an effect from it that this should be in the Ummah and in individuals of the Ummah. In other words, there should be reference to a concept emanating from a decisive 'Aqeedah. From here arises the view that developing spontaneity and creating an effect from it must take place in an Ummah. In other words, it must be in a group of people gathered by one 'Aqeedah, from which its system for life emanates. As for what some people call spontaneity in entities like the separated regions (of the Islamic lands), this is only quick observance and not spontaneity. This is because spontaneity is quick understanding and quick judgement on something connected with a concept emanating from a decisive 'Aqeedah. As for quick observance, it differs from spontaneity. This is because it is quick observance of the thing itself, while spontaneity is quick observance linked with a concept. Though it is claimed to be spontaneity, it however is not. It can exist with every person, but it is not spontaneity. Spontaneity is grown in the Ummah and it has its effect in the Ummah. The fact that it is in the Ummah is one of the conditions of influence; it is also a condition

for education and creation. This is because the 'Aqeedah from which systems and concepts emanate is a fundamental condition for the influence to exist. For example, when you develop quick understanding and quick judgement, it is necessary that these be in accordance with a concept. In order that everyone understands this concept, it is necessary that it emanates from an 'Aqeedah embraced by everybody. This would not take place except in the Ummah. When this exists with everybody, its effect will be on everybody. Therefore, there is no way to examine the effect of spontaneity with the Ummah unless she was an Ummah. If however, they were a people, or entities, then it is difficult to develop spontaneity in them; consequently there would be no effect from it.

When the West realised that the Islamic Ummah is gathered by an 'Aqeedah, it tried to detach the concepts from the 'Aqeedah. With time, it detached some concepts. So spontaneity became neglected and accordingly it vanished. To restore spontaneity to the souls, it is necessary to revive the concepts and link them with the 'Aqeedah. In other words, it is necessary to link the 'Aqeedah with the concepts about life, i.e. with the systems. Only then will spontaneity exist in the people, it will grow in them and its effects will exist spontaneously.

Spontaneity, that is quick understanding and quick judgement, has effect on the Ummah according to the level to which the Ummah understands this concept. The understanding by the Ummah of the concept and crystallisation of it come through its linkage with the 'Aqeedah. At that time spontaneity is grown in the Ummah in a natural way. Its effect in the Ummah will be as strong as the strength of the linkage of the concept with the 'Aqeedah. As an example, the political issues, the issues of science and information, the issues of war, struggle and their like, are issues that are not linked with the 'Aqeedah. This is because they relate to man as man and relate to danger and life. It could be said that these issues are not linked with the 'Aqeedah. In reality, these issues are related to man as man, but man must have a basis about life so as to understand their realities. The basis of life is the 'Aqeedah. Therefore, these issues must have an origin in the basis, i.e. linkage

with the ‘Aqeedah. Therefore, in these matters, there is quick understanding and quick observance, i.e. there is spontaneity in them. If they are not linked with the ‘Aqeedah, they will only have quick observance, but not spontaneity. In order that spontaneity exists in them, it is necessary that they are linked with the basis of life, i.e. it is necessary that they are linked with the ‘Aqeedah; then spontaneity exists. But before that, it is only quick observance.

For example in the incident of seeing the fluid and realising it is petrol, the linkage is with the danger of continuing to drive in the same direction. If the one who realised the fluid to be petrol was a Muslim, he would link this with the ‘Aqeedah that warns of the danger, thus changing his direction and not rushing towards the fluid. This would be spontaneity, because he linked with the ‘Aqeedah, even if this was automatic linkage. If the one who realised this was not a Muslim, he would not link it with the ‘Aqeedah and he would employ quick observance only, and he would avoid the danger by any way. In the example of the incident of Omar bin al-Khattab, one of the attendants realised from the speech of the woman that she had complained. His realisation was from the fact that the woman spoke to the Ameer ul-Mu’mineen, and the fact that the woman said, “my husband.” So he linked that with the ‘Aqeedah which makes the right of the wife on the husband preferable to the right of Allah through worship and fasting, i.e. prayer and fasting. Thus, he linked the fact that the person spoken to was the Ameer ul-Mu’mineen with what the ‘Aqeedah dictates in this situation of making the right of the servant preferable to the right of Allah. Thus, this was spontaneity and not quick observance only. Therefore, this was from the ‘Aqeedah. That is why it was spontaneity and not quick observance only.

