



GLOBAL JOURNAL OF HUMAN-SOCIAL SCIENCE: A  
ARTS & HUMANITIES - PSYCHOLOGY  
Volume 16 Issue 3 Version 1.0 Year 2016  
Type: Double Blind Peer Reviewed International Research Journal  
Publisher: Global Journals Inc. (USA)  
Online ISSN: 2249-460X & Print ISSN: 0975-587X

## Realization of Quaranic Teleology: An Initiative to Comprehend its Suitability Comparing it With the Modern Philosophies

By A.B.M Siddique

*World University of Bangladesh, Bangladesh*

*Abstract-* Why is teleology expected to understand and explain the evolution of human beings and for the ratiocination regarding their destiny's finalization? Is it a rational attempt that the pensive minds tried to visualize the sequences of human history through a teleological lens, or is it merely an urge of the unsatisfied minds to justify and rationalize their ontology oriented investigation, where teleology is an intellectual vessel of self-satisfaction? This essay want to answer these questions glancing over both sociophilosophical teleology and faith oriented or religious teleology. In understanding the religious or faith oriented teleology, the essay will explore the Quaranic teleological arguments comparing with modern socio-philosophy oriented teleology, basically Marxism. Marx was the only European Social scientist, who tried to put forward a holistic sociological approach, which has a grand-narrative and a specific teleology and which is capable to project a total trajectory of its deterministic philosophy.

*GJHSS-A Classification : FOR Code: 220399*



*Strictly as per the compliance and regulations of:*



© 2016. A.B.M Siddique. This is a research/review paper, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial 3.0 Unported License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/>), permitting all non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

# Realization of Quaranic Teleology: An Initiative to Comprehend its Suitability Comparing it With the Modern Philosophies

A.B.M Siddique

**Abstract-** Why is teleology expected to understand and explain the evolution of human beings and for the ratiocination regarding their destiny's finalization? Is it a rational attempt that the pensive minds tried to visualize the sequences of human history through a teleological lens, or is it merely an urge of the unsatisfied minds to justify and rationalize their ontology oriented investigation, where teleology is an intellectual vessel of self-satisfaction? This essay want to answer these questions glancing over both socio-philosophical teleology and faith oriented or religious teleology. In understanding the religious or faith oriented teleology, the essay will explore the Quaranic teleological arguments comparing with modern socio-philosophy oriented teleology, basically Marxism. Marx was the only European Social scientist, who tried to put forward a holistic sociological approach, which has a grand-narrative and a specific teleology and which is capable to project a total trajectory of its deterministic philosophy. The essay will investigate the Neoliberal ideology, the most dominant ideology of the West today, and try to see, whether it promotes any teleology or not. The essay will also go into the philosophy of Plato, who formed the base of the paradigmatic sequences of the Western thinking in the ancient Greece, whose impact is still visible and glaring in the Western world. The main purpose of this essay is to compare the teleological stand of the holy Koran and that of the all the relevant modern social philosophies from the critical analytical points and fathom out their basic differences. Hence the essay will underscore the Shiite cosmology to observe the courses of Islamic teleology. The relevant Gnostic philosophical stands will be evaluated in this article especially the Shiite Gnosos. As the writer has its own judgment to understand the Islamic teleology, the opinions will be established to bring the whole article before that kaleidoscope summarizing all the relevant texts.

## I. WHAT IS TELEOLOGY? IS IT A WELL DEFINED MANIFESTATION OF DETERMINISM?

At first we have to understand the term 'teleology', because like other branches of philosophy it encompasses a very wide gamut of understandings. It is because from time immemorial a number of thinkers contributed to this concept. As the enlightened minds, from the ancient Greek philosophers to the modern western world, all used this concept, the

world religions, from the early formation of Hinduism and other non-codified faiths to the localized religions like Sikhism, also any way accommodated this concept to portray their deterministic views and cosmologies. In some respects we can consider 'teleology' to be a primary cogent agent to explain a plausible deterministic philosophy, whether it is a materialistic or a faith oriented elaboration.

Hence, we better discuss the concept 'determinism' a bit to understand the term teleology. Determinism is a philosophical aspect that every event, including human cognitions, behaviors, decisions and actions, even the courses of the history are primordially determined by any primary cause or agent. Even that primary cause may not be a 'conscious being' or a deliberate 'Prime Mover'<sup>1</sup> or *unmoved mover* as God, it could be such an agent or actor that the certain destination will be arrived by the certain factors (human beings or history or anything small or grand) after certain lapses of time due to their courses of action, whereupon that agent or actor played its role. Therefore, the idea was both utilized by theological and material explanations in understanding the cause and finality of the complex nature of the universe and human history. Although the deterministic philosophies always proposed a predetermined unbroken chain of prior causations back to the origin of the universe or the inception of history, they are not necessarily always fatalist in nature. Many deterministic philosophies including religions also proposed methods or *gnosos* to change the courses or different phases of the determined end of the supreme cause or the viewer (from theological perspectives), which could slightly

<sup>1</sup> The term 'Prime Mover' was first used by Greek Philosopher Aristotle in his **Metaphysics, book number 12, section 1072b. Primum movens** (in Latin) or Prime Mover referred to as **the First Cause**, which has been used in the philosophical and theological cosmology oriented arguments and ratiocinations for the existence of God and in support of cosmogony oriented determinism. However Aristotle never thought of any benevolent God. His God only devised the creationism, and then remained silent. Aristotle mentioned,

*That the final cause may apply to immovable things is shown by the distinction of its meanings. For the final cause is not only "the good for something," but also "the good which is the end of some action."*

See

<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0052%3Abook%3D12%3Asection%3D1072b>

*Author:* Assistant Professor, World University of Bangladesh, Eastern Housing, South Kallanpur, Dhaka, Bangladesh.  
*e-mail:* mister.siddique@gmail.com

deviate the trajectory of determination because of some interventions. It must not occur from its major *Archimedean point*,<sup>2</sup> from where the Prime Mover or the Prime Cause devised everything to be unfolded with the courses of time. Therefore, even in most of the cases the religions are not rigorously fatalist or pessimistically deterministic in nature as many people assume.

However, the philosophic determinists believe that the universe is fully governed by causal laws resulting in only one possible state at any particular time. In question of free will and determinism, the Philosophers entered into further debates of compatibilism and incompatibilism.

Compatibilism was initially propagated by the Stoics in the ancient Greeks. In the modern time, Hume further extended his arguments on this premise.

The determinists argue that all actions that take place are predetermined by prior causes including human actions. Thus determinism rules out the possibility of any free actions without any pre-deterministic idea.

