

INTELLECTUAL SECULARISM

An Obstacle to the Development of Social Sciences

DR. MOHAMMAD RAFI UDDIN

عشق کی تیغ جگر دار اڑالی کس نے

علم کے ہاتھ میں خالی ہے نیام اے ساقی

There are three recognized levels of the Universe in which we live and which we study viz. the world of matter, the world of life and the world of mind. There are also three main divisions of knowledge corresponding to these three levels of existence.

1. The knowledge of the world of matter or the physical sciences which include Physics, Chemistry, Geology, Astronomy etc.

2. The knowledge of the world of life or the Biological sciences which include Botany, Zoology and their sub-divisions.

3. The knowledge of the world of mind or the Psychological Sciences known popularly as the human and social sciences They are collectively described sometimes as Social Science and at other times as Social Philosophy or the philosophy of the activities of the human individual and society. Among the branches of Social

Science or Social Philosophy we have to count the philosophy of Politics, the philosophy of Ethics, the philosophy of Economics, the philosophy of Law, the philosophy of History, the philosophy of Art, the philosophy of Education and the psychology of the Individual and Society. All these departments of knowledge are not only the branches of the same subject— single science of man—but they are also inseparable from each other and overlap each other. The reason is that each of them is based on and constitutes an application or elaboration of the knowledge of human nature and the nature of man is a single indivisible whole. For the political man is the economic man, the ethical man, the juridical man, the intellectual man and the aesthetical man, at one and the same time.

The Western scholars are known to have made an astounding progress in their knowledge of the world of matter. They know today how to split up the atom and use the energy latent in it to destroy a city like Hiroshima in the twinkling of an eye. They know how to fly around the earth in space and to photograph the surface of Venus at close quarters. Their progress in the biological sciences may not be very great or very satisfactory. Yet it is in their opinion good enough to prevent them from complaining of its utter inadequacy. But such is not the case with the human and social sciences. For the modern thinkers and philosophers of the West are found to be bitterly lamenting their lack of progress in these sciences. They agree on the following three points:

1. That the human and social sciences are in a state of complete disorder at present. At least none of them has developed sufficiently to acquire the coherence, the rational order or the system that characterizes a science and thereby to merit the title of a science.

2. That the proper development and systematization of these sciences is a dire need of mankind at present. If this need is not fulfilled quickly enough the western civilization may decay and even totally collapse.

3. That the reason why these sciences have failed to develop and become systematic so far is that they can be properly developed and systematized only on the basis of a correct view of human nature and their understanding of human nature is very poor.

This statement can be substantiated by endless quotations from eminent authorities but I shall give only one of them as a sample. McDougall the well-known psychologist who is himself the author of several outstanding works on Psychology, says in his book "World Chaos":

"Our ignorance of the nature of man has prevented and still pre-vents the development of all the social sciences. Such sciences are the crying need of our time; for lack of them our civilization is threatened gravely with decay and perhaps complete collapse."

"We talk of Psychology, of Economics and of Political Science, of Jurisprudence, of Sociology and of many other

supposed sciences; but the simple truth is that all these fine names simply mark great gaps in our knowledge—they vaguely indicate regions of vast wilderness hardly yet explored—regions which must be reduced to order, if our civilization is to endure.”

“My thesis is that in order to restore the balance of our civilization we need to have far more knowledge, (systematically ordered or scientific knowledge) of human nature and of the life of society than we yet have.”

“Here then is the only road to remedy the perilous and ever more dangerous state of our civilization. We must actively develop our social sciences into real sciences of human nature and its activities. The task of finding a basis and providing a methodology for the social sciences is far more pressing today than it has ever been.”

“What then in practical terms is the remedy? I give my answer most concisely by suggesting what I would do if I were a dictator... I would by every means seek to divert all our most powerful intellects from the physical sciences to research in the human and social sciences.”

Skinner, another eminent psychologist, supports the view of McDougall generally when he admits:

“Science has evolved unevenly. By seizing upon the easier problems first it has extended our control of inanimate nature without preparing for the social problems that follow. There is no point in furthering a science of nature unless it includes a

sizable science of human nature because only in that case the results will be wisely used.”

