

PalArch's Journal of Archaeology
of Egypt / Egyptology

**THE CONCEPT, STATUS AND SIGNIFICANCE OF GOD: A
COMPARATIVE STUDY OF ISLAM AND WESTERN DIVERTING
THERE OF**

Mr. Ghulam Sarwar¹, Dr Atiq ur Rehman², Dr. Ihsan ur Rahman Ghauri³

¹Assistant Professor of Islamic Studies, Government Post Graduate College Pasrur, Punjab, Pakistan.

²Associate professor, Dptt. Of Islamic Studies, University of Engeneering and Technology, Lahore, Pakistan.

³Associate Professor, Inst. Of Islamic Studies, University of the Punjab, Pakistan.

Mr. Ghulam Sarwar, Dr Atiq ur Rehman, Dr. Ihsan ur Rahman Ghauri , The Concept, Status And Significance Of God: A Comparative Study Of Islam And Western Diverting There Of , Palarch's Journal Of Archaeology Of Egypt/Egyptology 18(4). ISSN 1567-214x.

KeyWords: Islam, God, Holy Quran, Divine, Western Philosophical Tradition.

Abstract:

This research article dealt with the concept and status of God in Islam and Western philosophical and intellectual tradition; it also endeavoured to investigate Western philosophical diverting from this once popular concept of an omniscient, omnipresent and omnipotent Existence and consequences thereof.

Islam highly emphasizes the presence of a ubiquitous God who is the Creator, the Owner, the Planner and the Mover of this entire universe; its Divine book – the Holy Quran – variously proves the existence of a single God with no partner at all. This concept is considered to be the foundation stone of the edifice of Islam without which this edifice will be demolished in too. It is also evident from the study of the Western philosophical tradition that there has been the concept of God in one form or the other till a time reached when a large stratum of Western philosophers relinquished this creed and they replaced God by Reason---the new God of the West. So, in this

backdrop, this paper also made an effort to trace those causes which paved the way for this diverting from the concept, status and significance of God.

Introduction:

Humanity has passed through myriads of twists and turns of history; there have been a lot of religions, ideas and philosophies to be followed by the Homo sapiens. So far as the concept of God is concerned, it has been the part and parcel of every religion in one form or the other. In this, the civilized as well as the barbaric nations of the globe have been on the same page. This concept of God has been appeared in various names like The Absolute, The Truth, The Transcendental, The Ultimate Reality, The Divine etc.

However, it is evident from the study of the human history that there has been the idea of a divine existence which is the cause of all the causes and is responsible for the creation of this whole drama of universe. Throughout the course of history, numerous civilizations emerged in various parts of the Globe and each of them presented a doctrine that was based on a concept of divine power though with different type of nomenclature. Ancient civilizations like the Egyptian civilization, the Indus Valley Civilization, the Chinese civilization, Mesopotamian Civilizations etc. has the notion of a Supreme Being responsible for the creation of this whole universe.

However, there have been people who have utterly disregarded the existence of any religion whatever. Some have, after having impressed by the dazzling progress of science, refused the Religion as such; they are of the view that it is the age of science now and the epoch of religion has gone for good. Some, under the influence of philosophy, have put a question mark upon the possibility of God--- the ubiquitous, the omnipotent.

In the following lines a strenuous effort to analyze the concept and status of God in Islam and Western philosophical diverting thereof will be made in order to show that the concept of God is an indispensable part of the Islamic faith and Western philosophical tradition was in line with Islam till a particular period of time; then a diverting to this fundamental creed took place and a big stratum of Western Philosophers commenced to degrade and mock the idea of God/Logos.

Research Questions:

1. What is the concept of God in Islam with special reference to the Noble Quran?
2. What are the views of Muslim Scholars about God?
3. What was the concept of a God in the Western Philosophical tradition?
4. When a diverting from this basic dogma occurred?
5. Is this diverting logical?
6. What is the outcome of this diverting?
7. A comparison of both the stances regarding God's concept and status.

Discussions:

In the following lines, we will endeavour to discuss the concept, status and significance of God as propounded by Islam by quoting a number of verses of the Holy Quran which signify that God, which is called by the name of Allah by the Holy Book of Islam, is the sole Creator of the universe as it is known to us and also of the universe which is still beyond the human knowledge and intellect. And, He is not only the Maker but also a vigilant Organizer and all-knowing Administrator of the whole universe. We will also cite some famous Muslim scholars who have, by their own particular way, given the logic and proof for the existence of God.

First, it should be noted that Islam as a religion is pragmatic not static; it presents a concept of a single God/Creator Who is alive and is having a keen supervision and administration of the universe by involving Himself in its whole affairs. This and other universes, known or unknown to Man at the moment, is the creation of one and only God whom Quran gives the name Allah. That is why the Holy Quran narrates the unmatched and exemplary craftsmanship of God in the following words:

صُنِعَ اللَّهُ الَّذِي أَنْقَنَ كُلَّ شَيْءٍ ۖ إِنَّهُ خَبِيرٌ بِمَا تَفْعَلُونَ

“The Work of Allah, Who perfected all things, verily! He is Well-Acquainted with what you do.”¹

Similarly, the Holy Quran, in surah-e- Baqara, categorically proclaims the oneness of God and negates the existence of any other gods whatsoever. Verse number 163 reads:

وَالْهُكْمُ إِلَهُ وَاحِدٌ ۚ لَا إِلَهَ إِلَّا هُوَ الرَّحْمَنُ الرَّحِيمُ

“Your Allah is One Allah; there is no Allah save Him, the Beneficent, the Merciful”².

In this way, in surah Nahl, verse number 20, the Glorious Quran maintains that when each and every thing of this universe including Man himself is just a creation of a Creator then it is incumbent upon the human beings to worship Him only. Moreover, they must present their prayers before Him because He is the one Who can respond to their prayers. The Noble Quran says:

وَالَّذِينَ يَدْعُونَ مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ لَا يَخْلُقُونَ شَيْئًا وَهُمْ يُخْلَقُونَ

“Those whom they (Al-Mushrikin) invoke besides Allah have not created anything, but are themselves created.”³

So far as the profit and loss of the humans are concerned, these are solely in the hands of Allah Almighty and not in the hands of the so-called false gods. According to the Quran all gods but Allah have nothing to do with affairs of human beings. This is why, the Holy Quran proclaims this sublime and eternal reality in the following everlasting words:

¹. Al-Naml, verse No. 88.

². Al-baqara, verse No.163.

³. Al-Nahl, verse No.20.