In contrast, a compatibilist or soft determinist will defines a free act in a way that does not depend on the presence or absence of prior causes. For example, one could define a free act as an act without anyone's compulsion. Since the physical universe and the laws of nature are not persons, actions which are caused by the laws of nature would still be free acts. Therefore it is wrong to conclude that universal determinism would mean that, we are never free.

Hume was critical to the absolute authority of the free will. He opined that free will should not be understood as an absolute ability to have chosen differently under exactly the same inner and outer circumstances. Rather, it is a hypothetical ability that one can choose as he desires on the basis of his psychological or argumentative dispositions<sup>3</sup>. Hume

<sup>2</sup> *Archimedean point* or *Punctum Archimedis* refers to a hypothetical vantage point, from where the observer can objectively perceive **the subject of inquiry** with a view of totality. The concept also means that from removing 'oneself' from the object of study, one can minutely observe its relations with other things, but the observer remains independent. The expression comes from *Archimedes* (*Αρχιμήδης*), who supposedly claimed that he could lift the Earth off its foundation, if he were given a place to stand, one solid point, and a long enough lever. John Tzetzes mentioned in the 'Book of History 2' (translated by Francis R. Walton): Again, he [Archimedes] used to say, in the Doric speech of Syracuse : "Give me a place to stand and with a lever I will move the whole world." (ΕΛΕΓΕ ΔΕ ΚΑΙ ΔΩΡΙΣΤΙ ΦΩΝΗ ΣΥΡΑΚΟΥΣΙΑ, "ΠΑ ΒΩ ΚΑΙ ΧΑΡΙΣΤΙΩΝΙ ΤΑΝ ΓΑΝ ΚΙΝΗΣΩ ΠΑΣΑΝ.")

See also: <http://www.math.nyu.edu/~corres/Archimedes/Lever/-LeverQuotes.html>

This archimedean point was also mentioned in Descartes' second meditation with regards to finding certainty, the 'unmovable point' that Archimedes sought. From theological interpretations, it is a "God's eye view, who formulated the creationism and now is observing from his archimedean point.

<sup>3</sup> Hume, D. 1740. *A Treatise of Human Nature* (1967 edition). Oxford University Press, Oxford.

opined that the free acts are not uncaused (or self-caused as Kant argued) but rather caused by our choices as determined by our beliefs, desires, by our characters, or just by the spontaneous random acts.<sup>4</sup> While a decision-making process exists in Hume's determinism, this process is governed by a causal chain of events. For example, one may make the decision to support a charity, but that decision is determined by the conditions that existed prior to the decision being made.

On the other hand, the notion Incompatibilism developed on the premise that deterministic universe is completely incompatible with the notion that people may have free will. Incompatibilism has been bifurcated into two branches: a) libertarians, who deny that the universe is deterministic entirely, and b) the hard determinists, who deny that any free will can exist.

Libertarianism suggests that we actually do have free will, this fact is incompatible with determinism and that therefore the future should not be held determined. For example, I can continue to write this article or I could stop. Under this assertion, one could have choice to do anything freely. However it is not easily tangible, how chaotic and random movements of atom called '*Clinamen*'<sup>5</sup> could bring forth free will.

The hard incompatibilism on the other hand is causally determined by an unbroken chain of prior occurrences or causations. According to this philosophy, no absolutely random, spontaneous, mysterious or miraculous events can take place. A *deterministic Weltanschauung* asserts that it is simply irrational to resist (scientifically assumed) determinism only basing on purely intuitive grounds. Therefore, the gradual development of science suggests that determinism is the logical method in which reality works.

But some other rational minds may believe that free will is a necessary for moral responsibility, this may provide recourses to handle the disastrous consequences of the history. *Therefore, 'absolute free will' may be illusory, but acknowledgement of conditional or provisional freewill should be prudent. Many theological arguments have begun from this point.*

## II. TELEOLOGY FROM THE LENS OF DETERMINISM

Now it is easy for us to discuss the concept of 'teleology'. The Greek word teleology refers to telos (τέλος) which means end or purpose and -logia (-λογία) means language or knowledge (logia came from logos means speech also).

Teleology provides us arguments for the existence of God or a primary cause based on

<sup>4</sup> <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/compatibilism/>

<sup>5</sup> Lucretius, one of the advocated of Libertarianism asserted that the 'free will' arises out of the random, chaotic movements of atoms, called '*Clinamen*'.

perceived evidence of orders, purposes, design, or direction in Nature or in the continual unraveling of the history. Teleology is the supposition that there is certain purpose or directive principle in the works and processes of nature, which *Immanuel Kant* considered to be the *Physico-theological proof*.<sup>6</sup>

*Kant* wrote,<sup>7</sup>

- a) In the world we everywhere find clear signs of an order in accordance with a determinate purpose.
- b) This purposive order is quite alien to the things of the world and only belongs to them contingently, that is, they could not of themselves have co-operated to the fulfillment of determinate final purposes had they not been chosen and arranged by an ordering rationality.
- c) There exists, therefore, a cause which must be the cause of the world as intelligence through freedom.
- d) The unity of this cause may be inferred from the unity of the reciprocal relations existing between parts of the world, as members of an artfully arranged structure - inferred with such certainty in so far as our observation suffices for its verification in accordance with the principles of analogy.

Teleology may not be any deterministic philosophy necessarily. But for the sake of its compatibility of argumentations, the deterministic kaleidoscope (*rigid or flexible*) is necessary. Why? Then let us discuss from the Greek Philosophies, where some great thinkers discussed some immediate causes and effects of the realities, but the lack of the absolute destiny in their interpretations only invited other meandering and more speculative and conjectural philosophical rhetoric.

### III. UNDERSTANDING 'REALITY', RATIONALITY OF GOD, THE MAKING OF THE ARCHIMEDEAN POINT

As all the teleology theologically or materialistically try to explain the trajectory of history, their first attempt is to understand the reality in real sense. The ability to understand the truth can hint the reliability of the teleology and buttress the promoters of teleology. Hence, they take their stands to construe reality from their vantage points.