The question naturally arises: What is the reason that Western scholars who have made such a wonderful progress in the sciences of matter and to some extent in the sciences of life have hitherto failed to make any progress worth the name in the human and social sciences, and that too in spite of their realization of the fact that if they do not evolve the social sciences adequately their civilization is likely to collapse? What is the reason that the scholars of the West who have thoroughly known the invisible world of the atom of matter have not been able to know thoroughly the invisible world of the atom of society viz. the mind of the human individual, in spite of the great urgency and vital need of the knowledge of the latter? The answer can be given most confidently by saying that the reason is a peculiar Western attitude of mind amounting to an acute prejudice or aversion against all intellectual ideas relating to the physical, the biological or the psychological sciences, which imply or include or lead to the concept of God as a part of an intellectual conclusion, explanation or theory. This attitude of mind which may be appropriately described as INTELLECTUAL SECULARISM is common to all Western scholars including those who are atheists and those who believe in God and even happen to be religious-minded in some way. But while this attitude of mind is intelligible in an atheist it cannot be understood in a man who believes in God as the Creator of the Universe. The knowledge of the ultimate origin of an object is a part of its total knowledge and it is

the total knowledge of an object that we by our very nature desire and aim at. A rose is not a mere rose with none to cause its existence but to a religious man it is a rose that has been created by God as a manifestation of His infinite power, wisdom, creativeness and love of beauty and to an atheist it is a rose that has been created by the material and mechanical forces of nature operating all by themselves. We may not know it sometimes but we always attribute some ultimate origin to every-thing that we know in this universe. If we cannot attribute to it its real or true ultimate origin we are bound by our nature to attribute a wrong ultimate origin to it. In this latter case our knowledge of the object becomes wrong.

It is true that a scientist must endeavour to explain everything with-in the framework of the laws of nature but if God is really the Creator of the Universe and its source or origin then it cannot be denied that the mental, moral and aesthetic attributes and qualities of God enter into the laws of the universe—the physical, the biological and the psychological laws—and make them what they are just as the mental, moral and aesthetic qualities of a human artist enter into the picture that he creates and makes it what it is and just as the potentialities of a seed enter into the shape and size of the leaves, branches and flowers of the tree that grows out of it and make them what they are. As such neither the laws of nature nor the nature of God can be fully under-stood in isolation from each other. Iqbal only amplifies this idea when he writes:

“Nature, as we have seen, is not a mass of pure materiality occupying a void. It is a structure of events, a systematic mode of behaviour and as such organic to the Ultimate Self.

Nature is to the Divine Self as character is to the human self. In the picturesque phrase of the Quran it is the habit of Allah.”

That God and nature cannot be understood apart from each other is one of the basic teachings of the Holy Quran which exhorts the believers and the non-believers alike to study nature in order to know God and to believe in God in order to understand nature in a proper manner.

افلا ينظرون الى الابل كيف خلقت والى السماء كيف رفعت والى الارض كيف
سطحت

(See they not the camel how it is created? And the heavens how it is raised high? And the mountains how they are fixed and the earth how it is spread).

Studying Nature in the light of his belief is according to the Holy Quran as much the duty of a believer as praying, because the more he understands the Universe the more he will understand his creator and the purpose of his creator.

ان فى خلق السموات و الارض و اختلاف الليل و النهار لايت لاولى الالباب
الذين يذكرون الله قياما و قعودا و على جنوبهم و يتفكرون فى خلق السموات و
الارض ربنا ما خلقت هذا باطلا- سبحنك فقنا عذاب النار-

(In the creation of the heavens and the earth and the alternation of the night and the day there are surely signs for man of under-standing. Those who pray to Allah standing and sitting or lying on their sides and reflect on the creation of the heavens and the earth. Our Lord thou hast not created this Universe in vain. Glory be to thee. Save us from the chastisement of the fire).

The Quran asserts that the validity of its teachings which emphasize the love and worship of God will become more and more evident with the growth of man's knowledge of the laws of matter, life and mind.

سنريهم آيتنا فى الافاق و فى انفسهم حتى يتبين لهم انه الحق-

(We will soon show them our signs in the external world, i.e. the laws of nature operating in the worlds of matter and life and, in their own minds until it is quite clear to them that the Quran is truth).

The Quran warns mankind that if they do not make a proper use of their eyes and ears and their thinking powers they will be among those who go to Hell.

و لقد ذرانا لجهنم كثيرا من الجن و الانس لهم قلوب لا يفقهون بها و لهم
اعين لا يبصرون بها و لهم اذان لا يسمون بها لهم كالانعام بل هم اذل- اولئك هم
الغفلون-

(And verily we have created for Hell many a jinn and human being who have hearts wherewith they understand not and they have eyes wherewith they see not and they have ears wherewith they heart not. They are as cattle, and they are more astray. Those are the heedless ones.)

