

## Causality and Reliance (*Tawakkul*) in Ghazali's Epistemological System

Sobhi Rayan<sup>1</sup>

### Abstract

This article deals with the issue of causality and its ethical status in al-Ghazali's epistemological system, which is connected with causality and reliance (al-*ṣābābiyya* and *tawakkul*), dependence on God and trust in him; and the issue of work. These issues are based on the relationship between Man and God, be He exalted, and on other issues involving the components of Man himself. Al-Ghazali seeks to revive the necessary relationship between Man and God, be He exalted. The unity and oneness of God (*tawḥīd*) is the existential origin and epistemological example from which relationships between Man and himself, people and nature are derived, and the establishment of human work, physical or mental, is based on the knowledge of *tawḥīd*, which guarantees the process of this work will reach the end for which it was created.

**Keywords:** Causality, Ethics, Islam, Sufism Tawhid, AL-Ghazali.

### • Introduction

This article deals with the issue of causality and its relationship with ethics in al-Ghazali's epistemological system, where he connects causality and Man's actions through a treatment of the issue *Tawakkul* (reliance). Al-Ghazali sought to establish ethics on principles of certainty by referring them to their epistemological and existential origins, relying on science, knowledge, and work in order to achieve moral elevation. This conceptualization required that he deconstruct the relationship between human action and its existential principle because the reality of this connection affects the meaning of morals themselves.

Understanding the relationship between actions and ethics for al-Ghazali can be attributed to the structure of his philosophy, which is based on communication between the real known world and 'alam al-ghayb (hidden world). There is no separation between them; they are interconnected at the epistemological and existential levels, where Man lives in two different worlds simultaneously, moving between them in complete freedom and going beyond the borders of reality to other, endless worlds. This approach has led researchers to draw different conclusions, some of which claim that al-Ghazali rejected rational thinking and favored Sufism.

"Al-Ghazali's extreme views have had a long life in both Islamic and Western philosophy. He provided a basis for Sufism and for a rejection of rationalist philosophy that has retained influence to some extent even into modern times."<sup>2</sup> However, al-Ghazali's use of formal logic to raise objections against his rivals and to confirm his claims emphasizes his commitment to rational thinking.

"The study of the *Maqṣad al-asnā fi sharḥ ma'āni asmā' Allāh al-busnā, al-Iqtisād fi 'l-i'tiqād* and the *Tahāfut al-falāsifa*. Even in works where the Ash'arite view of divine predestination prevails; the use of Aristotelian logic – intended to rebuff philosophical inconsistencies – has led al-Ghazālī to absorb some philosophical constructs."<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Sobhi Rayan, Ph.D., Chairperson of the Islamic Studies Master's Degree Program at Al-Qasemi Academic College, Editor-in-Chief of AL-Qasemi Journal of Islamic Studies. Email: [sobhi.rayan@gmail.com](mailto:sobhi.rayan@gmail.com).

<sup>2</sup>James Naify, "Al-Ghazali", *The Columbia History of Western Philosophy*, Edited by Richard H. Popkin, Columbia University Press, 1999, p.197.

<sup>3</sup>Maria De Cillis, *Free Will and Predestination in Islamic Thought*, Routledge, New York, 2014, p. 4.

Some researchers claim that al-Ghazali's search for the existential origin reduced his interest in the search for Man's will: "The primary purpose of Ghazali's argumentation during his time was to ensure God's freedom of will. His position on human free will was perhaps intentionally ambiguous, secondary to the theological debates of the time."<sup>4</sup>

Furthermore, attributing Man's actions to God's will decreases dependence on the mind: "The faithful formulate guidelines for ethical behavior by careful attention to God's will and command codified in the Qur'an-Hadith-Shari'a synthesis, not by undue reliance on '*Aql* (reason)"<sup>5</sup>

On the other hand, al-Ghazali describes those who deny *Mushabadat* (visions) beyond the five senses as "sophistical" and "skeptical," and as "those who are skeptical of things perceptible by the senses." He describes them also as "apostates" and "disbelievers" who deny the existence of the world of *al-Malakūt* (the spiritual realm of sovereignty), who limit knowledge to the five senses only and deny "ability," "will," and knowledge because they are not perceived by the five senses, and thus, they stay at the lowest level of the world of *Shahāda* (witnessing and testimony) by the five senses.<sup>6</sup>