وَلَا تَدْعُ مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ مَا لَا يَنْفَعُكَ وَلَا يَضُرُّكَ ۚ فَإِنْ فَعَلْتَ فَإِنَّكَ إِذًا مِنَ الظَّالِمِينَ

“And cry not, beside Allah, unto that which cannot profit thee nor hurt thee, for if thou didst so then wert thou of the wrong-doers.”⁴

The Holy Quran emphasizes that if one uses his reason in a positive way, one would come to the conclusion that there should be only one God of this whole universe because this is in line with the logic and wisdom. And if there be two Gods working side by side, it would become impossible to administer the affairs of the universe properly and there would emerge a devastating clash between them. This undeniable truth has been narrated in the following impressive and thought provoking words:

لَوْ كَانَ فِيهِمَا آلِهَةٌ إِلَّا اللَّهُ لَفَسَدَتَا ۚ فَسُبْحَانَ اللَّهِ رَبِّ الْعَرْشِ عَمَّا يَصِفُونَ

“If there were therein gods beside Allah, then verily both (the heavens and the earth) had been disordered. Glorified be Allah, the Lord of the Throne, from all that they ascribe unto Him.”⁵

The Sun, the Moon, and the rotation of days and nights have been presented as the very signs of Allah Almighty. In reality, the Sun is revolving in his its own orbit and the Moon in its own one; both of them do not intervene in the affairs of the other and continue to revolve in their respective orbits for the billions of years. So far as day and night are concerned, they are also bound by a strict system of checks and balances; they follow a universal rule, too; they also do not meddle in the each others' affairs. That is why the Noble Quran reads:

لَا الشَّمْسُ يَنْبَغِي لَهَا أَنْ تُدْرِكَ الْقَمَرَ وَلَا اللَّيْلُ سَابِقُ النَّهَارِ ۚ وَكُلٌّ فِي فَلَكٍ يَسْبَحُونَ

“It is not permitted to the Sun to catch up the Moon, nor can the Night outstrip the Day: Each (just) swims along in (its own) orbit (according to Law).”⁶

Then, the Glorious Quran proves the existence of God by challenging the human beings they should examine the discipline built-in in the whole system of universe; everything is bound by some eternal law and cannot violate it in any way. The industry of Allah is sui generis and faultless, too. So Man is unable to find any fault with Allah Almighty – the most Wise, the most Perfect. In surah Mulk, Allah challenges the mankind:

الَّذِي خَلَقَ سَبْعَ سَمَاوَاتٍ طِبَاقًا ۚ مَا تَرَى فِي خَلْقِ الرَّحْمَنِ مِنْ تَفْوُتٍ ۚ فَارْجِعِ الْبَصَرَ ۖ هَلْ تَرَى مِنْ فُطُورٍ

“Who hath created seven heavens in harmony. Thou (Muhammad) canst see no fault in the Beneficent One's creation; then look again: Canst thou see any rifts?”⁷

The above mentioned verses of the Holy Quran testify that God is one and is the sole creator of both heaven and earth and of everything lying between them, too. Thus, it becomes imperative for the mankind not only to obey him but also worship him because He is the one Who has no partner whatsoever. This very fact has been mentioned and stressed in the following verse with an exalted style:

⁴ . Al-Younus, verse No.106.

⁵ . Al-umbiah, verse No. 22.

⁶ . Al-Yaseen, verse No. 40.

⁷ . Al-Mulk, verse No. 03.

وَمَا أُمِرُوا إِلَّا لِيَعْبُدُوا إِلَهًا وَاحِدًا ۚ لَآ إِلَهَ إِلَّا هُوَ ۚ سُبْحٰنَهُ عَمَّا يُشْرِكُونَ

“And they were not commanded but to worship only One God. There is no god but He. Pure is He from what they associate with Him.”⁸

Islam’s God is one who is ubiquitous and omnipotent so he has the right to be worshiped only and those who call or pray other than He are just illusions and all their efforts will be fizzled out in the end. That is why Quran says:

وَمَا يَتَّبِعِ الَّذِينَ يَدْعُونَ مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ شُرَكَاءَ ۖ إِنَّ يَتَّبِعُونَ إِلَّا الظَّنَّ وَإِنْ هُمْ إِلَّا يَخْرُصُونَ

“And those who worship and invoke others besides Allah, in fact they follow not the (Allah's so-called) partners, they follow only a conjecture and they only invent lies.”⁹

Similarly, Islam’s God is not only the Owner of the heaven and earth but also he is the very sovereign who will be the real Owner of the Day of Judgment; no one would have any control but He in the life hereafter. In the very commencement of surah Furqan, this reality has been illustrated very clearly and impressively.

الَّذِي لَهُ مُلْكُ السَّمٰوٰتِ وَالْاَرْضِ وَلَمْ يَتَّخِذْ وَلَدًا وَلَمْ يَكُنْ لَهُ شَرِيْكٌ فِي الْمُلْكِ وَخَلَقَ كُلَّ شَيْءٍ فَقَدَرَهُ تَقْدِيرًا

“He unto Whom belongeth the Sovereignty of the heavens and the earth, He hath chosen no son nor hath He any partner in the Sovereignty. He hath created everything and hath meted out for it a measure.”¹⁰

وَاتَّخَذُوا مِنْ دُونِهِ اِلٰهَةً لَّا يَخْلُقُوْنَ شَيْئًا وَهُمْ يُخْلَقُوْنَ وَلَا يَمْلِكُوْنَ لٰنَفْسِهِمْ ضَرًّا وَلَا نَفْعًا وَلَا يَمْلِكُوْنَ مَوْتًا وَلَا حَيٰوةً وَلَا نَشُوْرًا

“Yet have they taken, besides him, gods that can create nothing but are themselves created; that have no control of hurt or good to themselves; nor can they control death nor life nor resurrection.”¹¹

This was a brief account of the concept and status of God in Islam. Though there are numerous verses of the Holy Book of Islam which narrates this idea of God in a very lucid manner and make Man understand it in its letter and spirit in order to live a life which will benefit him not only in this world but also in the hereafter – the fundamental pillar of the edifice of Islam.

Now, we will endeavour to give some opinions of Muslim scholars who view the existence of an indispensable reality that cannot be denied in any way. Let’s start with the argument of Dr. Khalifa Abdul Hakeem who renders a number of instances in his notable book namely “ The Islamic Ideology”.

There are so many Quranic verses that testify the very existence of God. Besides, the peace and harmony that lie in the Universe has been presented as a proof of God’s existence. However, the chief Quranic argument to prove the existence of God is the teleological – relating to the doctrine of design and purpose in the material world – argument from law and order in nature. Nature is a

⁸ . Al-Tauba verse No. 31.

⁹ . Al-Yunus verse No. 66.

¹⁰ . Al-Furqan verse No. 02.