That explains why the Muslims have never been secularists to their attitude towards knowledge. Books written by the ancient Muslim scholars on scientific subject make a mention of God frequently in the beginning, in the middle and at the end, thus indicating that the writer looks upon the knowledge that he wants to communicate to his readers as a knowledge of God's creation which must be acquired primarily for the purpose of knowing God in a better way. In fact it was on account of and not in spite of the spiritual attitude of the Muslims to-wards the world, inspired by the teachings of the Holy Quran, and their intense desire to know the Universe as the creation of God, that they were able to invent the scientific method and to become the founders of modern science. Islam is the first great movement of History for a careful study of nature and the Western science owes its existence to this movement. It will not be out of place to

quote here a few well-known passages from Briffault's "Making of Humanity". He writes:

It was under their successors at the Oxford School that Roger Bacon learned Arabic and Arabic Science. Neither Roger Bacon nor his later namesake has any title to be credited with having introduced the experimental method. Roger Bacon was no more than one of the apostles of Muslim science and method to Christian Europe; and he never wearied of declaring that knowledge of Arabic and Science was for his contemporaries the only way to true knowledge. Discussions as to who was the originator of the experimental method are part of the colossal misrepresentation of the origins of European civilization. The experimental method of Arabs was by Bacon's time widespread and eagerly cultivated throughout Europe.' (p. 202)

'Science is the most momentous contribution of Arab civilization to the modern world; but its fruits were slow in ripening. Not until long after Moorish culture had sunk back into darkness did the giant to which it had given birth rise to his might. It was not science only which brought Europe back to life. Other and manifold influences from the civilization of Islam communicated its first glow to European life.' (p. 202)

'For although there is not a single aspect of European growth in which the decisive influence of Islamic culture is not traceable, nowhere is it so clear and momentous as in the genesis of that power which constitutes the permanent distinctive force of the

modern world, and the supreme source of its victory—natural science and the scientific spirit.’ (p. 109)

‘The debt of our science to that of the Arabs does not consist in startling discoveries of revolutionary theories; science owes a great deal more to Arab culture, it owes its existence. The ancient world was, as we saw, pre-scientific. The Astronomy and Mathematics of the Greeks were a foreign importation never thoroughly acclimatized in Greek culture.

(The Greeks systematized, generalized and theorized, but the patient ways of investigation, the accumulation of positive knowledge, the minute method of science, detailed and prolonged observation and experimental inquiry were altogether alien to the Greek temperament. Only in Hellenistic Alexandria was any approach to scientific work conducted in the ancient classical world. What we call science arose in Europe as a result of a new spirit of inquiry, of new methods of investigation, of the method of experiment, observation, measurement, of the development of Mathematics in a form unknown to the Greeks. That spirit and those methods were introduced into the European world by the Arabs.’ (p. 190).

And now it is the intellectual secularism of the Christian successors of the Muslim scientists that is hampering the growth of science in some of its most important aspects.

Intellectual secularism could have grown and flourished only in the peculiar intellectual climate of Christendom for it has its

source in the teachings of Christianity itself. The founder of Christianity separates the dues of Caesar from the dues of God and thus creates a cleavage between the world of matter and the world of the spirit, between that which is mundane, secular and temporal and that which is celestial, spiritual or divine. With Christianity this world and the next contradict each other. One can acquire the joys and blessings of the next world only by sacrificing those of this world. Religion and science can have nothing to do with each other, because religion is irrelevant to man's life on this earth. It is meant for the betterment of the life to come. Intellectual knowledge and science are on the other hand required for the betterment of this life. Religion insists on belief without reason. It is dogmatic and irrational and deals with a world which cannot be seen while the conclusions of science are based on reason, intellect, observation and experiment. It is, therefore, quite natural for a Christian to believe that mentioning God as a part of an intellectual argument must destroy its rational character and must bring the discussion within the realm of religion with all its emphasis on dogma, prejudice, irrationality or faith without reason rather against reason. How different is this outlook from the attitude of Islam to-wards scientific knowledge to which I have made a reference above.

The intellectual secularism of the Christians of the West, that is to say, their prejudice against the concept of God as an intellectual idea, born of their religion, was further accentuated by the reaction against religion engendered by the penalization and suppression of intellectual freedom by the Church, the tyranny of

the inquisitions and the pro-longed and bitter conflicts of the state and Church which ultimately brought about the separation of the two. Once religion was openly separated from politics it could not be expected to retain its hold on any important aspect of the life of the individual and the community. The result was the secularization not only of the political activity of the individual and the community but also of the legal, economic, social, educational and intellectual activity of both.

The prejudice against God and religion was further strengthened by the attitude of the 19th Century physicists who believed that matter was real because it was visible and could be subjected to experiments in the laboratory. God, spirit and consciousness could not be real as they could not be seen and subjected to experiments. It came to be accepted generally by the western scholars, no doubt on account of the accepted generally by predisposition of their Christian minds to keep religion apart from science, that the world is like a machine which is operated by its own law and does not need an external power to work. The prejudice was finally bestowed the status of an intellectual idea and raised to the pedestal of a standard scientific view by the evolutionary theory of Darwin who was himself the product of the cold and rigid mechanism and materialism of the Nineteenth Century. He explained evolution and the emergence of man as an outcome of the fortuitous play of the reckless forces of nature which he described as the struggle for existence, natural selection and the survival of the fittest. According to him it was a mere chance that man had developed such faculties as reason,