Some researchers maintain that al-Ghazali's discussion on the issue of *tawhīd* (the unity and oneness of God) led to his refutation of Man's free will: "Sufis are generally considered to be determinists. They believe that real *tawhīd* implies determinism. Al-Ghazali, in his account of determinism, attempts to refute several arguments for free will, such as the arguments from responsibility, from ordinary use of language, and from agent-causation."<sup>7</sup>

Al-Ghazali, however, attributes everything in the world of *Mulk wa al-Shahada* (dominion and witnessing) to *tawhīd*, which is the epistemological and existential origin. "*tawhīd* sees that everything is caused by the causer of causes, who does not look at the means, but sees them as exploited things that have no judgement, and the believer in this is a certain one."<sup>8</sup>

The return to *tawhīd* aims, first, to establish knowledge upon true and certain fundamentals, which are embodied in the epistemological origin that produces the action. The action is a value connected with *tawhīd*, and there is no value for an action that is disconnected from knowledge of *tawhīd*. Similarly, there is no value for knowledge without an action.

### • Causality and Reliance

Al-Ghazali defines *reliance* as dependence of the heart on *al-Wakeel* (the Trustee/ God).<sup>9</sup> It seems that this definition contradicts, though superficially, that of causality, because Man's reliance on the other in his actions lowers the connection of actions with their causes. Al-Ghazali, however, turns this contradiction into reconciliation by returning the causes to their origins. Al-Ghazali confirms that "all the doors of belief are not regularized except by knowing their origin (source) and the action is the fruit and the spiritual state is *Tawakkul* (reliance) on God."<sup>10</sup>

Achievement of knowledge and action are two conditions for reaching the spiritual state, which is the reliance (on God) that is considered one of the doors of belief, whose source is *tawhīd* (unity); *tawakkul* (reliance) is connected to knowledge and work, and it is not independent in its establishment and existence. "In standard Sufi terminology, the *hāl* was a gift of God. It did not result from the individual person's striving or effort *fi sabīl Allāh*, "along the path of God", rather, reaching this spiritual state depended not upon the mystic but upon God."<sup>11</sup> "Achievement of Reliance as a lived Spiritual State in the life of the dependent Man occurs if he is certain of four things in the Wakeel (the Trustee/God)":<sup>12</sup> the utmost degree of guidance, the utmost degree of power, the utmost degree of eloquence, and the utmost degree of mercy.

<sup>4</sup>Aftab, Macksood. "Is Islam Committed to Dualism in the Context of the Problem of Free Will?" *Journal of Cognition and Neuroethics*, 3 (1): 2015, 1-12, p.5.

<sup>5</sup>Peter J. Awn, "The Ethical Concerns of Classical Sufism," *The Journal of Religious Ethics* 11, no. 2 (1983): 240-63, p. 249.

<sup>6</sup>Al-Ghazali, *Ihya' 'Ulum al-Din*, Vol. 4, p. 252.

<sup>7</sup>Abdullahi Hassan Zaroug, "Al-Ghazali's Sufism: A Critical Appraisal", *Intellectual Discourse*, 1997, vol 5, No 2, 145-167, p.154.

<sup>8</sup>Al-Ghazali, *Ihya' 'Ulum al-Din*, Vol. 1, p. 74.

<sup>9</sup>Ghazali. *Ihya'*, Vol. 4, p. 259.

<sup>10</sup> Ghazali, *Ihya'*, Vol. 4, p. 245.

<sup>11</sup> Carol, L. Barger, "Sufism' Role in al-Ghazali's First Crisis of Knowledge ", *Medieval Encounters*, (2003): 32-78, 9, 1, p. 55.

<sup>12</sup>Al-Ghazali, *Ihya'*, vol. 4, p.260.

The decisive belief that there is no doer except God, who has complete knowledge and the ability to satisfy the worshippers of God; the complete care and mercy of worshippers and individuals; and the belief that there is no other ability above His ability, no knowledge above His utmost knowledge, no care above His utmost care, no mercy above His utmost mercy to the human being, makes your heart inevitably rely only on Him, and it will not turn to any other face or soul or ability.