¹¹ . Al-Furqan verse No. 03.

reign of law and not a product of capricious wills. The rational unity of nature follows from the rationality of its One Creator.¹²

In Islam, God is the absolute ruler of the universe and is the causes of all causes.¹³ So far as the authenticity of the Holy Quran is concerned, according to famous Western author Karen Armstrong, it is the holy words of God and its authority remains absolute.¹⁴ The Quran gives the idea of a God who transcends all bounds of time and space because these are mere creatures of Him. Within the bounds of this “time”, it is impossible to understand his scheme of this universe. His will has been the cause of the creations of each and every thing – bigger or smaller; visible or invisible – of this universe. That is why notable Muslim scholar Dr. Khalifa Abdul Hakeem in his well-known work “Islamic Ideology” maintains:

“The universe or nature is God’s volitional creation because He is a creative will. Creation in time can never be completely understood because time itself is created category. The infinity of his attributes must create infinity of worlds or universes; our material universe, with all its immensities of time and space, may be only one of His creations.”¹⁵ Frithjof Shuon, who

¹² . Dr. Khalifa Abdul Hakeem, *Islamic Ideology*, 10th Ed. (Lahore: Institute of Islamic Culture Lahore, 2006), 24.

¹³ . *Ibid*, 23.

¹⁴ . Armstrong, *Muhammad: Prophet for Our Time* (London: Harper Press, 2006), 16.

embraced Islam and got the name Isa Nuruddin, wrote many books that deal with Islam and the transcendental aspects, too. In the foreword of one of the notable books of Isa Nuruddin, Annemarie Schimmel writes that Shuon takes the concept of God seriously

“It is this aspect of Islam which is lucidly shown in Frithjof Schuon’s work: God is the Reality, and to be a true Muslim means to believe in the reality of the Absolute and the dependence of all things on the Absolute.”¹⁶

So, it is obligatory to Man that he should always kneel down before God and pray to him alone because God is the only entity in the universe to be worshiped and to be prayed to. This is why the famous dictum of Rene Descartes that is “*cogito ergo sum*” (I think, therefore I am) has been changed by Schuon by “*sum ergo oro*” (I am, therefore I pray).¹⁷ This very fact is the evident of Schuon’s firm belief in the concept and status of God. Schuon further opines that God being the Absolute ruler of the all universes always acts as a Creator and intervenes in every phenomenon, and there are no secondary causes, no intermediate principles, no natural laws which can come between God and the cosmic fact.¹⁸

He still writes that the all-powerfulness of the Allah Almighty is the supreme and sublime attribute which compels every creation – Man or otherwise – to accept the slavery of Him in order to prove themselves true dependents of Him. In the words of Schuon:

“One of the most salient doctrines in the Quran – the great theophany of Islam -- that of the Divine Omnipotence, this doctrine of the utter dependence of all things on God is enunciated in the Quran with a rigour that is exceptional in the climate of monotheism.”¹⁹

Isa Nuruddin, as against the Western Postmodernists’ stance that deny any link between God and Man, writes that Islam is the meeting between God and Man.²⁰ At page 147 of the book “Understanding Islam”, Schuon further clarifies the concept of *Logos* in the following words:

“The Holy Quran is the non-existent prototype of the gift of speech; that man and God meet in revealed speech, in the *Logos* which has taken on the differentiated form of the human language so that, through this language, man may find again the undifferentiated and saving word of the Eternal.”²¹

Similarly, notable Muslim philosopher poet Allama Iqbal, after having discussed in detail the concept of religious experience in the third chapter of his magnum opus “Reconstruction of Religious Thoughts in Islam”, which according to him fully satisfies the intellectual test, put forward the idea of an Ultimate Ego which the Holy Quran gives the proper name of Allah. He further writes that attributes of the perfect Ego is one of the most fundamental elements in the Quranic conception of God.²²

¹⁶ . Frithjof Schuon, Understanding Islam. Indiana: World Wisdom, 1976, p.V.

¹⁷ . Ibid; p. Vii

¹⁸ . Ibid; p. 11.

¹⁹ . Ibid; p. 71.

²⁰ . Ibid., 01.

²¹ . Schuon, Understanding Islam, 147.

²² . Dr. Muhammad Iqbal, The Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam (Gloucestershire: Dodo Press 2009), p.67.

Moreover, the Ultimate Ego is above all the concepts of time and space. The infinity of the Ultimate Ego comprises of the infinite inner possibilities of His creative activity of which the universe, as known to us, is only a partial expression.²³

These references manifest that according to Iqbal, a great Muslim Thinker and Philosopher, Allah is very Being who is the Ultimate Reality and is the sole Creator and single Administrator of the universe. And, it is also evident that the Iqbal's world view takes its final shape under the complete influence of Islam in which God/Allah is the fundamental element which cannot be ignored in any way.

Western Philosophical Stance regarding God:

First of all, in this section, we shall briefly discuss those ideas and notions about God which were prevailing in the Classical period of the history of the Western Philosophy.

Plato (427-347 BC) is perhaps the greatest philosopher and more influential theorist of the Classical era and has much influence upon the subsequent philosophers in the history of Western Philosophy. To begin with the idea of God, in his utopia *The Republic*, book-2, Plato accords Him the highest place in the following words:

“But the claim that God, who is good, is responsible for any instance of badness is to be resisted as forcefully as possible by anyone who wants a well-regulated community, until it is never spoken and never heard by anyone, of whatever age, whether the tale is told in verse or in prose.....any spoken words or composed works will have to conform to the principle that God is not responsible for everything, but only for good.”²⁴

In his famous dialogue “*Phaedrus*”, Plato praises Logos (Word of God/ Speech) much while accords a very lowly position to writing by numerating its many evils. Plato opines:

“How could they possible think that words that have been written down can do more than remind those who already know what the writing is about?”²⁵

Now coming to **Aristotle** (384-322 BC), a pupil of Plato and the tutor of Alexander the Great, who remained in Academy for about twenty years till the death of Plato in 347 BC, is considered to be a philosopher whose thoughts remained prevalent for about two thousand years after his death. Throughout this period Aristotle's authority remained almost unquestionable. He was the author of a philosophical and scientific system that became the framework and vehicle for both Christian Scholasticism, and medieval Islamic philosophy. Even after the intellectual revolutions of the Renaissance, the Reformation, and the Enlightenment, Aristotelian concepts remained embedded in Western thinking.²⁶

²³ . *ibid*, p. 69.

²⁴ . Plato *Completes Works*, John .M. Cooper, Heckett Publishing Company, Cambridge, *The Republic*, Book:2, Trans. G.M.A. Grube, p.1019—1020.