conscience and imagination and could indulge in such activities as religion, morals, politics, education, law, art, science and philosophy. What is now a human being might have been any wretched animal even a worm if the wind of chance had blown in a different direction. Darwinism was therefore welcomed as a theory of man and the universe which suited the western disgust for religion because it could explain everything without the aid of any ultimate spiritual factors and forces that may be operating in nature. It was generally accepted by the intellectual world of Darwin's own time and since then has had a pro-found effect on the development of all branches of science. It is now generally believed, in view of this theory, that every object or phenomenon of nature is a chance product of the evolutionary process and should be capable of being explained adequately by reference to its immediate visible past which really creates it. This principle is applied not only to the understanding of matter and life but also to the understanding of human self-consciousness which is therefore considered to be an emanation from matter and since matter has no visible past it is regarded as its own explanation. But if the existence of God may be a fact and if the human personality may be related to God and dependent upon God, by its natural constitution, how can we evolve a scientific theory of human nature which avoids the concept of God.

So strong is the prejudice of Western philosophers against the idea of God as an intellectual concept, that they do not suspect that their ignorance of human nature which they believe to be fraught with dangerous possibilities for the entire human race may

be due to the fact that they are ignoring the possibility of the notion of God being the only key to a scientific understanding of human nature. Indeed they are not prepared to acquire a scientific knowledge of at the cost of their intellectual secularism. They cannot conceive the possibility of a theory of human nature being at once spiritual and scientific. When they complain of their ignorance of human nature they have in mind that a scientific theory of human nature, when formulated will be secular or non-spiritual. But it can never be so. For man has something of the Divine in him and if God is actually in existence he cannot be extended from the domain of science or knowledge without making science unscientific and turning knowledge into ignorance.

A scientific theory of human nature cannot be a theory based only on a few facts observed as a result of experiments made on human beings in a laboratory. All the known and established facts of human history current and ancient provided by the activities of human individuals and communities constitute the legitimate scientific data of a science of human nature. If we can hit upon a hypothesis which is really able to explain these facts or to organize these facts into an ordered and coherent system, this hypothesis will become a scientific fact and the system of facts organized by it will become a scientific theory of human nature. That human beings are religious minded and worship God attributing a particular set of qualities to Him is a scientific fact and a true explanation of this fact ought to form a part of a scientific theory of human nature.

To argue that God is not a scientific fact because we cannot see God is not correct. The visibility of an object or an entity is not essential to a scientific proof of its existence. If we become scientifically sure of the presence of smoke at any place we become scientifically sure also of the presence of fire or combustion at that place. Indeed not only the existence but also the details of the qualities and characteristics of an invisible object can be known scientifically by its visible effects and manifestations. No scientist has ever seen an atom.

Yet who can deny today that the atom is a scientific fact. It is generally recognized by the scientists themselves that scientific facts are of two kinds—the facts based on direct observation and the facts in the form of assumptions which explain and order facts based on direct observation. The atom is a scientific fact of the second category and so is God because the force of the creative will of God which some scientists of the West have only vaguely and partially understood as life-force and to which they are forced to attribute the qualities of will and consciousness (which belong only to a personality or an individual) is ultimately the only assumption that can adequately explain and order all true facts of Physics, Biology and Psychology.

T. H. Huxley summed up the scientific code admirably well when he wrote to Charles Kingly:

“Sit down before fact as a little child, be prepared to give up every pre-conceived notion, follow humbly whenever and to whatever abysses nature leads or you shall learn nothing.”

Huxley is right and the reason why our scholars of human nature have learnt “nothing” is that they refuse to “sit down before fact”, and to give up their “pre-conceived notion” that the concept of God must be irrelevant to a scientific understanding of human nature. They are not prepared to follow humbly into the “abyss” of a spiritual interpretation of man and the universe to which nature may be leading. That this is actually so becomes clear when we consider the point at which the progress of modern secularist philosophers of human nature has come to a halt. This point is their view of the source and purpose of the urge for ideals in the nature of man and the relation of this urge to his animal instincts.

Following the Darwinian concept of evolution which, of course, suits eminently their intellectual secularism, they believe that what comes first in the sequence of the results of evolution is matter with its physical laws and then comes the animal with his instincts and last of all there appears the human being with his gift of self-consciousness or personality and its capacity to love ideals. The animal is a modified product of matter which becomes alive on account of the modification. It is nothing but matter in its origin. They conclude therefore that since the urge for an ideal in a human being has its origin in his animal nature it can be only a modified form of one or more of his animal instincts. They derive man from the animal and the animal from matter so that ultimately the reality of man is matter.