"Understanding that God has such pre-knowledge represents more trust in God than relying on conclusions drawn from God's habits. This higher trust in God is closely linked to the proper understanding of divine *tawhīd*. Indeed, advancing to the higher stages of *tawhīd* is the root that helps one develop this superior trust in God.<sup>13</sup> Absence of this spiritual state is attributed to a weakness of belief in, and a lack of certainty of, one of the four qualities, or to a weakness of the heart and its sickness, as a result of its capture by cowardice and its annoyance by illusions that dominate it. This differentiation between certainty and the heart is due to the possibility of achieving certainty without tranquility or achieving tranquility without certainty. The believer can be certain, but not tranquil or secure, because cowardice and bravery are instincts that are not based on certainty. The spiritual state of *Tawakkul* (reliance) differs between *Mutawakkilin* (dependents) and God with regard to weakness and power. It also differs in the dependent (*Mutawakkil*) between addition and reduction or between abundance and shortage, as it is not a fixed spiritual state. It occurs in three different degrees:

1. The *Mutawakkil* (dependent) should trust in God's care and His guardianship
2. The *Mutawakkil* (dependent) should annihilate himself in his dependence, for his dependence. The dependent's heart does not turn to dependence (reliance) and its truth, but to God, the only Trustee (*Wakeel*).
3. The difference between the *Hal* (spiritual state) of the *Mutawakkil* (dependent) in the two degrees lies in the fact that the dependent's reliance in the first degree is done through *Takalluf* (straining) and *Kasb* (acquisition). He pays attention to his dependence and feels it, and this distracts him from noticing the relied upon only. The second *Mutawakkil* (dependent) rises to the degree of annihilation, which implies abandonment of choice. "He won't argue that we should trust in God because He is the 'necessarily existing being' from whom all existence and all good flow. Nor does he hold, with his Ash'arite colleagues, that we should trust because whatever God wills, instant after instant, is good simply because God willed it, without regard for man's benefit or indeed, for any discernible purpose. But God wills the good in everything, and in everything He wills there is benefit to humankind."<sup>14</sup>

The spiritual state in which the *Mutawakkil* (dependent) is certain that he is a channel of the movement, ability, will, knowledge and other divine attributes, each taking place compulsorily, is unaware of what is happening to him. Al-Ghazali compares him to a baby who knows about his mother, though he does not cry for her, and his mother demands him. He knows also that even if he did not cling to his mother, she would carry him. If he did not ask for milk, his mother would initiate to feed him. This rare high status leads the dependent to stop calling on God and asking for something from Him because he has trust in God's generosity and care, while in the second degree he does not have to leave his calling on God and asking from Him, but he should leave off asking from others.

One might ask about the status of causes in *al-Mutawakkil's* actions and the management of his daily life: What is the relationship between reliance on God and the management of livelihood and life, which cannot be sustained except by work and diligence, and work that is conditioned by understanding causes and their relationship with their outcomes? Al-Ghazali answers this question through his clarification of the relationship between management and reliance on God. He admits that the second and third degrees are denials of management and of complete reliance on the *Wakeel* (Trustee/God). However, the first degree does not deny management and choice, but rejects certain forms of management. This means that the *Mutawakkil* on God manages his daily life affairs according to choices that are based on his senses and mind, and he chooses his actions and is not compelled to do them, but the achievement of these actions is made possible within the limits of God and His signs, or according to divine traditions and customs, rather than His explicit signs. The meaning of *management* in this context is the administration of political and economic issues and other fields of life. This management can occur at different levels: management of the individual, management of society, and management of the state.

<sup>13</sup>Frank Griffel, *Al-Ghazali's Philosophical Theology*, Oxford Scholarship Online, 2009, p.18.

<sup>14</sup>Eric L. Ormsby, *Ghazali: The Revival of Islam*, Oxford, one world, 2008, p. 131.

The *Mutawakkil*, first and foremost, conducts his secular actions of daily living and acts in the presence of God and the soul of His teachings, which God drew for Man. The *Muawakkil* does not attribute his actions to himself nor other people, but to God only, as God is present in his actions. Management can also be done without direct and explicit hints or signs from God, as the *Mutawakkil* depends on his known traditions and the steadiness of his rules. In other words, he depends on God's laws and rules for His creation and nature.

God's traditions, rules, and norms appear in the universe and nature through their consecutive, regular, and steady regularities. The *Mutawakkil's* secular actions should be considerate of God's rules and the clear limits set in his unseen written Book, and of God's universal actions in His seen Book. The achievement of this reliance on God cannot be fulfilled except by attaining the knowledge of the two books, i.e., by acquiring a grasp of the religious ethical sciences, the mental theoretical sciences, and the empirical natural sciences. Mastering these sciences is a condition for *Tawakkul* (reliance), and each deficit in knowledge of these sciences is a diminishment of reliance. After their accomplishment, the *Mutawakkil* is ready to rise to the second and third degrees.