We know that the Greeks entered into a debate from time immemorial, whether the reality is static or transitory in nature. This pre-Socratic debate was basically wavered by Heraclitus and Parmenides. Heraclitus argued that the permanent character of reality is change. Everything in reality is in a process, in flux, is

changing. Therefore, *one cannot step into the same river twice, the man is changed and so is the river*.<sup>8</sup>

On the other hand, Parmenides refuted the concept holding the '*flux of change*' to be mere *appearance of the human senses*, i.e. *the illusions of mind*.<sup>9</sup>

However, Protagoras, the best known sophist, was skeptical about any determining factor or parameter about reality. Most of the sophists were skeptical regarding so called values, norms, conventions and laws of the society and the state. They were moral relativists, therefore refuted the Athenian democracy, morals and laws holding them to be some mere ethno-cultural and time-spatial relative productions of the society.<sup>10</sup>

However Plato's teleology was devised on his argumentative stands against the Sophists and his early lessons from his great mentor Socrates. We can say that an inspiration to discover the '*Summum Bonum*' or '*the highest good*' propelled him towards teleology to explaining his (Platonic) creationism and cosmology.

But Plato faced the challenge to understand the reality of the universe from the jumble of Heraclitus and Parmenides and desired to infiltrate the Sophistic arguments.

Plato's metaphysics proposed two kinds of reality that encompassed the 'totality of reality'. Plato argued that in a sense Heraclitus was right, if we glance over the Physical reality. The animals, the plants, the objects etc are growing and decaying with the lapses of time. So the world of Physical or material objects is explainable from the idea of Heraclitian flux.

But there is another reality not yielding to transmutation, decay or death, the reality of concepts, ideas, forms and essences. These truths have been described by Parmenides. According to Plato, these truths or realities are like geometrical forms, like a triangle or a quadrangle or other precise geometrical forms. A triangle consists of 180 degree; this basic property is immutable anywhere in the universe. A circle's area is  $A = \pi r^2$ , it is also immutable everywhere in the universe. From these geometrical forms, he harbored the concept of ideas. In Greek *ideai* means both 'form' and 'idea'. Plato argued that absolute concepts are like these forms, which are not subjects to change and transmutation. Therefore, absolute virtues objectively and universally (e.g. absolute justice, righteousness) are like these geometrical forms.

Plato's teleology was to ensure '*highest good*' for human beings and his area of case study was the contemporary Greece.

<sup>6</sup> Kant, Immanuel. Critique of Pure reason. Book II: The dialectical Inferences of Pure reason. Chapter III: The Ideal of Pure reason.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid. section 6.

<sup>8</sup> Lavine. T.Z. 1989 Ed. From Socrates to Sartre: the philosophic quest.p.24. Bantam Books.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid.p.25

Plato argued that people must understand reality objectively to ensure their highest good (Summum Bonum). But for establishing highest good, human beings need to have 'true knowledge'. His true knowledge buttresses two prerequisites: (1) *it must be immutable, unchanging and unchangeable*. (2) *It must be about what is real*.

In his famous 'allegory of the cave,' Plato argued that most of us like some prisoners imprisoned in a dark cave, facing the inside wall and cannot see the fellow prisoners. They have been living here since their birth. They never saw the light of day. Behind them a fire is burning. They are also in chain. They can only see their shadows casting upon the wall. So their world and reality means this shadowy world, like a puppet show on the screen. This is also a political allegory. With our established faiths, views cultured by our norms, conventions and rituals, we also behave like these prisoners in our day to day life. If we want to know the reality in a true sense, we have to come out of this illusory world. But at first we need the true knowledge to shatter this shadowy world. Plato said that only understanding the highest realm of knowledge, perceiving the immutable, intelligible forms by applying dialectics, one can only shatter down this shadowy illusory realm.<sup>11</sup>

Basically Plato was the foremost argumentative philosopher, who preceded Marx many hundred years to break down *false consciousness*. However, Plato also agreed that all human beings do not possess this quality primarily. In his concept of *tripartite soul*, he argued that human being's soul consists upon three elements; a) power to use language and reason, b) bodily appetites, c) spirited element.

Plato opined that power to use language and reason distinguishes man from other living beings. If a man's soul is dominated by this one, s/he is guided by rationality and falls into ambit of first category of human being's natural hierarchy.<sup>12</sup> This man is the philosopher king, who will lead the ideal state with other philosopher kings and the military and producer class will form the *organic totality* in the state with them.

#### IV. PROBLEM'S OF PLATO'S TELEOLOGY

Now let us take a look into the problems of Plato's teleology, which was vehemently repudiated by his great pupil Aristotle later on.

- a) Plato's world is simply dependent upon human intellects and ideas of rationality. How could we define that the primary forms, that will shape the whole intellectual gamut of the 'ideal state', were located correctly? Hence how could we define the first Philosopher kings and their notions of forms?

Who will justify them, when the others are incapable to understand the ideas or forms? If the others can locate them, they are also the philosopher kings. But who will locate them and place them in their appropriate place?

- b) Plato's concept of human being's highest good consists upon 'justice' and 'happiness.'<sup>13</sup> He said that human beings highest good must be the sense of wellbeing or happiness which comes from functioning with concordance of his nature. He then said about the fulfillment of the needs of soul. But the question is: how did he know that? How can we measure the rational proportion of the three elements required for a man's wellbeing?
- c) Plato defined morality as knowing and maintaining balance and harmony between rational and irrational elements of soul<sup>14</sup>. How did Plato know that? What are the tactics to keep balancing and harmonizing them?
- d) As Aristotle mentioned, if Plato is a finite being, subject to change and transmutation, his conceptualized forms are also illusory, subjects to change and transmutation. They are simply the copies of actual objects.<sup>15</sup>
- e) Plato depended upon Dialectics to make out the reasons and get at the bedrocks of the truths. But the Socratic Dialectics or any kind are only applicable to understand the reality basing upon worldly perceptions in the forms of propositions (theses) and counter-propositions (anti-theses).

Basically Plato first developed a rational teleology, but due to the anthropomorphic explanations, the teleology finally tuned out futile and not feasible. Even his concept of highest good that formed his teleology is not beyond controversy.

Plato's concept of highest good is world oriented. Therefore, it is natural that his teleology could not think beyond human being's perceptual realm. The eschatological question is absent in the entire thesis of Plato.

I have mentioned Plato as the real father of Western Philosophy. Alfred North Whitehead said, the history of Western philosophy is only a series of footnotes of Plato<sup>16</sup>.