Thus we see Freud explaining the human urge for an ideal as a distorted and modified form of his sex instinct the object of which is to provide man with a substitute activity in the form of religion, morality, art, science, philosophy, and politics to compensate him for the thwarted and obstructed activity of his sexual instinct. According to Adler man's urge for an ideal is a distorted and modified form of his instinct of self-assertion which has been operating all along in the history of organic evolution for the protection of the life of the animal against other hostile and aggressive animals. When an individual is unable to satisfy a particular desire for power he creates the desire for a relevant ideal and strives after it to compensate himself for his sense of inferiority. Karl Marx is of the view that the urge for ideals in man is only an unconscious distortion of his economic urge. Man strives after an ideal apparently but really his activity is motivated by his economic conditions which he desires to improve. McDougall explains the urge for an ideal in man as a result of the occasional reinforcement of the sentiment of self-regard—itsself a peculiar compound of all his instincts—by the instinct of self-assertion. But all these explanations of the source and purpose of ideals in human nature are logically defective, incoherent and inconsistent. Freud for example does not tell us why and how a man's ideal which according to him is born of his sex instinct is sometimes able to rule and control his sex instinct to the extent of eliminating it totally from his life. Adler is unable to explain how the instinct of self-assertion the primary object of which is the protection of life creates an ideal for the sake of which man

becomes ready sometimes to lay down his life. Similarly the view of Karl Marx does not explain why if the function of a man's ideal is to improve his economic conditions which are only a means for the preservation of his life, does he become ready to starve himself to death for the sake of his ideal whenever his ideal calls upon him to do so. Such questions are very difficult to answer consistently with any of the theories of ideals put forward by these writers. Hence none of them has even faced such questions. The mental attitude of each of these writers is no more reasonable than that of a man who, not knowing how and why a tree grows, may insist upon telling us that what exists first of all in the history of the growth of a tree is its stem and later on there appear its branches and leaves and finally there is its seed embedded in a flower. He ignores the original seed of the tree out of which the tree grows simply because it was hidden from his view below the soil and he did not see it. He saw instead only the stalk of the young tree growing out of the soil. Just as he in his ignorance explains the tree out of its stem and not out of its seed which is its real origin so these writers in their ignorance explain the human being out of matter and not out of self-consciousness which is his real origin.

The secular attitude of these writers towards knowledge has made them blind to the possibility that self-consciousness the entity which emerges in man as the highest and the last product of the evolution of the universe and which bestows upon him the capacity to love ideals may be also the source or the origin of the Universe as the personality of its Creator, as the seed of a tree

which is the highest and the last pro-duct of the growth of a tree is also its source or origin.

As a matter of fact there is no idea of the place and role of ideals in human nature and human activity more satisfactory and more convincing than this that “the urge for ideals is neither derived from nor sub serves any of those human impulses known as instincts, which man shares with the animals below him on the ladder of evolution. On the other hand it is man’s natural and independent urge for beauty and perfection which rules and controls all such impulses in spite of their biological pressure for the sake of its own expression and satisfaction.”

This idea is a hypothesis which is able to explain and organize in the form of a beautiful coherent and ordered system all the known and established facts of human nature and human history inferred both from introspection and observation and no substitute idea can explain, order or systematize these facts to the same extent. From the intellectual and scientific point of view therefore this capacity of the idea has to be taken as a dependable criterion of its validity as a scientific fact and there can be no escape from it. But imagine the extremely disturbing implications of this idea for an intellectual secularist.

The idea implies that the urge for ideals is the real and the ultimate motivating power of all human activities whether economic, political, ethical, legal, intellectual, artistic or otherwise. As such it is life itself. As it is not the creature or servant of instincts it is the creator of instincts and has created them through

ages of biological evolution to employ them in its own service. It is the will of the creator itself working in man for the realization of its own ends. It was the cause of biological evolution in the past and cause of physical evolution earlier and it is the cause of human or socio-psychological evolution now. At the physical stage of evolution it manifested itself as electric energy and caused the material universe to evolve through its various stages till it became ripe for the emergence of life. At the biological stage of evolution it manifested itself as life-force and evolved the animal up to the stage of its biological perfection in the human being. At the human stage of evolution it has manifested itself as the urge for an ideal and there can be no doubt that its object is to bring the human race to the stage of their highest socio-psychological or ideological perfection. When an individual loves his ideal passionately the joy, the pleasure or the satisfaction that he gets from obeying his ideal surpasses far in intensity and quality and is far more valuable and preferable to him than any pleasure that he can derive from the satisfaction of any of his instincts. That is why he becomes ready to lay down his life (for the preservation of which instincts are meant) for the sake of his ideal whenever his ideal demands it. This urge can be perfectly and permanently satisfied only by an ideal of the highest beauty and perfection—an ideal which has all the qualities of beauty, goodness, truth, power and creativeness which the religious man ascribes to God. If an individual cannot love such an ideal which is the only true ideal of his nature that is if he, in view of the difficulties of his educational environment, lacks a personal realization and experience of the

beauty of such an ideal he is forced to love another ideal which, owing to an error of his judgment, appears to him to be beautiful. This new ideal does not possess the qualities of the Right Ideal but the individual attributes these qualities to it wrongly and unconsciously in order to satisfy an urgent and irresistible demand of his nature.