²⁵ . Plato, *Phaedrus*, translated by Alaxander Nehamas and Paul Woofruff, p.552.

²⁶ Encyclopaedia Britannica, written by Anselm. H. Amadio, Anthony J.P. Kenny, retrieved on 02-15-2020

Aristotle wrote both in the fields of philosophy and science and presented a thought that was profound, original, scientific, and wide-ranging. He stands as a distinguished personality among his predecessor philosophers. His treatises are systematic; his works are careful and critical. This salient feature of his philosophical thought makes him a prominent philosopher in the realm of philosophy. Alongside his teacher Plato, Aristotle is the great founding figure of Western Philosophy and literary theory. Though other Greek philosophers commented on literary works, but Aristotle inaugurated the systematic and distinctive discipline of literary criticism and theory with the *Poetics*; it is perhaps the most influential work of his kind, shaping future considerations of genre, prosody, style, structure, and form.²⁷

As against his tutor Plato—who uses deductive logic, drawing particular conclusions from general concepts---, Aristotle uses inductive logic, drawing general conclusions from particular objects.

It is a worthwhile fact that Aristotle posited the concept of “Unmoved Mover” of the universe which influenced Thomas Aquinas much in the 13th century. This concept testifies his admission of a sole Maker and Mover of this whole system of universe.

Coming to the Neo-Platonism, a philosophical system that locates reality in a “transcendental spiritual realm that gives meaning to the visible world”; it was founded and developed by Plotinus—first Neo-Platonist philosopher--- in the third century C.E. and modified by his successors. It came to dominate the Greek philosophical schools and remained predominant until the second half of the 6th century C.E. Plotinus, an acute critic and arguer, collected works of Ennead. This is considered to be the first and greatest collection of Neo-Platonic writings. In his famous essay “On the Intellectual Beauty”, he gives a detailed account of the “Real Being” and its various manifestations. Plotinus always insisted that the One, or Good—it was Plato’s highest principle, too---, is beyond the reach of thought or language.²⁸

Plotinus does not see eye ball to eye ball with the idea—as extended by Plato--- that art is a merely the pale imitation of a more flawless nature. He instead argues that an artist struggles to imbue an inchoate matter with form and beauty, thus enabling both viewer and artist to surpass the material world and discover the more real world of intelligible Forms, with the ultimate goal of unification with the One--- the transcendent source of all being. Plotinus is of the view that the “reality lies in a transcendental world of spirit rather than an imperfect sensible world”. Plotinus’s revisions of Plato not only influenced the Christine Neo-Platonism of the Middle Ages but also left indelible imprints upon the modern literary movements including the romanticism. S.T. Coleridge, P.B. Shelley, R.W. Emerson were greatly influenced by Plotinus’s thought.

Stoicism was laid by Zeno in the third century B.C. in Citium, a city of Cyprus. He came to Athens in his twenties. According to this school of philosophy happiness for the human beings lie in accepting the time as it presents itself by not allowing oneself to be controlled by the desire for pleasure or fear of pain. “Virtue is the only good” is the fundamental teaching of the Stoics.

²⁷. William E. Cain, Lauri. e A. Finke, Barbara E. Jhonson, Jeffery L. Williams, *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*, 1st Edition, USA, 2001, (The Republic Letter No.7), p.86.

²⁸. *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, topic Neoplatinism, retrieved on 02-18-2020.

God is not separate from the world; He is the soul of the world. All things are parts of one single system, which is called Nature; the individual life is good when it is in harmony with Nature... Virtue consists in a will which is in agreement with Nature.²⁹

St. Augustine (354--430) has an important place in the history of Western Philosophy. Born in Thagaste in Roman North Africa in 354 A.D., he commenced his educational career by reading some philosophical text by following standard Roman practice of the later empire. At the age of 18, he read Cicero's Hortensius as part of the syllabus at Carthage, and it affected him profoundly, introducing him to philosophy, and in particular to ethical eudemonism. That is why, he cites the Hortensius regularly in his writings.³⁰

To him, Happiness is a great human desire; it is the highest good for the mankind. Having love for the right thing for the right reason is the pre-condition of good deeds. Plotinus's idea of intellectual ascent from the corporeal world to the transcendental world of Forms was transmitted through the works of St. Augustine to the posterity, in particular.

St. Augustine was a prolific writer; he wrote about one thousand works. He wrote at a time when Christianity was in his infancy. His "Confessions" is among one of the early books of human spiritual literature. Augustine thinks "God as his sole reliever of his miseries" and problems when he says: "Behold O my Lord, before Thee I lie not; but as I speak, so is my heart. Thou shalt light my candle; Thou O Lord my God, wilt enlighten my darkness."³¹

"The City of God" is an attempt to provide a refuge to Man when earthly forces fail to furnish him protection hence giving him at least a hope of peacefulness and salvation in the moments of fear and melancholy. In the middle Ages, this book was a powerful instrument for the Church in fighting with the secular princes. After the sack of Rome by the Goths in 410 A.D., Augustine wrote this renowned book between 412 A.D. and 427 A.D.

Saint Thomas Aquinas (1225--1274) is regarded as the greatest of the scholastic philosophers.³² He succeeded in persuading the Church that Aristotle's system should be made the base of Christian philosophy. His magnum opus "Summa Theologica's" first part is specified to God, five proofs of God's existence and His Oneness, and His various attributes and dimensions. As he says:

"The essence of God is His own very existence.....impossible it therefore that many Gods should exist."³³

²⁹. Ibid, p. 269.

³⁰. David Furley, Rutlege History of Philosophy, Vol. 02 published by Taloyer and Francis e-Library, 2005 p. 389.

³¹. St. Augustine, Confession, translated by E. B. Pusey, Book 11, p. 151.

³². Burtard Russel, A history of Western Philosophy, 4th Edition, Simon and Schuster, New York, p.452.

³³. Saint Thomas Equinas, Summa Theologica, translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province, Question 1, Article 2, p. 179.

Very early in the above mentioned book, in articles 9 and 10 of question 1, Aquinas tries to solve the obscurities and ambiguities of the biblical text and vehemently defends the figurative style of it when he writes:

“The parabolical sense is contained in the literal, for by words things are signified properly and figuratively. When Scripture speaks of God’s arm, the literal sense is not that God has such a member, but only what is signified by this member, namely operative power. Hence it is plain that nothing false can ever underlie the literal sense of Holy Writ.”³⁴

The Seeds of Diverting from the Concept of God:

From the above lines, in which some of the notable philosophers of the West have been referred to, it becomes crystal clear that the concept of a God as the sole Creator of the whole universe has been in vogue in the Western Philosophical tradition till the time of Rene Descartes. It was, in fact, Descartes who first of all raised the slogan of the superiority of Reason in the whole scheme of the affairs of the universe.