From these two examples, it appears clearly that the effect of spontaneity is only in an Ummah that is gathered by one ‘Aqeedah. It can’t be in the people and with the people, for it would then be quick observance only, not spontaneity. Accordingly, the effect of spontaneity is only in the Ummah and not in the people. If it existed in the people, i.e. if it was not linked with the ‘Aqeedah that gathers the people, then it would be quick observance only, not spontaneity. Therefore, if progress in creating spontaneity in the

people is hoped for, this could happen in an Ummah, but not with the people. It would have no effect if there were no bond. This is important from two aspects: The first is the fact that it is necessary when working to create spontaneity. The second aspect is the effect on the people. The degree of effect on the people is quite obvious. This is because the effect only occurs by realising a matter dictated by the bond of the Ummah or emanating from it, i.e. dictated by the ‘Aqeedah that governs the people. If that did not exist, one cannot understand what it means, for one does not have that which indicates what it means. Therefore, there would be no effect. Realisation is necessary for spontaneity. If there were no realisation, even if the speed was there, then there would be no spontaneity. Thus, spontaneity is quick realisation of the aim and this only results from linkage. It is true that quick realisation might lead to understanding of the aim, but this would be quick observance and not spontaneity. For example, if you know that a judicial investigator wants to know your identity, when he asks a question, from the circumstances you realise quickly what is wanted from this question. Thus you can answer quickly foiling this objective, because you realised his purpose from the circumstances linked with the question. However, this is quick observance and not spontaneity. Quick realisation was due to the understanding of his aim, not due to your understanding of what emanates from the ‘Aqeedah. Therefore, this realisation was quick observance and not spontaneity. This is because you did not link with the ‘Aqeedah and what emanates from it in order to know his aim. It rather resulted from your understanding of his aim from the circumstances.

Moreover, understanding the intention from other than the ‘Aqeedah, what results from it and what emanates from it, is a deficient understanding. This is because it is taken from the circumstances or from other matters. This understanding may or may not be correctly concluded. It also may or may not indicate this. Therefore, it was not complete, so it only leads to quick observance and does not lead to spontaneity. This is because it is quick understanding of the reality and linking it with other than what it is usually linked with and so it is definitely incomplete; because it is devoid of the linkage with the ‘Aqeedah. It is in fact devoid of any linkage. If it was linked, it was linked with other than

the 'Aqeedah. Even if this was correctly and quickly understood, it however remains quick observance, for it is quick understanding of the reality and not understanding of what emanates from the 'Aqeedah.

Understanding the intention of the speaker does not result from quick observance, for it is not complete. It rather results from the linkage; this linkage is what reveals the intention of the speaker quickly and accordingly gives spontaniety. This is the reality and this indicates that that effect is only in the Ummah, not in the people.

In summary, the effect of spontaniety in the people comes from their quick understanding of the reality, together with the linkage to the 'Aqeedah and what emanates from it. The understanding of the reality only gives quick observance, but linkage to the 'Aqeedah is what gives spontaniety, though the intention is understood in each case. The intention of the speaker can be understood from the circumstances, but this understanding remains incomplete until it is linked with the 'Aqeedah and what emanates from it. If it were linked with that, it would be correct and complete. Otherwise it would not be complete.

Therefore, two matters are necessary: Firstly, quick understanding of the reality, which gives quick observance - this is general in the people and in the Ummah. The second is that it has to be linked with the 'Aqeedah and what emanates from it, which is specific to the Ummah. It is this that certainly creates spontaniety. Therefore, the effect should be targeted in the Ummah and not in the people, for it affects her clearly and thus spontaniety becomes natural to her. This is because linkage is one of the necessities of spontaniety. Therefore, the effect should be targeted in the Ummah through the 'Aqeedah, or through the rules and thoughts that emanate from it.

THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN SPONTANIETY AND QUICK OBSERVANCE

Spontaniety and quick observance both come from one matter, which is quick understanding. However, spontaniety comes together with its results, such as when the woman said to Omar that her husband stood the night praying and fasted the day; also when the woman gave the apple to the Messenger ﷺ and he divided it into two parts and gave her one part. In the example of the woman that complained to Omar, the Bedouin who was with Omar understood that she complained about her husband and did not praise him. The understanding that this is a complaint and not praise is spontaniety. As for the woman who gave the apple to the Messenger ﷺ, she intended to know about menstruation, so the Messenger understood her purpose and answered her. This example is quick observance and not spontaniety. This is because the Messenger understood from the apple that she meant menstruation, so this was quick observance, though it was based on quick understanding. Quick observance is to understand the purpose of the speaker or the doer quickly, whereas spontaniety is to understand the purpose of the speaker and the doer quickly but with a difference. In spontaniety, one understands the purpose of the speaker from the speech. However, the speech may have many meanings, if one understood the correct meaning then this is spontaniety. While quick observance is that the speaker or the doer obscures his speech, while he aims at one particular meaning that you grasp. Thus, your understanding of him is quick observance and not spontaniety. Thus, the speech or the action is understood quickly; spontaniety and quick observance share that aspect, but they then depart from each other. If the purpose of the speaker or the doer is only one thing, but he obscures his words or action, then this is quick observance. However, when he means many matters, but he obscures these matters, then you should use spontaniety and not quick observance. Thus, obscuring the speech or the action leads to quick observance, while obscuring the purpose leads to spontaniety. The two matters, spontaniety and quick observance, can't exist except with quick thinking. Therefore, both can only exist in intelligent people. However, this quick understanding only leads to one thing, either to quick observance or to spontaniety. If the