Since the ideal whether wrong or right is the motivating force of all human activities, all the experiences of an individual whether intellectual, aesthetic, moral or spiritual arise in the service of the ideal and are made to serve the ideal. The love of the ideal organizes, integrates and unifies into itself all his experiences. This implies further that when the ideal of an individual is right and perfect i.e. when his ideal is God all his true experiences will be relevant to it and he will not need to modify them in order to make them consistent with his ideal. But when his ideal is wrong and imperfect all his true experiences will be irrelevant to it and the individual will be forced to modify them and alter them in the process of their emergence so as to make them consistent with his ideal. Thus neither the morality of a man who loves a wrong ideal can be a true morality nor his scientific knowledge can be a true scientific knowledge.

When an individual has a secular attitude towards scientific know' ledge it means that he does not permit his knowledge of facts to be organized by the Right Ideal. But one cannot be ideologically neutral Hence he will in effect permit his knowledge to be organized by some wrong ideal which happens to thrust

itself in the ideological void created by his secularism. This means that intellectual secularism leads person to have a wrong perspective of things and his knowledge of the human, biological and material sciences is never absolutely correct although the extent of his error will be different for different spheres of science. For a secularist believes in some false God as the God that is relevant to scientific knowledge. Unfortunately it is not generally realized that to have a secular attitude towards knowledge is not the same thing as to have no belief about the existence or otherwise of God or to believe that God exists but scientific knowledge has no relevance to God. It means something different. It means that God may exist but scientific knowledge has no relevance to true God, while it is positively relevant to some false God say matter or mechanical forces or some other substitute for true God.

A secular attitude towards knowledge is most harmful to the development of the human and social sciences. It is a little less harmful to the development of the biological sciences, and it is the least harmful, apparently almost harmless to the development of physical sciences. In other words its harmfulness becomes less and less as in his scientific investigation and inquiry a scientist is removed farther & farther away from the realm of conscious purpose. The reason for this is plain to see. The ideal of a scientist even when it is wrong and imperfect is the chosen conscious purpose of his life which he thinks is the true purpose of human life and which he is bound to regard vaguely as the purpose of the universe itself. His wrong ideal alters and twists the true results of

his investigation most of all when the material of his investigation relates to the human world, the world that is directly and totally controlled by the ideals of human beings including his own ideal. While endeavoring to explain the nature of the political, ethical, social, intellectual, educational, legal, artistic and economic activities of man he interprets them in such a manner that his own ideal or his own view of the true purpose of these activities is vindicated. As a matter of fact the nature of the human urge for an ideal reveals that the purpose of all human activity whether political, ethical, intellectual, economic or otherwise is the perfect realization of an ideal of the highest beauty and perfection, which is God. It means that philosophies of politics, ethics, education, art, economics, law and history and the psychologies of the individual and society can never be rationally ordered, true and systematic unless this important fact is made the core or the essence of each. Since this has not been done so far all these human and social sciences are in a state of chaos.

The Wrong ideal of a scientist is able to alter and twist the true results of his investigation to a lesser degree when his investigation relates to the world of animals because it is a world that is external to him. However in the absence of his knowledge of the true nature of human urge for ideals a scientist cannot see the creative will of God taking the shape of a life force in his own instinctive urges as well as those of other animals and therefore cannot explain the nature and direction of the processes of life and the causes and objectives of organic evolution. Western Biological Science has made some progress no doubt but the

secularistic attitude of the Western biologists is now working to bring its progress to a halt.

The wrong ideal of a physicist does not enter into the results of his investigation very much except at the very highest stages of the development of physics when this science begins to enter the realm of philosophy. It, however, affects the purpose for which he can use his findings and strictly speaking the purpose for which a piece of knowledge is intended to be used cannot be separated from it. A fact is never the same fact to two persons loving two different ideals because a fact known to an individual is according to him a fact in so far only as it is relevant to the theoretical and practical requirements of his ideal.

His knowledge therefore acquires a particular complexion or colour borrowed from his ideal; it bears the stamp of his ideal. Even the material universe is not the same for two persons who believe in two different ideals. Even the simple statement two plus two is equal to four cannot have the same significance and cannot impart the same piece of knowledge to two persons who believe in two different ideals. The famous story of a hungry man who was put the question what does two plus two amount to and gave the reply four loaves of bread is a very eloquent statement of the fact that the purposes of men modify their knowledge of hard facts. What we call knowledge is not merely a piece of information about an object external to us. It is also our internal attitude derived from our ideal towards that object and our idea of the use we should make of it. It is the information plus the

attitude towards the information. The information and the attitude both combine to form the complete idea of the object, the organic whole that we call knowledge. It is this organic whole that constitutes our intellectual experience. The knowledge of the properties of objective things is a subjective reality and our subjective attitude towards those objective things emerges in our consciousness simultaneously with that reality and forms an inseparable part of it. Consequently when ideals differ, knowledge even if it may be the knowledge of physics or mathematics cannot really remain the same although it may be apparently the same. A white carpet spread in a room fitted with electric bulbs of different colours will look yellow, green, red or blue according to the light that is turned on and it is evident that to say that a carpet is white is not the same thing as to say that it is red or blue. The Nazis rightly believed that their Science was different from that of the rest of the world and the Russians rightly believe today that their science even their Physics or Mathematics is not the same as that of the capitalists.