Rene Descartes:

Rene Descartes (1596--1650), philosopher, mathematician, a man of science and the great representative of the rationalistic trend³⁵, is regarded as the founder of the modern philosophy on account of formulating his first modern version of “*Mind-Body Dualism*”, that began with Plato and developed, owing to religious reasons, by Christine philosophy, and putting forward a new science grounded in observation and experiment.

Before Descartes, it was believed that things—physical or metaphysical-- have a common origin or common principal instead of their apparent differences and this common principal is purely metaphysical in nature; on the other hand, Descartes asserted that mind or matter, physical beings or meta-physical beings do not have a common ground or same principal; they are dissimilar and belong to different domains and they should be treated as such. So, to him, mind and matter are two, distinct, independent and sovereign worlds that can be existed independent of each other. This concept of Dualism of Descartes is still regarded as a fundamental philosophical idea in Western Philosophy. This concept was, in fact, the proclamation of the independence “Reason” from “Divine Guidance” leading towards more concepts and ideas which would utterly disregard the idea of God.

Let’s have a look at some lines from his famous book “*Meditations of First Philosophy*” which manifests his stance regarding mind and matter.

“I here say, in the first place, that there is a great difference between mind and body, in as much as body is by nature is always divisible, and the mind is entirely indivisible. For, as a matter of fact, when I consider the mind, that is to say, myself in as much as I am only a thinking thing, I cannot distinguish in myself any parts, but apprehend myself to be clearly one and entire; and although the whole mind seems to be united to the whole body, yet if a foot, or an arm, or some other part, is separated from my body, I am aware that nothing has been taken away from my mind....., this would be sufficient to teach me

³⁴. Ibid, Question 1 , Article 10, p.172.

³⁵. Rene Guenon, *The Great Triad*, Trans. Peter Kingsley (Long mead: Quinta Essentia, 1991), 135.

that the mind or soul of man is entirely different from body, if I had not already learned it from other sources.”³⁶

This was, in fact, the very first intellectual revolt against the century’s long philosophical tradition of the West. By inventing a new system viz. “Methodic/ Cartesian Doubt”, a process of considering every knowledge of the Past as dubitable and debatable, Descartes launched a vigorous campaign against traditional knowledge of his predecessors derived from the authority, the senses and reason and erected new epistemic foundations on the basis of the intuition that, when he is thinking, he exists; this he expressed in the dictum “I think, therefore I am” (best known in its Latin formulation, “Cogito, Ergo Sum”).³⁷

Nigel Warburton in his famous book “A Little History of Philosophy” writes about the method of the Cartesian Doubt:

“This method is quite straightforward: do not accept anything as true if there is the slightest possibility that it is not.... if there is the tiniest room for doubt, reject it.”³⁸

Friedrich Nietzsche:

Friedrich Nietzsche: (1844-1900) is the second Western philosopher considered to be a man who has a big hand in the construction of the modern West. This is the very philosopher whom the post-modernists have not despised yet; they are compelled to give him respect owing to his rebellious ideas and disastrous notions. He has a tremendous influence upon modernism, existentialism, post-structuralism, and post-modernism, too. Owing to his evocative genre and provocative ideas, his philosophy gave rise to passionate reactions.

He does not talk, as against most of his predecessors, of the idea of Man’s perfection and completion and construction and progress in this world; rather, he is a staunch upholder of the idea of Man’s annihilation and total destruction. To him, destruction and not the construction is necessary for the human uplift. Hence, he also denied all the moral or religious obligations by putting forward his famous concept of “*Nihilism*”--- the rejection of all religious and moral principles in the belief that life is meaningless. He is an entrenched foe of *Christianity* and *Platonic philosophy* (owing to its taste for edification); however, he is absolutely central to modern attempts to rethink the Western tradition’s most fundamental assumptions.³⁹

After resigning from the University of Basel in 1879, Nietzsche involved in writing his philosophical works that ambitiously attempt to displace Christianity and post-Socratic philosophy through a cataclysmic reconsideration of all values. His posthumously published essay “*On Truth and Lying in a Non-Moral Sense*” articulates myriads of Nietzsche’s major motifs and became a preferred reference point for poststructuralists such as Jacques Derrida and

³⁶. Descartes, *Meditations on First Philosophy*, Trans. Elizabeth .S. Haldane (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 30—31.

³⁷. Watson, Richard A., *Encyclopaedia Britannica* 6th Ed., “Rene Descartes”, retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Rene-Descartes> on 02-24-2020.

³⁸. Nigel Warburton, *A Little History of Philosophy* (London: Yale University Press, 2011), 63.

³⁹. Cain, *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*, 870.

Paul De Man during the 1970s. In this essay, Nietzsche made a direct assault on the epistemological grounds of the Western philosophy. According to him, from Plato on, Western philosophy has been committed to discover a “*Transcendental Truth*” (Idea of God) that lies out of the reach of human minds. As, for him, human perception is very narrow and lowly in order to have a glimpse of that *Truth*. So, irrespective of this fundamental flaw why, then, are humans dedicated to search for this *Truth*? Nietzsche answers that *Truth* is a useful illusion, one that serves a fundamental derive to survive. *Truth* is a comfortable lie; it boosts self-confidence, the untroubled conviction of being right.⁴⁰

To him “Truth” is nothing but a “mobile army of metaphors, metonymies and anthropomorphism”⁴¹. Truths are illusions of which we have forgotten that they are illusions”.⁴² This essay is also held responsible for Nietzsche’s reputation as “Godfather of Postmodernism.”⁴³ Some have termed his notion about truth as “Deconstructive Scepticism.”⁴⁴

His book “Beyond Good and Evil: Prelude to the Philosophy of Future”, really aims at modifying reader’s opinion regarding “Good” and “Evil”. He uses Good and Evil in ordinary connotation first and then to shock his reader says that he prefers Evil to Good. In this famous book, Nietzsche showed his severe resentment and suspicion against everything whether it be truth and philosophy or morality and religion through his deconstructive attitude. He says:

“No one would consider a doctrine to be true just because it makes people happy or virtuous, with the possible exception of the darling “Idealists”, who were enthusiastic over the Good, the True, and the Beautiful, and let all sorts of colourful, clumsy and good-natured desiderata swim through pond in utter confusion.”⁴⁵

Nietzsche has become a pioneer in negating the existence of any Omnipotent and Omniscient being; rather he declares that Man is now strong enough to be ashamed of any faith in God.⁴⁶

The book “The Gay Science” is considered to be the prime example of the aphoristic style of Nietzsche. In this book, he disgusts the concepts of virtues whatsoever. Also, he propounded the blasphemous idea of “Death of God” that has played a vital role in penetrating this concept into the mind and soul of the Western philosophers particularly the postmodernists who are mostly resented by the existence of any God or any Divine power to guide humanity. Nietzsche opines:

⁴⁰. Cain, The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism, 871.