However the anthropomorphic fallacies of Plato to fathom out the highest good also hunted all the important socio-philosophical history of Europe, who wrote and are still writing the footnotes of Plato with the same mistakes that Plato did.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid. 50

<sup>14</sup> Ibid.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid. p.70

<sup>16</sup> Ibid.p.10

<sup>11</sup> Ibid. p.39, 41

<sup>12</sup> Ibid. p.49

## V. KARL MARX, PROLETARIAT STRUGGLE AND THE CLASSLESS SOCIETY

Marx was a product of the *Kantian turn*. Immanuel Kant was the foremost runner of the philosophical groups, who argued for the social group oriented philosophical arguments. A particular social group gives rise to different philosophical outlook as it holds different ways to perceive reality. After Kant from Hegel through Marx till Jean-Paul Sartre, all claimed that what we know or what we experience actually in part due to our minds or ways of thinking.<sup>17</sup>

Hence Marx defined all the ideologies to be defined as systems of ideas, which are determined by the class conflicts and which reflect and promote the interests of the dominant classes. Therefore ideologies portray distorted types of consciousness and in order to promote the economic interests of certain social classes, they falsify the true realities.

In the Preface of *the German Ideology*, Marx wrote

*Hitherto men have constantly made up for themselves false conceptions about themselves, about what they are and what they ought to be. They have arranged their relationships according to their ideas of God, of normal man, etc. The phantoms of their brains have got out of their hands. They, the creators, have bowed down before their creations. Let us liberate them from the chimeras, the ideas, dogmas, imaginary beings under the yoke of which they are pining away. Let us revolt against the rule of thoughts. Let us teach men, says one, to exchange these imaginations for thoughts which correspond to the essence of man; says the second, to take up a critical attitude to them; says the third, to knock them out of their heads; and -- existing reality will collapse.*<sup>18</sup>

Marx's own definition of ideology is problematic from his own stand. He is trying to promote a particular class and their economic condition and devised provocative means to arise the proletariats. So Marxism falls into the ambit of ideology, when he himself refuted all ideologies.

However Marxist teleology is also a determinism. Marx supported the class struggle and the establishment of the Proletariat leadership as the highest good for the mankind. So he developed teleology. But Marx also said that this class struggle after the maturity of the capitalist stage is inevitable. So it is clearly a deterministic philosophy.

In the Communist Manifesto, Marx showed two stages of the formation of Communism. In its first stage, the communists will establish a government with

absolute dictatorial power in order to guarantee a successful transition of power from capitalism to communism, although according to Marx, state itself is an instrument of class oppression.

In the *Communist Manifesto*, Marx wrote

But with the development of industry, the proletariat not only increases in number; it becomes concentrated in greater masses, its strength grows, and it feels that strength more. The various interests and conditions of life within the ranks of the proletariat are more and more equalized, in proportion as machinery obliterates all distinctions of labor, and nearly everywhere reduces wages to the same low level. The growing competition among the bourgeois, and the resulting commercial crises, make the wages of the workers ever more fluctuating. The increasing improvement of machinery, ever more rapidly developing, makes their livelihood more and more precarious; the collisions between individual workmen and individual bourgeois take more and more the character of collisions between two classes. Thereupon, the workers begin to form combinations (trade unions) against the bourgeois; they club together in order to keep up the rate of wages; they found permanent associations in order to make provision beforehand for these occasional revolts. Here and there, the contest breaks out into riots.<sup>19</sup>

However, after usurping all the means of coercions, e.g. the state, army, court, police the Communists will destroy the entire capitalist power. It will nationalize all the private properties of the states. But this will be the stage of crude, raw and materialistic communism. But the 'forces of production' will be the same as it was in the bourgeois capitalist system. The 'relations of production' will be changed. In the 1st stage of the egalitarian ideology of the crude communism, the people will lead a common low level living standard within a strict equalization of wages.

But in the ultimate stage of communism, the people will no longer be dominated by material world. His product will be recognized by itself, he will engage himself in absolute creative works. Marx wrote that whole of the modern industry was the man's product. Industrial mechanization is the externalization of human hands, ears, eyes, brains. Mills, mines, factories and the total extent of the expanding technologies are simply the externalizations of human beings creative powers. Men's servitude to the newly emerged God viz 'money' alienated him from his product. He sells his creative estranges him from essential human qualities and from

<sup>17</sup> Ibid. p.199

<sup>18</sup> From the preface of 'German Ideology' by Karl Marx. See also. <http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1845/german-ideology/-preface.htm>

<sup>19</sup> Manifesto of the Communist Party, 1848. 1<sup>st</sup> Chapter: Bourgeois and Proletarians; Karl Marx and Frederick Engels. See: <http://www.anu.edu.au/polsci/marx/classics/manifesto.html>

other fellow people. It is Marx's famous concept of *alienation*.<sup>20</sup>

*Marx wrote in the Economic and the Philosophical Manuscript*

This fact expresses merely that the object which labor produces – labor's product – confronts it as something alien, as a power independent of the producer. The product of labor is labor which has been embodied in an object, which has become material: it is the objectification of labor. Labor's realization is its objectification. Under these economic conditions this realization of labor appears as *loss of realization* for the workers; objectification as *loss of the object and bondage to it; appropriation as estrangement, as alienation*.

In the ultimate stage of Communism, Man could overcome his alienation from his labor. The division of labor that objectified his products will be vanished from the world.

#### *The Problems of Marxist teleology*

- Marx confined the ultimate good of the mankind in the hands of the Proletariats. But how did he know that it could usher us towards the best possible solution of Mankind? How did he assume that as the products of the workers are objectified, only the dismantling process of alienation could deliver the mankind? Is it not severely hypothetical? Was it an objective stand or a personal predilection of Marx, which was shaped into a theory basing conjectural elements, where some are rational and some are hypothetical? After the establishment of the USSR in 1917, we saw that the Proletarians got divided into the social groups and the power elites exploited the people sometimes more coercively than the Tsarist Russia. Did not it open a space for the reinterpretation of the Marxist thesis?
- Marx did not tell anything precisely regarding the transformation of the 'crude capitalism' into an 'ultimate communism'. Is it the reason that the Soviet leaderships faced problems and many were confused in providing further explanations and many of the leaders turned into severe despots? Rather W.W.Rostow's *'the stages of Economic growth'* and the arrival at the ultimate stage i.e. 'the age of high mass consumption' through the capitalist process of development from the traditional society, through its successive developed stages like preconditions for take-off, take-off, the drive to maturity is more or less correct in a certain timeframe<sup>21</sup>. Therefore, at least some Western

countries till 80's could exemplify the welfare societies in a functional condition and provided at least a countable and respectable social security.