To be brief the implications of the only true and the only possible explanation of the place and role of ideals in human nature which lead irresistibly to the concept of God, are such that the scholars of the West cannot accept it in view of their creed of intellectual secularism. So strong is this prejudice against the idea of God that when they feel that their study of nature has brought them very close to this idea and it may become difficult for them to avoid it they are horrified and refrain from using the term God and use some other term instead and thereby stop following

nature further in the same direction. But since unfortunately the Western scholars are accepted by the world as the leaders of mankind in the intellectual field their prejudice has passed for a rational view and spread far and wide to the corners of the earth. The results have been already very disastrous and more disastrous results are bound to follow. The world's progress in the knowledge of human nature has come to a dead stop and the human and social sciences which could be formulated only on the basis of a correct view of human nature are in a state of disorder. The biological sciences too are not in a healthy state. The theory of the fundamental cause of evolution, which if properly formulated could have made the human race hopeful of a glorious future, has been misunderstood. Its errors are being perpetuated by a clique of influential biologists who insist on maintaining its secular character at all costs.

If the scholars of the West had not been suffering from theophobia and had had the courage and the good sense to accept the advice of one of them, Mr. Huxley, quoted above, that is, to "follow nature wherever and to whatever abyss it may lead," they would have successfully crossed the point at which their knowledge of the human and social sciences has come to a halt and would have accepted as true the only explanation of the role of the urge for ideals in human activity that is rationally possible. In such a case intellectual secularism would have disappeared from all sciences including the biological and the physical sciences automatically. For when we change our view of man we have to change our view of the entire universe. A spiritual view of man is

incompatible with a secular view of any part of the universe and its knowledge.

Some of the most eminent physicists of the world have already come to the conclusion that the ultimate nature of electric energy which has caused the material world to evolve to the stage of its perfection is a conscious force which has a mathematical mind. Yet they refuse to come to the conclusion, which is obvious to a man of religion, that this conscious force is the will or the creative desire of God. Similarly some eminent biologists have arrived at the conclusion that there is an internal conscious drive in an organism which regulates its growth in a chosen direction and which is the cause of all organic evolution from its earliest stages to the last. They call it the life-force, the elan vital or the vital impetus and attribute to it some qualities of mind consciousness. But they like their physicist brothers also refuse to come to the next conclusion which is equally obvious to a man who believes in God that this life force is the will or the creative desire of God which has expressed itself in a form that is appropriate stage of evolution. Again all psychologists believe that man has an urge for ideals and some of them believe also that it is an urge for beauty and perfection. But no psychologists have cared to arrive at the next immediate conclusion that this urge can be perfectly satisfied only by an ideal of the highest beauty and perfection which can be no other than God and that it is the will or the creative desire of God that is expressing itself in the historical process urging the human society to act for the achievement of their own highest beauty and perfection.

A physicist may say, "I do not know anything beyond the mathematical nature of the Reality of matter that I have discovered. I do not know that it has moral qualities and I do not want to compensate my lack of scientific knowledge as a physicist by the teachings of revelation although I believe in revelation." Similarly a biologist may say that he has no scientific knowledge of the other qualities of the life-force that it may be possessing and he has no reason to suppose it is God on the authority of revelation. A psychologist too may make a similar reply. But really there is nothing to prevent the physicists, the biologists and the psychologists from adopting the will or the creative desire of God instead of a mere mathematical mind a life-force or an instinct as a provisional conclusion or hypothesis explaining the cause of material, biological or human evolution just to discover how far it can explain other facts of which no satisfactory explanation is yet available. If they had done so they would have found that the hypothesis does really explain a host of such facts and also opens the way to the knowledge of a host of new facts of the worlds of matter, life and mind. What is more they would have been able to coordinate and integrate their separate sciences into one Science of the Universe which would have ultimately explained everything, would have served as the Common Weltanschauung of humanity and would have united them as a single family of God. But what has actually stopped the physicists, the biologists or the psychologists from doing so is nothing but prejudice, aversion from religion and an irrational secular attitude towards the universe.