The connections among reliance, management, and work are clear indications that abstention from secular life, abandoning its interests and goals and resorting to isolation, have nothing to do with reliance, as reliance is fulfilled only through active participation in managing the fields of political, economic, and scientific life, and issues that concern people's livelihood and their life interests.

Al-Ghazali does not deny the difficulty of achieving reliance in the real world in its three degrees/ranks, but it is possible, especially in the first degree, which is closest to possibility and accomplishment. Al-Ghazali compares the constancy of this state to the paleness of the patient whose disease controls him; it might either stay or go away. He compares the second rank/degree to the paleness of the fevered patient, whose fever might continue for a day or two. The third rank/degree is compared to the paleness of fear, which might continue for a very short time or not continue at all.

#### • Reliance and the Issue of Work

The concept of work is connected to various concepts such as belief, knowledge, and reliance on the Holy Koran, the prophetic Sunna, and Islamic culture in general. This connection indicates the practical and applied dimension of theoretical works, so that they do not remain divorced from human reality. Al-Ghazali maintains this general approach to emphasize and establish the rank of work and its cognitive value through his theory of practical ethics, which connects, in its essence, abstract concepts and practical applications: "The core of that theory was, on the negative side, that the value terms applied to action, such as *wājib* (duty), *hasan* (beautiful) and *qabih* (ugly) have no meanings in themselves, hence their application to action cannot be known by natural human intellect. The positive side was that these terms have meanings related to the commands and prohibitions of the divine Law."<sup>15</sup>

The concepts of value are applied through actions such as "doing one's duty" and "the beautiful and the ugly," which have no meaning in themselves. Thus, it is impossible to know its practical application by the human mind. However, in its positive form, this theory says that these concepts have some meaning when they are related to "imperatives" and divine prohibitions. Therefore, the application of these concepts can be known and understood only through learning the Shari'ah (Islamic Law).

Though al-Ghazali connected work with reliance on God, considering that *reliance* as a legal term was misunderstood, some scholars claim that he "forbids the belief in causality and devotes *Jabr* (compulsion), *Tawakkul* (reliance), and submission due to his Ash'arite origins and Sufi literature; he sees his book *Ihya' 'Ulum al-Din* as a declaration of the death of difference and blocked the door of *ijtihad* (individual judgment), not only by jurisprudence but also in every field of knowledge and therefore, he should be seen as one of the strictest elements of addiction in the system of values in Islamic culture."<sup>16</sup>

Others argue that the differences among researcher sin interpreting al-Ghazali's concept of causality can be attributed to their classification of al-Ghazali according to different philosophical theories: "I think, as a first reason for this, that Ghazali's important way of explaining the issue is not carefully examined and clearly understood.

<sup>15</sup>George F. Hourani, *Reason and Tradition in Islamic Ethics*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1985, p. 148.

<sup>16</sup>Al-Jabiri, A. Muhammad, *'Aql al-'Akblaqi*, Beirut, Markaz Dirasat Al-Wahdat Al-'Arabiyya, 2001, p. 592.

That is why he is usually put by scholars either on the side of occasionalist philosophers like Mulbransch and some of *Mutakallimun* (polemicists) or that of those who deny causality in nature like Hume. Not only this, he is also put-though rarely -on the side of Aristotelian philosophers. The Aristotelian and the Humean approaches are two extremes none of which Ghazali goes to. As to occasionalism, I think that Ghazali cannot be put in this category, either. For Ghazali does not think that secondary causes are mere instruments in the hand of God; to the contrary, secondary causes are really causes."<sup>17</sup>

In the other hand, some scholars understand al-Ghazali's ethical theory in a completely different way, rejecting criticism against him and the descriptions used to characterize him as non-scientific, non-rational, and non-realistic. They argue that he depended on the rules of logic in his research and adopted mental necessity as a steady framework for organizing the real world and similar worlds. Moreover, ... because the real world for al-Ghazali is not merely a world that any other world can substitute; it is the best world because it is the reflection of the Divine ability in the beauty of its goodness and the splendor of its justice. In fact, al-Ghazali rightly opened the door of knowledge, the door of the mind, and the door of reality onto unprecedented horizons that cannot be denied except by an arrogant stubborn, and onto unknown possibilities that cannot be denied except by an ignorant.<sup>18</sup>