obscurity or vagueness were in the speech or the action itself, it would be quick observance. If the obscurity or vagueness were in the purpose of the speech or action, it would be spontaneity. Therefore, in her statement to Omar about her husband, the woman obscured her purpose and made it vague. While the woman who gave an apple to the Messenger obscured the action but did not obscure the purpose. Therefore, the action regarding the woman with the Messenger was quick observance, while the action regarding the woman with Omar was spontaneity. This is the difference between making the purpose vague, so it would be spontaneity, and making the speech or the work vague, so it would be quick observance. What is hoped for is the development of spontaneity and not quick observance.

THE WAY TO CREATE SPONTANIETY

Action needs to be taken to create spontaneity either in the individuals or in the Ummah. Attempting to create it in the individuals would only create it in them, but not in the Ummah as a whole. However, effort to create it in the Ummah would definitely create it in the individuals. This is because the Ummah is the sum of the individuals with the effect of linkage among them by an ‘Aqeedah from which a system of life emanates. Therefore, it is necessary that action to create spontaneity in the people, as well as the individuals, should be action in the Ummah as a whole. So, we discuss the way to create spontaneity in the Ummah and from this spontaneity it is developed in the individuals. The creation of spontaneity in the Ummah starts with transforming the ‘Aqeedah from being a matter of doctrine only, to being a political idea or a political thought. The action then proceeds until we realize that the rules and concepts built on the ‘Aqeedah are political thoughts. Once we achieve this, we start with quick understanding. Thus, firstly, it is necessary to start by making the ‘Aqeedah a political thought and then making the thoughts that are built on the ‘Aqeedah political thoughts. Making the rules that emanate from the ‘Aqeedah political thoughts results from making the ‘Aqeedah itself a political thought. Therefore, one does not concern himself with the rules as long as the ‘Aqeedah was of a political character.

Thus, the origin is to make the ‘Aqeedah a political idea or political thought. So, in whatever way one started, this is the basis; whether one started with the ‘Aqeedah or with the rules that emanate from it. The fact that the Islamic ‘Aqeedah is *Laa ilaaha illa Allah* (There is no god except Allah), Muhammadun Rasoolullah (Mohammed is the Messenger of Allah), this means that no one is worthy of worship except Allah. So, one discharges the affairs of the Ummah, including one’s own affairs, with the fact that there is none worthy of worship except Allah. Thus, one does not accept for himself to worship other than Allah, or to be servant to other than Allah. This raises your status in the Ummah and the people, for while they do not see Allah and do not know His nature, it becomes great for them to see a person reject the worship of whom the people know. So you will rise by that in their view. Thus, if the word “*Laa ilaaha illa Allah*”, by the meaning “there is none worthy of worship except Allah” became a political idea, it would change your view towards the people and how the people view you. If you declare “*Muhammad Rasoolullah*”, then you will abide by what he, Mohammed ﷺ, brought from Allah, i.e. you will abide by the rules of Shar’. If you abide by this and take charge of the people’s affairs in accordance with it, i.e. act upon it and make the people act on it, then you will transform the whole ‘Aqeedah into a political idea, or a political thought. However, if you start with *ahkaam* (rules), this would appear to be easier and closer to generating spontaneity. This is because what gathers between yourself and the people is the ‘Aqeedah, including the rules that emanate from it. If you take these rules based on *Imaan*, then the reality alone will indicate quick understanding and quick linkage. The listener to the woman’s complaint to the Ameer ul-Mu’mineen about her husband, in the assembly of Omar bin al-Khattab, did not concern himself with the Islamic ‘Aqeedah, for he knew that she and the Ameer ul-Mu’mineen believed in it. He rather concerned himself with what relates to this of rules that emanate from it, which is the preference of the right of the wife to the right of Allah ﷻ. So he was satisfied with that and linked quick observance that occurred to him with this *hukm* emanating from the ‘Aqeedah. With this linkage to the *hukm* alone, he had spontaneity. He did not need to make linkage to the ‘Aqeedah, for he knew that the woman believed in this ‘Aqeedah and raised her complaint to the Ameer ul-Mu’mineen for