My plea is that there is a point in the development of secularized scientific knowledge where the most fundamental of all the facts of revelation common to the teachings of all the great religions of the world, namely the idea of God and scientific knowledge, embrace each other as two inseparable companions each merging itself in the other and giving a tremendous rational support to the other, so that it cannot be distinguished which is science and which is revelation. When that point is reached scientific knowledge can no longer progress without its other companion. That point has been already reached and now scientific knowledge cannot progress headlong unless it is made to embrace its inseparable other companion from whom it was unfortunately separated and whom it has been traveling through the centuries to rejoin. The idea of God is no longer a myth. It is a scientific fact which explains, orders, enlightens, enriches and reveals other scientific facts.

All human beings have an immense store of potential love for each other and a strong unconscious desire to live in unity and peace like a single family. The reason is that the motivating force of their activities is the same namely the urge to love and serve an ideal of the highest beauty and perfection, namely their Creator. They are disunited because the intellectual secularism of their educators, teachers and text-book writers have made them forget their Creator, the true common ideal of their nature which alone can give them an enduring happiness and satisfaction. As a consequence they have split up into a number of groups or sections each loving and serving a different substitute for their

true ideal, a false God which is a race or a nation or a colour or a country or a creed such as Democracy, Communism, Socialism etc. Each of these sections of humanity desire to see their false God become the undisputed master of the world. They are therefore openly or secretly the mortal enemies of each other although they keep their hostile designs against each other camouflaged by attractive philosophies, skilful propaganda, sweet words, treaties and aids. We have already witnessed the result of their bitter enmity against each other in the shape of two world wars and a third world war which will be an atomic war likely to end in almost a total annihilation of mankind is imminent. The remedy is only one and it is that men and women all over the world should come forward to love and serve the ideal of their nature which is the only possible basis of their unity. But this is impossible as long as intellectual secularism is not eradicated throughout the world and our knowledge of man and the universe which is now related to false Gods is not delivered from its prison and related once again to the Creator of man and the universe to whom alone it is relevant. The differences of religion among the various human communities of today is no hindrance to the achievement of this goal for it can be achieved totally without entering into any religious controversies and we know that more than half of the human race are unanimous in their belief in God and His qualities.

It is however hoping against hope to think that the Western scholars will ever give us the lead in the matter. There are incapable of doing so. They can never cross the point mentioned

above at which their knowledge of human nature has come to a halt. They will never accept the true explanation of the place of ideals in human nature as it is totally incompatible with the history and culture that have gone into their making.

They will not awaken to their mistake till their civilization has actually collapsed and when this happens it will be already too late to rectify the mistake. I am therefore convinced that we Pakistanis have a great role to play in the present intellectual situation of the world. Thanks to Iqbal the idea that the urge for ideals is the real and the ultimate motivating power of all human activity which is capable of eradicating intellectual secularism completely from all scientific knowledge is already ours. This idea is true and unshakable. It can hold its own most firmly against any intellectual challenge that may come from any quarters. With the help of the idea we can change the world. We can use it to create a smooth and peaceful world-wide intellectual revolution ending in the eternal unity of the human race and the reign of a permanent peace in the human world. But we must make a beginning at home and how can we make a beginning? By revising our textbooks in all the sciences, physical and biological as well as human and social and for all stages of education right from the primary classes to the M.A. classes in such a manner that the readers are made to realize, or experience the truth that the universe in all its three departments of matter, life and animal is the creation of God, that their own departments mental object in studying nature and acquiring knowledge of the universe is to know God and His qualities which are expressed in creation better and better so that

they may be able to love and serve God more and more wholeheartedly, that no human activity whether ethical, educational, intellectual, aesthetic, economic, political, or legal, can be at its best and highest and directed rightly and fruitfully in the long run which does not enable the individual or the community to love and serve God wholeheartedly. How the writer of the text-book will present his subject matter and what methods and devices he will use to make his text-book perfectly adapted to his purpose is a matter that can be left to those who will supervise and direct his work.

I quote at the end a poem of Iqbal entitled “A conversation between Knowledge and Love” which sums up beautifully the ideas I have just expressed.

علم
نگاهم راز دار هفت و چار است گرفتار کمندم دوزگار است جہاں بینم بایں سو باز کردند مرا با آنسوئے گردوں چہ کار است چکد صد نغمہ از سازے کہ دارم ببازار افکنم رازے کہ دارم
عشق
ز افسون تو دریا شعلہ زار است

هوا آتش گزار و زهر دار است
چو با من یار بودی، نور بودی
بریدی از من و نور تو نار است
بخلوت خانه لاهوت زادی
ولیکن در نخ شیطان فنادی
بیا این خاکدان را گلستان ساز
جهان پیر را دیگر جوان ساز
ز روز آفرینش همدم استیم
همان یک نغمه را زیر و بم استیم

References:-

1. Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam—Iqbal
2. First Principles of Education—M. Rafiuddin
3. Ideology of the Future—M. Rafiuddin