⁴¹. Ibid. 878.

⁴². Friedrich Nietzsche, On Truth and Lying in a Non-moral Sense, Trans. Sander L. Gilman and Carole Blair. (London: Oxford University Press, 1989), 7.

⁴³. Lawrence E. Cahoone, From Modernism to Postmodernism: An Anthology (NJ: Wiley Blackwell, 1996), 109.

⁴⁴. Nietzsche, The Gay Science, Trans. Josefine Nauckhoff (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 21.

⁴⁵. Nietzsche, Beyond Good and Evil, Trans. Judith Norman (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 123.

⁴⁶. Nietzsche, The Will to Power, Trans. Walter Kaufmann (New York: Vintage Books, 1968), 558.

“After Buddha was dead, they still showed his shadow in a cave for centuries--- a tremendous, gruesome shadow. God is dead; but given the way people are, there may still for millennia be caves in which they show his shadow.—and we---, we must defeat his shadow as well!”⁴⁷

Martin Heidegger:

Martin Heidegger (1889--1976) stands among those Western philosophers who left indelible imprints in the realm of philosophy and literary criticism. His magnum opus “Being and Time”, a groundbreaking amalgam and extension of the phenomenology of Edmund Husserl and the Hermeneutics of Wilhelm Dilthey, analyzes what we really mean by the word ‘being’.⁴⁸

This book on “ontology and metaphysics” is considered to be highly influential in determining the course of twentieth-century philosophy and in exerting immense influence on various disciplines like theology, psychology, hermeneutics and literary criticism.

Heidegger’s master piece, “Being and Time”, despite its nearly impenetrable obscurity, earned him the recognition as one the world’s leading philosopher.⁴⁹ This remarkable book, at the very start, describes that the question of “Being” has been neglected by the Greek Philosophers on the ground that this was a question too apparent and clear to be questioned. Owing to this neglect, “history of being” remained dormant and ultimately forgot in the course of history of philosophy. The question of being is one which provided a stimulus for the researches of Plato and Aristotle, only to subside from then on as a theme for actual investigation. A dogma has been developed which not only declares the question about the meaning of being as superfluous, but sanctions its complete neglect.⁵⁰ So, through his Being and Time, Heidegger attempts to answer this forgotten question of being; and which, according to Heidegger, can be addressed only by a “destruction” of the history of philosophy--- the very idea that became the foundation of the theory of deconstruction as propounded by Jacques Derrida.

In “Being and Time”, Heidegger maintains that:

“The Question of Being does not achieve its true concreteness until we have carried through the process of destroying the ontological tradition.”⁵¹ In this quotation, ontological tradition refers to the discourse of metaphysics – an indispensable part of religion of which God is considered to be a fundamental and the most important element.

Jacques Derrida:

Jacques Derrida (1930--2004), French philosopher and literary critic famous for his theory of deconstruction, whose critique of Western Philosophy and analyses of the nature of language, writing and meaning were highly controversial yet immensely influential in much of the

⁴⁷. Nietzsche, *The Gay Science*, 108.

⁴⁸. Cain, *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*, 1118.

⁴⁹. Wolin, Richard. and Arne Naess, *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 7th Ed., s.v. “Martin Heidegger”, retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Martin-Heidegger-German-philosopher> on 02-29-2020.

⁵⁰. Heidegger, *Being and Time*, 21.

⁵¹. Martin Heidegger, *Being and Time* (New York: Harper and Row, 1962), 49.

intellectual world in the late 20th century.⁵²His creative writings treat philosophical and literary works and do so in many ways, of which deconstruction is the most philosophically important.⁵³Deconstruction is a way of reading which introduces an essentially doubtful insight: there is no end to the play of meanings, supported by ceaselessness of signs, and hence no reliable and authentic truth. Claims of reason are debunked by paradoxes of language.⁵⁴

The works of Jacques Derrida disobey and challenge classification in accordance with any definite and distinct dividing lines that define modern academic discourse. They are unique in present day philosophy and pose a challenge to conventional understanding of modern philosophy.⁵⁵

Derrida is celebrated as the principal proponent of the theory of deconstruction, a term he coined for the critical analysis of the traditional concepts of oppositions ingrained in the Western philosophy since the time of the primitive Greeks. These oppositions are binary pairs in nature in which first member occupies the primary position whereas second is considered to be a derivative. Examples include: ‘speech and writing’, ‘body and mind’, ‘right and wrong’, ‘good and bad’, ‘inside and outside’, ‘literal and metaphorical’, and ‘form and meaning’ among many others.

The theory of deconstruction, after a long journey, reached such a point that may be called its climax and this climax owes much to the genius of Jacques Derrida—father of the philosophical Movement of Deconstruction.⁵⁶Jacques Derrida does postmortem of the text while reading it. Text and textuality, in fact, provides a strong spur to his deconstructive imagination that result in an acute examination of the text leading to the total breaking up of its texture. He is a reader so scrupulous who draws intense attention to concealed and invisible meanings and hence does de novo interpretation of the text that adds much to furtherance its new meanings. As a matter of fact, text is one of the most common points of departure and springboard for his thinking.⁵⁷

Generally, an array of well-formulated and organized concepts and ideas is sine qua non for an esteemed philosophical thought; however, Derrida’s writings seem to be utterly complex and undisciplined when seen through this angle. In particular, his work is at odds with a properly philosophical conception of what it is for philosophical writing to be well shaped and disciplined.⁵⁸ It is perhaps due to the reason that he wants himself to be the most baffling writer in the history of philosophical thought owing to such type of genre.

Being a great critic of traditional philosophical thought and a prominent philosopher of the history of philosophy, Derrida questioned many assumptions adopted by the Western Philosophical tradition and the Western culture as well. He challenged the Western philosophical assumptions through “deconstruction”—an approach to understanding the relationship between

⁵². Encyclopaedia Britannica, 3rd Ed., s.v. “Jacques Derrida” retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Jacques-Derrida> on 03-02-2020.

⁵³. Robert L. Arrington, *A Companion to Philosophers* (NJ: Blackwell Publishers, 1999), 204.

⁵⁴. Joshua Kates, *Fielding Derrida: Philosophy, Literary Criticism, History, and the Work of Deconstruction* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2008), 12.