Al-Ghazali criticizes the concept of reliance as wrong, because it implies the idea of abandoning work or earning by one's body, and he considers it ignorant and forbidden by law. He emphasizes the strong connection between reliance and work and shows influences on the worshipper's movements and the pursuit of his goal through his work and his pursuit of different types of work. This effort is based on Man's knowledge of his intentions and high goals. It is a beneficial pursuit that aims to serve the human being and his interests. In addition, this pursuit is based on Man's choice of what he sees in his senses and mind as useful and good to him. There are four arts of work that al-Ghazali believes take into account people's care and interests:<sup>19</sup>

**1. The First Art** is useful obtainment, whose causes are divided into three degrees:

- a. Fixed reasons, such as "food is a cause of satiety."
- b. Hypothetical causes, whose effects do not occur without them, such as "a traveler in a valley without provisions."
- c. Imaginary causes, such as charms and incantations, and cautery.

Nobody denies that the actions that Man performs are intended to bring him benefit, but the causes or means that he uses to attain his desired benefit are different and discrepant according to their connection with reliance. Al-Ghazali connects causes and effects on a rational basis, which means that the causal relationship must be definitive. The causality of adopting and employing a certain means must be necessary, and its abandonment is prohibited. It can also involve a hypothetical causality, i.e., a probability based on human experience. He believes that it is obligatory to adopt the causes in these two cases. However, he warns against adopting causes that are based on delusion or are not approved of by one's senses and mind.

**2. The Second Art** is preserving useful things, such as savings. Al-Ghazali divides this art in light of three cases:

- a. The person meets his individual needs, such as food, clothing, and housing and distributes his money according to his condition.
- b. Saving for forty days.
- c. Saving for a year.

The differences among the time spans for saving is meaningless after permission is given for saving, because the intention is the reformation of the heart, so that it will devote itself to worshipping and remembering God. Probably, a person's mind is busying itself about earning money, while another person's mind is busying itself about not having money. This is the ruling for the single individual. However, the supporter of a family might go beyond the limits of reliance by saving food for a whole year, but saving more than that nullifies reliance, because the causes are repeated with the repetition of years.

<sup>17</sup> Ramazan Erturk, "What Ghazali Denies and Does Not Deny About Causality", *Tasawuf*, Ankara, 2001, p. 240.

<sup>18</sup> Abd al-Rahman, Taha, *Al-Lisan wa al-Mizan aw al-Takanthur al-'Aqli*. Al-Dar al-Baydha', Al-Markiz al-Thaqafi al-'Arabi, 1988, p.385.

<sup>19</sup> Al-Ghazali, *Ihya'*, Vol. 4, p. 265.

Saving is a human attribute whose source lies in a person's fear of the future. This is a legitimate fear, but its tyranny makes it lose its legitimacy, and its outcomes become terrible to the saver and society, because when fear overcomes the human being, that fear generates psychological and physical diseases that can harm the saver himself. Moreover, saving can mean depriving those who are in need, in addition to causing an economic slowdown that can harm all the individuals of society. Al-Ghazali clearly understood the functions of money as: a medium of exchange and a measure of value. Money is used in payment of all goods and debts. However, he emphasizes again and again that money is not desired for its own sake.

And, as a means of holding wealth, he says, when one owns money, one owns about everything.<sup>20</sup> Al-Ghazali distinguishes between the individual and the supporter of a family regarding the issue of saving, due to the differences associated with responsibility that exist between them. This means that an increase in responsibility and its expansion calls for special rules. However, limitation of the period of time is not obligatory in all cases. For examples, the state can save for more than one year, according to its economic condition. The story of Prophet Yusuf a-Siddiq involves a message about this.

**3. The Third Art** is repelling an expected harm, such as a person's taking the *Mutawakkil* of his weapon to defend himself in the event that he is attacked by an enemy, shutting the door for fear of thieves, and tying a camel for fear that it might run away. These are causes that know God's law, be He exalted, through certainty, expectation, or imagination.

Expectation is based on real experience, and the occurrence of its objects is possible, not impossible nor obligatory. Its possibility differs according to our understanding of reality. Taking precautions that repel an expected harm is connected with the degree of our sensory and mental knowledge about the occurrence of this harm. The adoption of precautions is made according to the degree of expectation and the probability of the occurrence of this event or phenomenon. If the probability of the occurrence is decisive or hypothetical, the *Mutawakkil* should take the necessary precautions and means to repel the expected harm, and this requires that the *Mutawakkil* should establish his expectation on real data provided by the senses and the mind and avoid data that are based on delusion.