he believed in this ‘Aqeedah also. The man had spontaniety from linking to the hukm shar’ee and not from the ‘Aqeedah followed by linking to the hukm shar’ee. Therefore, the generation of spontaniety from the ahkaam shar’iyyah, i.e. from that which emanates from the ‘Aqeedah, is easier and more attainable. Thus, generation of spontaniety in the people only requires making the ahkaam shar’iyyah political thoughts, by which the affairs are discharged and by which alone the people are held accountable. However, all of this depends on understanding that the people believe in that from which the ahkaam shar’iyyah emanate, which is the ‘Aqeedah. If, for example, you took charge of the affairs of the people in Egypt, where the people of Egypt are Muslims and all of them believe in the Islamic ‘Aqeedah, then if you wanted to generate spontaniety in them, all that you would have to do is make the ahkaam shar’iyyah political thoughts in their view. Spontaniety would then exist in Egypt. However, if you wanted to generate it in France, for example, where the people do not believe in the Islamic ‘Aqeedah, it is necessary that you proceed first by making the Islamic ‘Aqeedah a political thought in their view. Spontaniety would then exist in them, albeit slowly and in succession. There is a difference between working in France and working in Egypt. Since we wish to generate spontaniety in the Islamic countries, the discussion will be on the ahkaam shar’iyyah that emanate from the ‘Aqeedah. This is quicker and easier when trying to generate spontaniety.

To generate spontaniety in people, it is necessary to start first, before anything else, by making the ahkaam shar’iyyah a political thought in their view - a matter that is easy and feasible. The people believe in the Islamic ‘Aqeedah and abide by it and by its ahkaam. One only has to generate in them the idea that this is hukm shar’ee and that it is necessary to abide by what emanates from the ‘Aqeedah, the same way as it is necessary to abide by the ‘Aqeedah. This is because Imaan and Kufr only occur from abiding by the ahkaam shar’iyyah or not. Once this exists in the people, the matter of transferring the ahkaam into political thoughts would depend on them and would gain influence over them, so they themselves would make the ahkaam shar’iyyah their political thoughts. One’s task would then be the stimulation and direction. Thus, if they view

that the general liberties and freedoms contradict the ‘Aqeedah, or they do not emanate from it, it would be easy for them to abandon them and you would not need to be concerned with that. However, if they continued to view them as emanating from the ‘Aqeedah or not contradictory to it, then it would be difficult for them to abandon them, even if they were political thoughts. This is because they are linked to the ‘Aqeedah which they believe in. Thus, it is necessary that they understand that these freedoms do not come from the ‘Aqeedah. They contradict it and do not emanate from it. Without this, it is not possible that they abandon the general freedoms. Also the fact that the Christian is a Kaafir, that alcohol is haraam, that domination and control by the Kuffar is not allowed, whether they were from the West or the East, that abiding by the hukm shar’ee is fard, all of these and their like are easy to understand once linked with the ‘Aqeedah. Thus, reading the saying of Allah ﷻ,

﴿لَقَدْ كَفَرَ الَّذِينَ قَالُوا إِنَّ اللَّهَ هُوَ الْمَسِيحُ ابْنُ مَرْيَمَ﴾

“They surely disbelieve, those who say: ‘Lo! Allah is the Messiah, son of Mary’” [TMQ Al Ma’idah: 72], is enough for the Muslim to consider the Christian as a Kaafir. The recitation, also, of the saying of Allah ﷻ,

﴿فَهَلْ أَنْتُمْ مُنْتَهُونَ﴾

“Will you then abstain (from them)?” [TMQ Al-Ma’idah: 91] is enough to know about the ayah of alcohol and that it is haraam. Similarly, the saying of Allah ﷻ,

﴿وَلَنْ يَجْعَلَ اللَّهُ لِلْكَافِرِينَ عَلَى الْمُؤْمِنِينَ سَبِيلًا﴾

“Allah never allows the disbelievers to have authority over the believers” [TMQ An-Nisaa’: 141], explains definitely that the domination and control of the Muslims by the Kaafir is not allowed. The recitation of His ﷻ saying,