- Many scholars raised this question, if communism is inevitable through dialectical developments, why are the communist whipping the running horse? Why is any subjective intervention necessary?
- According to Marx, religions are anyway a sort of false conceptions as he described it, *'They, the creators, have bowed down before their creations'*<sup>22</sup>. But his interpretations on behalf of the laborers took the shapes of Biblical religious trajectories, where the workers are getting disillusioned in every turn. His labor class is still underway to reach the expected Jerusalem, which could never be materialized. It is like the journey of the Israelites for the *Promised Land*, but they are getting stumbled in every walk. As Exodus described,

*"They took their journey from Elim, and all the congregation of the children of Israel came to the wilderness of Sin, which is between Elim and Sinai, on the fifteenth day of the second month after their departing out of the land of Egypt.*

*The whole congregation of the children of Israel murmured against Moses and against Aaron in the wilderness; (Exodus 16:1-2)*<sup>23</sup>

Although the Yahweh promised a land, Moses is driving the folk towards the destiny. Did Karl Marx take both the roles viz the roles of Yahweh and Moses, who promised for the inevitable Proletarian revolution, again driving the workers to materialize the promise?

And with their disillusioned eyes after the Soviet case, the workers are saying,

*"We wish that we had died by the hand of Yahweh in the land of Egypt, when we sat by the flesh-pots, when we ate our fill of bread, for you have brought us out into this wilderness, to kill this whole assembly with hunger." (Exodus, 16:3)*

However, the Biblical Israelites were misguided as they are ungrateful towards the salvation act of Moses, but it is also true, they did not or will never attain the Promised Land.

Again, Marx took the role of Daniel to salvage the people from the corrupt and tyrannical kings and monarchs. As Nebuchadnezzar, the king of Daniel's time, told,

*"But at the last Daniel came in before me, whose name was Belteshazzar, according to the name of my god, and in whom is the spirit of the holy gods: and I told the dream before him, [saying],*

<sup>20</sup> Estranged Labour. Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844 by Karl Marx. See: <http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx-works/1844/manuscripts/labour.htm>

<sup>21</sup> "The Five Stages of Growth--A Summary, Chapter 2. 1960. *The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-Communist Manifesto* "W.W. Rostow. p. 4-16. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. See also:

<sup>22</sup> *From the Preface of the German Ideology.*

<sup>23</sup> See also: <http://www.needprayer.com/bible/bible.asp>

*Beltshazzar, master of the magicians, because I know that the spirit of the holy gods is in you, and no secret troubles you, tell me the visions of my dream that I have seen, and the interpretation of it." (Daniel, 4: 8-9)<sup>24</sup>*

Is this new Daniel really capable to interpret the dreams? That is really a big question mark after the collapse of the Soviet Union and the reformation disguise of Dang Xiao Ping in China.

a) *The Neoliberalism and its beloved liberal democracy*

Morally and ethically in strict ideological manner, the Neoliberalism and its cousin democracy do not promote any teleology, if not we consider any immediate interests from the concept of Benthamian Utilitarianism.

Basically Neoliberalism is such an economic and social policy oriented approach based on neoclassical theories of economics that minimizes the role of the state and maximize the private business sector. The term "neoliberalism" has come into the fore of the cultural studies to describe an internationally prevailing ideological paradigm that leads to social, cultural, and political practices and policies that use the language of markets, efficiency, consumer choice, transactional thinking and individual autonomy to shift risk from governments and corporations onto individuals and to extend this kind of market logic into the realm of social and affective relationships<sup>25</sup>.

Neoliberalism seeks to transfer control of the economy from public to the private sector, under the belief that it will produce a more efficient government and improve the economic health of the nation. The definitive statement of the concrete policies advocated by neoliberalism is often taken to be John Williamson's "Washington Consensus," a list of policy proposals that appeared to have gained consensus approval among the Washington-based international economic organizations (like the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank). Williamson's list included ten points<sup>26</sup>:

- Fiscal policy Governments should not run large deficits that have to be paid back by future citizens, and such deficits can only have a short term effect on the level of employment in the economy. Constant deficits will lead to higher inflation and lower productivity, and should be avoided. Deficits should only be used for occasional stabilization purposes.
- Redirection of public spending from subsidies (especially what neoliberals call "indiscriminate subsidies") and other spending neoliberals deem wasteful toward broad-based provision of key pro-growth, pro-poor services like primary education, primary health care and infrastructure investment.

- Tax reform– broadening the tax base and adopting moderate marginal tax rates to encourage innovation and efficiency;
- Interest rates that are market determined and positive (but moderate) in real terms;
- Floating exchange rates;
- Trade liberalization – liberalization of imports, with particular emphasis on elimination of quantitative restrictions (licensing, etc.); any trade protection to be provided by law and relatively uniform tariffs; thus encouraging competition and long term growth
- Liberalization of the "capital account" of the balance of payments, that is, allowing people the opportunity to invest funds overseas and allowing foreign funds to be invested in the home country.
- Privatization of state enterprises; Promoting market provision of goods and services which the government cannot provide as effectively or efficiently, such as telecommunications, where having many service providers promotes choice and competition.
- Deregulation – abolition of regulations that impede market entry or restrict competition, except for those justified on safety, environmental and consumer protection grounds, and prudent oversight of financial institutions;
- Legal security for property rights; and,
- Financialization of capital.

Neoliberalism got imbedded in the Westerner World after the Second World war. David Harvey notes that under this new system free trade was regulated "under a system of fixed exchange rates anchored by the US dollar's convertibility into gold at a fixed price. Fixed exchange rates were incompatible with free flows of capital.<sup>27</sup>

So, basically Neoliberalism and its cousin democracy are basically modern application and proliferation of strictly materialistic Benthamian Utilitarianism, where Jeremy Bentham argued that the right act or policy was that which would cause "the greatest good for the greatest number of people", also known as "the greatest happiness principle", or the principle of utility. In the present context of nation state, this greatest number people will be calculated within the state boundary. Bentham said,

"Nature has placed mankind under the governance of two sovereign masters, pain and pleasure. It is for them alone to point out what we ought to do, as well as to determine what we shall do. On the one hand the

<sup>24</sup> See also: <http://www.needprayer.com/bible/bible.asp>

<sup>25</sup> From Wikipedia. See: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Neoliberalism#cite\\_ref-6](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Neoliberalism#cite_ref-6)

<sup>26</sup> Ibid.