Adoption of the necessary means to repel an expected harm requires that the *Mutawakkil* should have knowledge and awareness of the sciences of his era in order to understand his reality and be present in his world, so that he is able to look into the future on the basis of rational principles, without illusions and superstitions. Thus, building dams in order to prevent floods becomes reliance; engaging in health care in order to prevent the spread of diseases becomes reliance; making military preparations to prevent attacks by enemies becomes reliance; investing in science in order to prevent backwardness becomes reliance; and establishing the foundations of justice to prevent corruption becomes reliance, too.

**4. The Fourth Art** is the removal of an existing harm, such as taking medicine to treat disease. For example, there are causes that alleviate or cure a disease. Some causes are decisive, such as water that removes thirst; some causes are hypothetical, such as *Fasd* (bloodletting), *hijāma* (cupping), and the procedures of other fields of medicine. Some causes are delusional, such as cupping, cautery, incantations, amulets, and evil omens. The condition of *Tawakkul* is abandonment of these means/causes.

*Al-Mutawakkil* has to adopt causes (means) in order to face existing problems or harms, such as disease. Seeking medical treatment is one of the causes (means) of recovery. Securing the availability of these causes requires great efforts in developing and supporting medical sciences and ancillary sciences and establishing hospitals and sanitarium. Also, securing the availability of equipment is an important part of the causes (means) that are the *Mutawakkil's* responsibility.

The individual *Mutawakkil* is responsible for his own health and its preservation, as deposits that God entrusted to him. This applies to all state systems. The *Mutawakkil* president is responsible for his subjects and people is responsible for removing the dangers and corruption that face his state, just as the individual is responsible for his body. Harm is not limited to diseases of the body; it can occur at all levels. Ignorance, for example, is a disease that should be treated by education; political, economic, administrative, and judicial corruption are diseases that should be treated by medicine; each disease has a specific medicine.

<sup>20</sup>S. Mohammad Ghazanfar, Abdul Azim Islahi, *Economic Thought of AL-Ghazali*, Scientific Publishing Centre King Abdulaziz University, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia, 1997, p.28.

- **Summary**

The connections among knowledge, the spiritual state, and work in al-Ghazali's ethical theory aim to coin a comprehensive theory that combines epistemological and existential elements, the phenomenon and beyond, work and values, matter and spirit, body and soul, and the individual and the other. It is a theory that is based on the principle of communication between different worlds and between concepts that appear contradictory on the external level, but al-Ghazali made an effort to bridge over the artificial contradictions and reveal the real relations between these components.

The relationship of communication between these components reveals the truths of things by connecting them with their sources and origins. The connections among the triad of knowledge, spiritual state, and work lead to an epistemological and existential integration tending toward ethical sublimity. Science and knowledge can be independent and separate from work and the spiritual state, but then it is not useful. Al-Ghazali focused on useful knowledge that brings benefits to human beings, but independent science and knowledge that is independent of work and misses a specific goal that serves Man and his existence on this earth are elements of ruin and destruction.

Al-Ghazali seeks to revive the necessary relationship between Man and God, be He exalted, considering it the beginning of beginnings, the end of ends, and the origin of relations. Unity is the existential origin and epistemological ideal from which the relationship between Man and himself, and between humans and nature, are derived. The establishment of human work in sense and mind is based on the science of unity, which guarantees that the process of human work will reach the goal for which Man was born.

Man's awareness of himself, that he is not the source of his existence, is attributable to the founder of existence and its Creator, and Man is not an epistemological ideal that produces the truths of things as they are. When Man realizes the truth of his existence and knowledge, he will realize that he does not realize the truths of existence. Self-awareness is Man's perception of his helplessness regarding his existential and epistemological perception, and his helplessness at perceiving the necessity of communication with God. God's will have decided that the human being will be an honored creature that is preferred to the rest of creatures, and one of the signs of this honor is that he is "chosen" and responsible for his actions.

Freedom of choice is a quality that characterizes wise people who can distinguish among choices in order to choose the best actions to benefit their lives. The chooser resorts to his sense and mind in his choice of his actions, hoping to achieve the utmost goodness. When Man realizes the limitations of the mind in his making of choices, he resorts to the first principle, from which existence was created, in an attempt to know the existential origin of existence, out of a desire for his certain goodness.

This resorting to the *Asl* (origin) is a request for divine support to guide human actions towards their destinations, and it should not be understood as an abandonment of action, but as a choice of the best and most preferable ones. It is right to say that communication with the *Asl* (origin) aims to expand the borders of the mind and connect it with absolute, existential truths.