⁵⁵. Christopher Norris, *Deconstruction: Theory and Practice*, 3rd Ed. (London: Routledge, 2002), 18.

⁵⁶. Simon Glendinning, *Derrida: A Very Short Introduction* (London: Oxford University Press, 2011), 20.

⁵⁷. *Ibid.*, 20.

⁵⁸. *Ibid.*, 29.

the text and its meanings and it generally runs counter to the intended meanings or the structural unity of a text whatsoever. In his famous book “Spectres of Marx”, Jacques Derrida refers to deconstruction as radicalization of a certain spirit of Marxism. These philosophical assumptions are considered to be an indispensable part of “metaphysics of presence” to which Western philosophy has linked itself. This notion of Metaphysics of Presence testifies the existence of a God as the First Cause.

This “metaphysics of presence”, according to Derrida, conceives meaning only on the basis of presence. Owing to this tradition, a foundation exists beneath every meaning which constitutes an immediate presence. For Plato this foundation are the “Ideas”, for Jean Jacques Rousseau, it is the “Passions”, while for Edmund Husserl it is “Pure Consciousness”.

Derrida also shows his apprehensions, Stuart Sim writes, about the concept what he calls “metaphysics of presence”, the idea that the meaning can be grasped in its totality by the language users, that the meanings of words are present in the minds of the speakers when they speak or write them, so that they can be transferred to others in their pure and fair form. For Derrida, it is just an illusion deeply rooted in our culture. In truth, discourse in West is based on this illusion. Having belief in the “metaphysics of presence” is to be committed to what Derrida regards “logo-centricity”, another persistently troublesome illusion of the West that deconstruction is determined to unveil. Derrida is of the view that there are always breaks and intervals in communication and thus meaning cannot be present in its entirety at any one point of time. So, meaning should be taken as suffering continuous change, “never quite all there when a word is used, but always differed from itself, as well as deferred from reaching any sense of completeness.”⁵⁹

So far as the aspects of deconstruction are concerned, these are of two types: literary and philosophical. Former aspect concerns the textual expounding, where invention is an essential condition to finding concealed meanings in the text; whereas, the later aspect concerns with the basic target of the deconstruction: the Meta-physics of binary oppositions or simply Meta-physics. Commencing from Heideggerian point of view, Derrida is of the view that Meta-physics affects the whole body of philosophy from Plato onwards. Meta-physics, in fact, creates binary oppositions and install a hierarchy that, by the irony of the fate, privileges one member of each dichotomy usually the first one (presence before absence, speech before writing, and so on).

Jacques Derrida has argued that from Plato to Rousseau to Heidegger, “Logocentrism”—a concept that privileges and is based on the stability and authority of Logos as the pivotal principle of philosophy; it also places at the centre of its world view an idea (logos) which orders and illustrates the world while remaining outside of the world that it maintains and explains⁶⁰---has been accorded a superior place in the realm of Western Philosophy. For Derrida, This concept is the greatest illusion posed by the Western philosophy. For Derrida, every concept or theory put forwarded by Western philosophers is an outcome of language, so, it is unstable and cannot escape the vagueness and ambiguity of language. For Derrida, language is the “ground of being”---the source from which our experience and knowledge of the world originates---but this ground is confined with the play: it is itself as in progress, problematical and dogmatically saturated as the world view it generates. Owing to this fact, there is no origin to comprehension

⁵⁹. Stuart, Sim, Derrida and the End of History (Cambridge: Icon Books, 1999), 34-5.

⁶⁰. Lois Tyson, Critical Theory Today: A User Friendly Guide (New York/London: Routledge, 2006), 256.

of existence. There are, in reality, countless vantage grounds from which to view it, and each of this vantage ground has its own language, which Derrida calls its 'discourse'. In other words, Derrida decentred the Western philosophy by claiming that the universe does not revolve around it.⁶¹

Derrida further argues that Logocentrism---this concept holds that meaning resides in 'alive' speech rather than in 'lifeless' writing---is a paradigm that has been inherited from Judaism and Hellenism. Logos is a Greek term for speech, law, thought, reason etc. which refers back to the Words spoken by God; hence giving writing an inferior place than speech or making it mere a substitute for speech. This is evident from Western philosophical traditions because they rigorously espouse the idea of Logocentrism. Derrida's philosophical discussions reverses the traditional dichotomies of speech and writing, good and evil, essence and appearance etc.; hence giving a severe blow to traditional Meta-Physical decisions of Western Philosophy. This uncovering of the dichotomies is, in fact, the deconstruction of the Western philosophy and culture as well. In this way, he accords superior positions to the words which have been dealt with as inferior or lowly so far. In other words, Derrida redefines the formerly ancillary and low-ranking words. To him, this binary system of oppositions hinders the plurality of meanings so that its deconstruction is necessary to provide an outlet to plurality of meanings.

After redefining the hitherto subservient term, Derrida for the most part transforms the term's orthography. For example, writing "différence" with an "a" as "différance" in order to show the change in its status. The verb "différer" in French has two elemental meanings. If used transitively, it means: "to delay or defer"; when used intransitively, it means: "to differ or be different". In the coinage of the word "différance", Derrida had perhaps three things in mind. First, it was to accentuate dynamic dimension of the development of "deferring" or "differing", in much the same manner that Levinas, at one juncture, in taking into account how to translate Heidegger, had propounded writing "essance", instead of "essence" in order to emphasize the zestful character of "Being", which otherwise risked being thought as mere inert fact. Secondly, as the difference between "différence" and "différance" is not discernable in spoken French, Derrida's invention of the new phrase drew attention to the very fact that, in speech itself, something was already in action that exceeded the ostensible immediacy, closeness to self, and the presence of the voice. Lastly, since it came from a verb that was both transitive and intransitive, "différance" could be used to highlight a movement that was itself neither active nor passive, but prior to that opposition, just as it preceded, too, many similar binary oppositions: presence and absence, subject and object, good and bad, right and wrong, and so on.