<sup>27</sup> Harvey, David .2005. *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*, Oxford University Press.



standard of right and wrong, on the other the chain of causes and effects, are fastened to their throne."<sup>28</sup>

After the 30s depression the Macro Economics of John Maynard Keynes or in the recent Economic recession of the West, the trials of people are only to come out of the prevailing economic catastrophe and reformulate economy to reshape the hedonistic and sybaritic Utilitarian philosophy. The liberal democracy is nothing but the lever of the Neoliberal philosophy within and outside the statecraft.

b) *The Problems of liberal democracy*

The liberal democracy has no moral agency other than its own people and they elect their governments. Robert Dahl, the rector of modern democracy, considered this process to be a procedural minimum, where the people in most of the cases elect their parliamentarian members and their political participation is confined within this extent. But beyond this "procedural minimum", there is not much to do with democracy in most of the countries. Two of the leading democracy scholars, Philippe Schmitter and Terry Karl (1991), hold that democracy does not consist of a single unique set of institutions. Theories of 'classical' democracy assumed decision-making based on direct participation, leading to consensus. The assembled citizenry was expected to agree on a course of action after listening to the alternatives and weighing up their respective merits. However commonly accepted image of democracy nowadays identifies it with *majority rule*.<sup>29</sup>

In many non-Western countries democracy is characterized by ethnic cleavages, where majority rule might involve serious problems. Schmitter and Karl asked the following questions,

What happens when a properly assembled majority (especially a stable, self-perpetuating one) regularly makes decisions that harm some minority (especially a threatened cultural or ethnic group)?<sup>30</sup>

In these circumstances, the dominant Anglo-Saxon model of *majoritarian democracy* (Westminster democracy) may not be able to handle the cultural or religious conflicts of deeply divided or segmented societies with their minorities.

Therefore, the majoritarian rule is failed to ensure minoritarian interests, when it is the 'political field' that promotes 'winner takes all.'

c) *Schmitter and Karl (1991: 76) wrote*

The specific form democracy takes is contingent upon a country's socioeconomic conditions

as well as its entrenched state structures and policy practices.<sup>31</sup>

The hideous facts will be clarified, if we consider the democratization process from the third world context. We will see that in most of the cases, the democratic formulation did not achieve the matured stage. Rather, it opened a third frontier, a 'grey zone' between 'open autocracy' and 'liberal democracy'.

Schneider and Schmitter (2004) draw the distinction between the liberalization of autocracy and the consolidation of democracy. Liberalization of autocracy is exclusively concerned with political liberalization– defined as the process of making effective certain rights that protect both individuals and social groups from arbitrary or illegal acts committed by the state or third parties.

Consolidation of democracy can be defined as the processes that make mutual trust and reassurance among the relevant actors. It involves the willingness of actors to compete according to pre-established rules and, if they lose, they consent to the winners' right to govern.<sup>32</sup>

Therefore, according to Merkel (2004) most of the 'electoral democracies' (i.e. the democracies that delimit the people's participation only within adult suffrage, secret balloting and regular elections) are 'defective democracy' a diminished, sub-type of (liberal) democracy lacking the respect to the rule of law, horizontal accountability and their governing powers.<sup>33</sup>

But the political scientists also looked at the exogenous factors that create problems in democratic process.

According to Vanhanen (1989), the more the resources of a country (capital, education, natural resources, land, water etc.) are concentrated in the hands of the few, the less democracy can develop.<sup>34</sup>

In the age of hyper capitalism capital, education, resources are concentrated in the few hands and the global Capitalism devises the shape of local or peripheral capitalism. So, only the internal hands are not enough capable to consolidate the inland democracies.

Some other problems of democracy could be chalked out in the following ways:

- It is so materialistically devised that the leaders could be utilized and exploited by monetary or pleasure oriented ruses. The recent monetary and sex scandals are glaring examples.
- It is not safeguarding for people from moral decadence, as all the liberal democratic states
- produce huge weaponry and pornographies that promote moral and spiritual decadence.

<sup>28</sup> Bentham, Jeremy. 1781. *The Principles of Morals and Legislation*. p. 1.

<sup>29</sup> Mentioned in 'Challenging Common Assumptions on Corruption and Democratizations' of 'Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation, SDC.' P.9.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid.

<sup>31</sup> Ibid.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid. p.11

- The recent economic recession proved that after any long termed and unmediated warfare and climatic cataclysms (that are also usually promoted by so-called liberal states), the so-called economic planning cannot revive the economic power.

Islam

What is the teleology of Islam? I believe that the Muslims scholars could opine differently in this issue.

We better try to understand the Islamic teleology from the premise of the creation of human beings. Because this human being is not an ordinary being in Islam, rather he bears the absolute essence of the Supreme Being in himself. How could we understand that?

We can read some striking verses of the holy Koran and pursue the Socratic dialectics to get at our solution. We will mention some verses from the holy Koran and pose some important and relevant questions to steer our argumentations to a particular direction.

*And when thy Lord said unto the angels: Lo! I am about to place a viceroy in the earth, they said: Wilt thou place therein one who will do harm therein and will shed blood, while we, we hymn Thy praise and sanctify Thee? He said: Surely I know that which ye know not. (Al-Bqara, 2:30)<sup>35</sup>*

It is quite noteworthy that although the angels had been serving their LORD, HE needed a viceroy on Earth.

*The question is, what qualities did this viceroy possess that even the immaculate angels lacked?*

Then ALLAH taught Adam all the names of the Universe, which were even unknown to the Angels.

*And He taught Adam all the names, then showed them to the angels, saying: Inform Me of the names of these, if ye are truthful.*

*They said: Be glorified! We have no knowledge saving that which Thou hast taught us. Lo! Thou, only Thou, art the Knower, the Wise.*

*He said: O Adam! Inform them of their names, and when he had informed them of their names, He said: Did I not tell you that I know the secret of the heavens and the earth? And I know that which ye disclose and which ye hide. (Al-Baqara, 2: 31-33)*

*If these angels serve the LORD in all the visible and invisible universes, could these mere names be unknown to them?*

*If the answer is 'yes', our next question is, do these names hint some ordinary names?*

The answer is *no*.

Because after this incident, ALLAH ordered the angels to bow down before Adam.

*And when We said unto the angels: Prostrate yourselves before Adam, they fell prostrate, all save Iblis. He demurred through pride, and so became a disbeliever. (Al-Baqara, 2:34)*

Therefore, we can conclude that those names, which ALLAH taught Adam, were not mere ordinary names.