﴿فَلَا وَرَبِّكَ لَا يُؤْمِنُونَ حَتَّى يُحَكِّمُوكَ فِيمَا شَجَرَ بَيْنَهُمْ﴾

“But, no; by your Lord, they will not believe (in truth) until they make you judge of what is in dispute between them” [TMQ An-Nisa’: 65], and the recitation of His ﷺ saying,

﴿وَمَا آتَاكُمُ الرَّسُولُ فَخُذُوهُ وَمَا نَهَاكُمْ عَنْهُ فَانْتَهُوا﴾

“Whatever the Rasool brought to you take it, and whatever he forbade you, abstain from it” [TMQ Al-Hashr: 7], makes one believe that the failure of the ruler in abiding by the hukm shar’ee is a sin or Kufr.

Thus, the matter of taking charge of the affairs by the ahkaam shar’iyyah is easy in the Islamic countries. If action starts with that, then success in it is easy and guaranteed. Therefore, work for spontaniety, i.e. to generate spontaniety in the people is easy. This is because it starts with the ahkaam shar’iyyah and transforming them into political thoughts, a matter which is easy and attainable. The second matter remains, that is the generation of quick observance or quick understanding of the reality and whatever it indicates. This is what is meant by quick observance. This second matter requires education and generation; it is not enough just to draw attention to it. There is a great difference between quick understanding of reality, i.e. generation of quick observance and the generation of spontaniety. What was mentioned before only focused on generating quick observance, though this was in the context of generating spontaniety, for it is this that generates spontaniety. Though it was the first pillar, it is however considered the second pillar in spontaniety. This is because its linkage with the ‘Aqeedah and whatever emanates from it, or linking it with the ahkaam shar’iyyah, is what generates spontaniety.

Generating quick observance alone is not enough and it does not necessarily generate spontaniety, though it is the first pillar in it. It is rather necessary to know the purpose of the speaker. This purpose is only understood from the linkage with the hukm shar’ee which he understands and knows emanates from the ‘Aqeedah. Therefore, it is necessary that the bond exist so as to make linkage with it and to know the purpose. Then quick observance can exist. Though it is the speech that is said and the reality that occurs that generates quick observance, unless they are linked with the bond

there would not be spontaniety in the people.

Therefore, if an Ummah, like the Islamic Ummah, managed to transform the idea into a political thought, she would have spontaniety if she linked the events that take place daily to what emanates from the ‘Aqeedah. Thus, the issue lies in spontaniety, though it is apparently connected with quick understanding of reality, i.e. generating observance or quick observance. However, it is, before and after that, related to transformation of the idea and the hukm shar’ee into political thoughts. That is why quick observance or quick understanding of reality is ignored. The focus instead is the transformation of the Islamic idea and the ahkaam shar’iyyah into political thoughts. Therefore, generating spontaniety in the Ummah or in the individuals is achieved by, firstly and before everything, making the Islamic opinion a political opinion. After that spontaniety will exist. This is how spontaniety must be generated and this generation must be on the basis of Islam. Generating the Islamic opinion comes first. Making it a political opinion comes next. Then comes the generation of spontaniety. Thus for example, fighting against Kuffar, because they are Kuffar is self-evident, it is a hukm shar’ee. The jizya is taken from them to prevent fighting. Thus the jizya is taken because peace is intended. The jizya is taken because they are Kuffar who want peace. They are fought against because they are Kuffar who want war. It is aimed first of all to transform this Islamic opinion into a political opinion, not merely a fiqhi (juristic) opinion. After that, i.e. after this opinion is understood, they are fought and peace is made with them, then spontaniety becomes necessary in order to understand their situation. Spontaniety is thus necessary to understand their situation. This results either from their actions or from their words. Therefore, the opinion must first be Islamic, then political and then after that spontaniety is achieved. Thus, spontaniety is necessary, but only on the basis of Islam, i.e. on the basis of hukm shar’ee. Other than that, though it may possibly produce spontaniety, we do not accept it, nor involve ourselves with it. We only accept the Islamic opinion. Anything other than that we do not accept or busy ourselves with. The Islamic opinion is the basis and spontaniety is necessary for this Islamic opinion. Even in the incident of seeing the petrol in the road, spontaniety occurred from understanding

that it is petrol. But the reaction to the realisation of danger resulted from the Islamic opinion. Allah forbade man from placing himself in danger. When a Muslim flees from danger, his flight must be based on the hukm shar'ee. We do not flee just for the sake of safety. This applies to the other examples. Thus, the Islamic opinion comes first and before everything; then spontaneity follows.

24 Dhil-Qa'dah 1396 AH
16/11/1976 CE