Alex Callinicos writes about 'différance'---the famous neologism of Derrida:

"Meta-physics of presence is a fundamental concept of Western philosophy: that thought can have direct access to the 'Real'. Derrida's stance" about "différence"-- the quality that is the main reason for the creation of meanings--- is quite different from other postmodernists. Différance necessitates a play of 'absence' and 'presence': that is to say, the procedure of differentiation intrinsic in, as an instance, signification encompasses the advancing of a moment of 'presence'--- that is, of prompt approach to the 'Real'--- despite the fact that this moment is never reached but is, on the other hand, always deferred as 'other-worldly

⁶¹. Ibid. 256.

signified'. Derrida's 'differance' plans to seize this essential coexistence of absence and presence--- presence is something which is essentially put in position but constantly deferred.⁶²

Derrida is of the view that our use of language is distinct with what he regards "differance". The reality that final meanings cannot be distinctive in speech, but only in writing, signifies for Derrida the immanent instability of meaning, that, as he illustrates, is always both "differed" and "deferred". Deconstruction as an intellectual movement highlights this intrinsic instability to our notice. For Derrida, "differance", the demonstration of that instability, is natural to our discourse serving to shatter our traditional notion of language as a firm and well balanced entity for the communication of meaning among individuals.⁶³ Similarly, Sara Salih writes about 'differance' that it is a concept that hints at the way through which meanings are never present in themselves but rather invariably depend upon what is absent, so that it becomes viable to utter that language contains mere differences with no constructive terms.⁶⁴

The above discussion highlights that Derrida is a staunch opponent of the idea of Logos that is directly associated with God. So, the negation of Logos is the categorical denial of God, in fact. Similarly, there is a long list of Western theorists and philosophers who are of the view that the concept of a God is an absurd and meaningless idea so it has nothing to do with the affairs of both Man and the Universe. Among them are included: A.J. Ayer, Julian Baggini, Roland Barthes, Jean Baudrillard, Simone de Beauvoir, Albert Camus, Friedrich Engels, Michel Foucault, A. C. Grayling, Jean-François Lyotard, Michael Martin, Karl Marx, John Stuart Mill, Graham Oppy, Michel Onfray, Alexander Rosenberg, Jean-Paul Sartre, Etienne Vermeersch.

The above mentioned philosophers are but a few names in the long list of the Western philosophers who, in their writings, denies the existence of a God. So far as the diverting from this once cherished belief of the Western philosophers is concerned that they did not understand the reality of God's existence and badly entangled in the maze of philosophical discussions and preferred Reason and made it their God, in reality.

Conclusion:

From the above paragraphs, it can be safely said that in Islam God is the Supreme Being and is responsible for the creation of the universe with all its creations including Man; whereas, before Rene Descartes, most of the Western philosophers had a clear idea of God being the sole Creator and Mover of the universe but after Descartes the "Reason" was accorded much higher place in the philosophical realm of the West that it actually replaced God and became the new God of the West leading it towards a position where the West now faces utter lack of spiritual serenity and peacefulness. This stance of these so-called philosophers is utterly illogical because a claim of denial of a thing which is out of the reach of human senses cannot be supported in any way. They deny God because He is beyond Reason. However, rational approach, in fact, demands admission of God not its negation and this claim is evident by the numerous signs that are present in the universe and in Man's own self, too.

⁶². Alex Callinicos, *The Resources of Critique* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2006), 7.

⁶³. Sim, *Derrida and the End of History*, 32-33.

⁶⁴. Sara Salih, *Judith Butler* (London: Routledge, 2002), 36.

That is why; in his notable book viz “*Spiritual Perspectives and Human Facts*”, Isa Nuruddin makes a very fine comparison of the East and West that depicts the real cause of their intellectual decadence covering postmodern age particularly. He opines:

“All civilizations have declined, though their way of decay was different; the decay of the East is passive and that of the West is active. The fault of the East in decay is that it no longer thinks; the West in decay thinks too much and thinks wrongly. The East is sleeping over truths; the West lives in errors.”⁶⁵

⁶⁵. Frithjof Shuon, *Spiritual Perspectives and Human Facts*, Trans. D. M. Matheson (London: Faber, 1954), 22.

Bibliography:

1. Al- Quran.
2. Abdul Hakeem, Dr. Khalifa. *Islamic Ideology*. 10th Ed., Lahore: Institute of Islamic Culture Lahore, 2006.
3. Armstrong, Karen. *Muhammad: Prophet for Our Time*. London: Harper Press, 2006.
4. Shuon, Frithjof. *Understanding Islam*. Indiana: World Wisdom, 1976.
5. Iqbal, Dr. Muhammad. *The Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam*. Gloucestershire: Dodo Press, 2009.
6. Cooper, Jhon M. *Plato’s Complete Works*. Indiana: Hackett Publishing Company, 1997.
7. Cain, William E. et al., *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*, 1st Ed. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 2001.
8. Furley, David. *Rutledge History of Philosophy*. London: Routledge, 2005.
9. Augustine, St. *Confession*. Trans. E. B. Pusey, New York: Penguin Books, 1963.
10. Russel, Bertrand. *A History of Western Philosophy*, 4th Ed. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1993.
11. Equinas, Thomas. *Summa Theologica*. Trans. Fathers of the English Dominican Province, Question 1, Article 2, New York: Benzinger Brothers, 1947.
12. Guenon, Rene. *The Great Triad*. Trans. Peter Kingsley, Long mead: Quinta Essentia, 1991.
13. Descartes, Rene. *Meditations on First Philosophy*, Trans. Elizabeth .S. Haldane (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
14. Warburton, Nigel. *A Little History of Philosophy*. London: Yale University Press, 2011.
15. Nietzsche, Friedrich. *On Truth and Lying in a Non-moral Sense*. Trans. Sander L. Gilman and Carole Blair, London: Oxford University Press, 1989.
16. Cahoone, Lawrence E. *From Modernism to Postmodernism: An Anthology*. NJ: Wiley Blackwell, 1996.
17. Nietzsche, Friedrich. *The Gay Science*. Trans. Josefine Nauckkhoff, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
18. Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Beyond Good and Evil*. Trans. Judith Norman, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
19. Nietzsche, Friedrich. *The Will to Power*. Trans. Walter Kaufmann, New York: Vintage Books, 1968.
20. Heidegger, Martin. *Being and Time*. New York: Harper and Row, 1962.
21. Arrington, Robert L. *A Companion to Philosophers*. NJ: Blackwell Publishers, 1999.

-
22. Kates, Joshua. *Fielding Derrida: Philosophy, Literary Criticism, History, and the Work of Deconstruction*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2008.
 23. Norris Christopher, *Deconstruction: Theory and Practice*. 3rd Ed. London: Routledge, 2002.
 24. Glendnning, Simon. *Derrida: A Very Short Introduction*. London: Oxford University Press, 2011.
 25. Sim, Stuart. *Derrida and the End of History*. Cambridge: Icon Books, 1999.
 26. Tyson, Lois. *Critical Theory Today: A User Friendly Guide*. New York: Routledge, 2006.
 27. Callinicos, Alex. *The Resources of Critique*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2006.
 28. Salih, Sara, Judith Butler, London: Routledge, 2002.
 29. Shuon, Frithjof. *Spiritual Perspectives and Human Facts*. Trans. D. M. Matheson (London: Faber, 1954).