*But our next question is: If ALLAH is the only BEING THAT commands worship from everything, how could HE order the angels to prostrate before Adam? is it not self-contradictory for LORD's judgement?*

Let us read the holy Koran again,

*And (remember) when thy Lord said unto the angels: Lo! I am creating a mortal out of potter's clay of black mud altered,*

*So, when I have made him and have breathed into him of My Spirit, do ye fall down, prostrating yourselves unto him.*

*So the angels fell prostrate, all of them together*

*Save Iblis. He refused to be among the prostrate. (Al-Hijr, 15:28-31)*

Here it is clear that HIS viceroy contained some of HIS eternal essences to represent his eternal soul, which the angels lack and they therefore prostrated before him. Here it is also clear that having the divine essence, Adam turned into the effigy of LORD. So after Satan had refused to prostrate before Adam, he turned into an outcaste and cursed one.

*He said: O Iblis! What aileth thee that thou art not among the prostrate?*

*He said: I am not one to prostrate myself unto a mortal whom Thou hast created out of potter's clay of black mud altered!*

*He said: Then go thou forth from hence, for lo! thou art outcast. (Al-Hijr, 15:32-34)*

Even from the Bible, we get also almost similar instances.

*And the LORD God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul. (Genesis, 2:7)<sup>36</sup>*

And also,

*And out of the ground the LORD God formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air; and brought them unto Adam to see what he would call them: and whatsoever Adam called every living creature, that was the name there of.*

*And Adam gave names to all cattle, and to the fowl of the air, and to every beast of the field; but for Adam there was not found an help meet for him. (Genesis, 2:19-20)*

<sup>35</sup> Here all the English versions of the Holy Koran are taken from Pickthal's translation.

<sup>36</sup> Here all the Biblical references have been taken from the King James Version.

Therefore we can guess that the most successful representation of LORD was devised through human beings, who (basically the internally flourished beings) have the potentiality to understand almost all that LORD knows in the visible and invisible universes (the knowledge of Gayeb) that even the angels do not know.

Probably through the names, Adam was taught both the apparent and inherent qualities of the beings and entities of the visible and invisible universes.

Definitely all the human beings could not represent ALLAH, it is not possible either.

The next question is, *who are those people, who are HIS viceroys and represent HIM on earth?*

In answer of this question, we can pursue the Platonic Philosophy. Plato said that Justice, morality and other values are remaining in the universe as some forms just like the geometrical forms. From this idea, Saint Thomas Aquinas argued in his famous book *Summa Theologiæ*<sup>37</sup> that the visible world with its finite concepts and immutable characters are worldly. The Kingdom of Heaven of Christ is the real and immutable world, where all values are immutable forms of Plato, as they are absolute and devised by God.

We can sum up from our prior arguments that Adam and his progenies received some divine essence from God. Therefore they can only represent their LORD on earth. Those selected progenies of Adam, who are the Prophets and Imams according to Islam, can represent the essences (*tangible and subtle*) of God.

As for example: Islam promotes "*Justice*" for the sake of ultimate betterment of mankind. Islam wants to ensure justice on earth, as it ensures justice in the hereafter from the Creator of the Universe "*ALLAH*".

Islam at first clarifies its theogonical and cosmological issue punctiliously. Therefore, any anthropomorphic or relative or time-space bounded "*Justice*" is no longer required by Mankind, as the absolute way for Justice has been proposed by the Absolute or Supreme Being of the universe. The Holly Quran clarifies the sublime state of ALLAH,

*He is Allah, the One!*

*Allah, the eternally Besought of all!*

*He begetteth not nor was begotten.*

*And there is none comparable unto Him. (112, Surah Al-Ikhlâs)*

As Islam's concern is not time-space bounded or relative human consciousness oriented logic and Justice, the Holly Quran provides us some hints on the Superiority of ALLAH to portray the process of Justice in Islamic faith and the formation of its epistemology.

The Holly Quran says,

*And if thou wert to ask them: Who created the heavens and the earth, and constrained the sun and the moon (to their appointed work)? They would say: Allah. How then are they turned away?*

*Allah maketh the provision wide for whom He will of His bondmen, and straiteneth it for whom (He will). Lo! Allah is Aware of all things. (Surah Ankaboot, 29: 61-62)*

Justice is a concept, which is broad, sometimes unfathomable and susceptible. In the human world its components varies from one country to another. Therefore the mode of Justice takes different shapes in different timeframes and even in different régimes of a single state, which may not be acceptable by the opponents of the incumbent authority frequently. But in the divine realm, there must be a true and absolute form of Justice, which Plato called *the form of Justice*, the divine justice. How can we promote that justice in the world, when anyone lacks the divine essence?

The answer is clear from our earlier arguments. The Prophets and the immaculate Imams could ensure that justice. As long as these viceroys exist on earth, the world does not lack the divine agency to promote justice. Therefore the Shiites especially the Twelver Jafari School believes that the age of the Imams started after the demise of the Holy Prophet, which will continue till the judgement day.

However all the human values were formulated and processed by such a "Being", which has absolute authority over everything with absolute knowledge or WHO HIMSELF is the source of all knowledge. The Holy Quran says,

*Should He not know what He created? And He is the Subtile, the Aware. (Surah Al-Mulk, 67:14)*

And the Holy Koran said,

*Lo! We have created everything by measure. (Surah Al-Qamar, 55:49)*

So if any human being cannot understand this subtleness of ALLAH's regulations, if he cannot understand HIS very accurate measures, how could he establish justice, when human relations are too subtle and the question of justice demands too appropriateness. The answer is conspicuous. The Prophets and the Imams could understand the divine forms and the values as they contain the divine essence and represent ALLAH successfully.

The Holy Koran says,

*Lo! Allah wrongeth not even of the weight of an ant; and if there is a good deed, He will double it and will give (the doer) from His presence an immense reward. (Surah Nisa, 4: 40)*

The Prophets and the infallible Imams also represent the same righteousness on earth. And the wise men and

<sup>37</sup> From *Summa Theologiæ* of St. Thomas Aquinas.

sages could make out this truth from the Cosmic maintainance. The Holy Koran says,

*Lo! In the creation of the heavens and the earth and (in) the difference of night and day are tokens (of His Sovereignty) for men of understanding, (Surah Aal-e-Imran, 3:190)*

*But when all the human beings are not infallible and they are subject to mistakes and errors, do they have no way to be redeemed?*

*Is Islam very rigid from its trajectory of teleology and there is no way for those, who do not pursue the divine missions?*

The Shiite Islam believes that ALLAH kept some secrets in HIMSELF. HE reveals those in the proper times. This concept is called Bada. If any deviated Muslim can understand her/his mistake and s/he repents in ALLAH's name, ALLAH could change the course of her/his fate. This is called Bada.<sup>38</sup>

In support of this, it is said in the Holy Koran,

*Allah effaceth what He will, and establisheth (what He will), and with Him is the source of ordinance. (surah-Rad, 13:39)*

Bada is wrongly conceptualized among many Muslims. Bada means Mahuwa Isbat i.e. alteration of any earlier divine ruling by a new one. It precedes the final ruling of ALLAH. It provides hopes for those who committed felonies and sheer crimes and lead them towards hopes and concentration in their prayers.<sup>39</sup>

Ayatullah Murtada Mutahhari wrote,

*The concept of bada' has an apparent meaning which few would regard as acceptable. Some have even criticized the Shi'ah for believing in bada'. The meaning of bada' is revision in Divine Destiny (qada'), meaning that God has not fixed a definite and final form for the course of human history. In other words, God says to man: "You yourselves are in charge of the fulfilment of Divine Destiny, and it is you who can advance, stop or reverse the course of history." There is no blind determinism either on the part of nature or the means of life or from the viewpoint of Divine Destiny, to rule over history. This is one way of looking at man, his history and destiny.<sup>40</sup>*

If there were no concept like Bada, the infidels might have accused that they would have not been misguided, if ALLAH had not predestined their futures. But ALLAH dismissed their accusation in the final revealed text.

*They who are idolaters will say: Had Allah willed, we had not ascribed (unto Him) partners neither had our fathers,*

<sup>38</sup> Asl-Al Shiah wa Usuliah by Allama Muhammad Husayn Kashif al-Ghita. From the Bengali version.p.117-8, The Ahl al-Bayt World assembly and Iraq association Bangladesh.

<sup>39</sup> Ibid. p. 118.

<sup>40</sup> History of Human Evolution by Ayatullah Murtada Mutahhari. Imam Reza (AS) network. See: <http://www.imamreza.net/eng/imamreza.-php?id=641>

*nor had we forbidden aught. Thus did those who were before them give the lie (to Allah's messengers) till they tasted of the fear of Us. (Sural al-Anaam, 6:48)*

Otherwise the following verses of the Holy Koran becomes futile and meaningless.

*Lo! We have shown him the way, whether he be grateful or disbelieving. (Surah al-Insan, 76:3)*

And,

*And that man hath only that for which he maketh effort, (Surah An Najm, 53:39)*

This concept is even applicable for a whole nation from a holistic approach. ALLAH's messengers could usher the people the right tracks, but the people will have to bear the outcomes of their own deeds. The Holy Koran, therefore, says,

*Whosoever goeth right, it is only for (the good of) his own soul that he goeth right, and whosoever erreth, erreth only to its hurt. No laden soul can bear another's load, We never punish until we have sent a messenger. (Surah Al-Isra, 17:15).*

In Surah Ar-Rad, ALLAH underpinned the concept of human-beings' 'AmI' or 'deed' in a wider magnitude, in the context of the nations. The Holy Koran says,

*Lo! Allah changeth not the condition of a folk until they (first) change that which is in their hearts; (Surah Ar-Rad, 13:11)*

d) *Understanding Islamic teleology from the above arguments*

From the above argumentations, we can summarize that the teleology of Islam means the representation of ALLAH by human beings through flourishing HIS divine values and essences in finite forms. But as the finite beings, Human beings have limitations and they are subject to errors, S/he has ways to repent and revise her/his attitudes and do works accordingly. As ALLAH is infinite, the messengers of ALLAH came to represent HIS essences from their finite forms for Mankind. Here lies the ultimate Summum Bonum of Mankind. The ultimate teleology of Islam is also hidden in this trajectory devised by ALLAH, where HE is strict to HIS ideational formulations, but HE is not without mercy.

*Lo! Allah wrongeth not mankind in aught; but mankind wrong themselves. (Surah Yunus, 10:44)*

The Islamic teleology is neither defunct in case of hereafter or eschatological questions like Platonic philosophy or Marxism nor it bound the ultimate summum Bonum of Mankind in the hand of the Proletariats, whose applicability is questionable, if we glance on the history especially in case of the former Soviet Union.

It is not devised by a Prime Mover of Aristotle, after setting the Universe in motion He remains out of the unraveling process<sup>41</sup>.

It is not an absolute compatibalist philosophy that underscores the '*absolute free will*' of human beings, nor is it absolutely a deterministic or noncompatinialist philosophy that omits utterly the 'free will' of human beings. Rather it is such a finest synergetic concept that bridges between deterministic and compatibalist arguments, which proves rationally the existence of God and HIS true representation through Mankind, at the same time it defends Human beings to be fate oriented and ushers the best ways for the salvation of Mankind in the world and in the hereafter.

17. W.W. Rostow. The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-Communist Manifesto. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

### REFERENCES RÉFÉRENCES REFERENCIAS

1. Aquinas, St. Thomas. Summa Theologiæ. See: <http://www.ccel.org/ccel/aquinas/summa.txt>
2. Bentham, Jeremy. 1781. The Principles of Morals and Legislation. See: <http://www.constitution.org/-jb/pml.htm>
3. Challenging Common Assumptions on Corruption and Democratizations', 'Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation, SDC.
4. Harvey, David. 2005. A Brief History of Neoliberalism, Oxford University Press.
5. Hume, David. A Treatise of Human Nature. 1967 ed. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
6. Kant, Immanuel. Critique of Pure reason. Book II: The dialectical Inferences of Pure reason. Chapter III: The Ideal of Pure reason.
7. Kashif al-Ghita, Allama Muhammad Husayn. Asl-Al Shiah wa Usuliah. From the Bengali version. The Ahl al-Bayt World assembly and Iraq association Bangladesh.
8. Lavine. T.Z. 1989 Ed. From Socrates to Sartre: the philosophic quest. Bantam Books.
9. Marx, Karl. The German Ideology.
10. Marx, Karl. Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844.
11. Marx, Karl and Engels, Frederick Manifesto of the Communist Party, 1848.
12. Mutahhari, Ayatullah Murtada. Human Evolution. Imam Reza (AS) network. See: <http://www.-imamreza.net/eng/imamreza.php?-id=641>
13. Plato. Metaphysics see: <http://www.perseus.tufts.-edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0052%3Abook%3D12%3Asection%3D1072b>
14. The Holy Bible King James Version.
15. The Holy Koran Pickthal's translation.
16. Tzetzes, John Book of Hisotry 2. trabslated by Francis R. Walton. See: <http://www.math.nyu.-edu/~crrres/Archimedes/Lever/LeverQuotes.html>

<sup>41</sup> Lavine. T.Z. 1989 Ed. From Socrates to Sartre: the philosophic quest.p.73. Bantam Books.