

Sources of Islamic Ethics-Morality

- Muslims name four (4) Ethical sources;
- Qur'an (**reading & recitation**)
- Sunnah (**customs of Muhammad - HADITH**)
- The consensus
- Analogy
- These four ethical sources of Islamic teaching establish for the Muslim the '**Shari'ah**' – the pathway to **Allah**

Sufi Critique of Moral Philosophy

Publishing Date: 31.08.2024

What is Moral Philosophy?

Moral philosophy is derived from the Greek word *ethike etos* (custom, morality). Another name for moral philosophy is "ethics". Moral philosophy examines the problems related to the moral behaviors of people in their personal and social

lives and evaluates human behaviors. However, the subject of moral philosophy is not all human behaviors, but free and conscious behaviors. In other words, moral philosophy is an examination of human conscious actions.

According to moral philosophy, morality is the entirety of the principles that people determine for themselves in order to live in harmony within a society. In this sense, morality is the rules of behavior that exist in certain proportions in every society, independent of philosophy. Therefore, while morality is a value judgment that determines a factual form of behavior, ethics is the branch of philosophy that investigates, examines, explains and evaluates this value judgment.

It is accepted that the beginning of moral philosophy emerged with the beginning of the ancient age. Socrates (469 BC - 399 BC) is shown as the founder of moral philosophy. In ancient times, the understanding of morality focused on social ethics rather than individual ethics. In this understanding, the goal is the collective happiness of people. However, slaves were not considered equal to other people in this evaluation and the understanding of ethics was considered only for free people. After ancient times, with the rise of Christianity in the West, an ethical understanding whose source was God emerged. This understanding was rational and involved will. For a long time, ethics only included views originating from God. From the 15th century onwards, deviations were seen from the understanding of ethics centered on God and religion. During this period, an ethical understanding based on reason, isolated from religion and distanced from theology, dominated. While some philosophers had an ethical understanding compatible with materialist philosophy, some put forward an ethical understanding that had elements similar to the understanding of virtue and morality in Eastern philosophy. Basic concepts such as good and evil have been defined in different ways by many philosophers. However, what is common to almost all of them is the explanation of concepts such as morality, virtue, selfishness, goodness and evil with reason. Philosophy has sought answers to various questions such as whether the concept of ethics exists, whether the concept of ethics is universal, what good and evil are, whether there is a universal moral law, etc. with methods based on reason.

Today, philosophers continue to be interested in the question of what people should and should not believe, or how they should and should not behave. They

are also interested in the origin of accepted moral principles, under what conditions these principles can be considered reasonable, and which principles can be accepted as true. Are these principles a product of human thought? Is their source God? Is there more than one source? There are supporters of each option here.

Many philosophers treat God's commands and prohibitions as if they were their own thoughts. In other words, they think that God thinks like them. In this way, they deify their minds. They accept that people's moral intuitions are the ultimate criterion. However, because people's intuitions are different from each other, moral philosophers cannot find common ground.

Today, the fact that some of the actions attributed to God in the distorted Torah and Bible are morally questionable leaves believers in a dilemma. Based on these, religious morality is criticized by philosophers. Thus, the inclusion of God's commands and prohibitions in the subject of morality has created a problem. These philosophers have ignored the fact that the Torah and Bible have been changed by people and have not examined the facts in Islam. Thus, they have given excuses to people who do not want to believe in God.

According to some philosophers, through man's thought on the nature of things, God's basic moral criteria and their application to our daily lives can very well be discovered with reason. This means that the human mind can think about the content of revelation without revelation. This means that the human mind is deified.

There are some fundamental problems of moral philosophy. No common solution has been obtained that everyone accepts about these until today. These fundamental problems are as follows:

- 1) Do human actions have a purpose?
- 2) Are the forms of action that are accepted by society and are desired to be done by individuals really “good”?
- 3) Is there a universal moral law that all people will adopt?
- 4) What are the characteristics that distinguish moral judgment from other judgments?
- 5) Is the nature of man suitable for being moral?

6) Is man free when performing moral actions?

There are no common answers that everyone can accept to all these questions. Because these questions are intended to be answered only with reason. However, it is impossible to understand them with reason alone. It is not possible to answer these questions without understanding what a man is, what reason is, and what creation means. The answers to these questions are in the science of secrets. But the science of secrets is above reason. People will not be able to obtain complete and definite answers to these questions without resorting to the science of secrets.

Sufi Criticisms of Moral Philosophy

1) "Moral philosophy deals with the subject of morality since ancient times. According to moral philosophers, people before ancient times were primitive and did not have a systematic understanding of morality."

The concept of primitive man is completely wrong and unreal. Because the first man, Adam (pbuh), was a prophet. His wife, Eve (rah), was the second human created after him. The human generation emerged from both of them. These first people were not primitive. These people lived with the belief in monotheism and consciously believed in and worshipped Allah. Adam was also a man of science. No positive scientist could know the knowledge he possessed. However, Adam knew everything that positive scientists knew. Because Allah Almighty taught him the nature of all His names. Adam explained the angels the nature of these names and the angels were amazed by this knowledge. As a result, the angels prostrated to Adam. Only Satan, despite knowing the truth, did not prostrate himself out of arrogance and became an unbeliever. Therefore, those who deny these truths today are at the same level as Satan. Such a level is a sign that a person will remain disappointed in the hereafter. Therefore, calling these first people primitive is a great slander. The first people did not have today's technology, but they did have the knowledge of the secrets. Today's positive sciences and technological products are nothing compared to the data of the knowledge of the secrets. Wearing fancy clothes and sitting in fancy places are not signs of civilization, humanity and wisdom. Those who live in this way are

beings that are even lower than Satan if they do not believe in Allah and His prophet Hz. Muhammad (pbuh). Therefore, people should not rely on their own intelligence and means and distort the truth.

There is no written document from the first humans to the present day. However, information about them is conveyed to people in the heavenly books. Some people who came after Adam (pbuh) neglected the divine laws in time and deviated from the right path. As a result, many negativities arose. Today, a large portion of people live in the same deviation.

Therefore, as moral philosophers claim, there is no primitive human being and the claim that moral philosophy began with Socrates is completely unfounded. Moral philosophers excluded them because they could not reconcile the moral understanding of the heavenly religions with the selfishness of their own minds and souls. To what extent is this behavior scientific and moral? No moral philosopher has ever been able to answer this question.

2) Imam Ghazali criticized philosophers in his book *Al-Munqidhu mineddalal* and said the following:

“Philosophers claim to have logic and proof, that is, definitive evidence. However, they have fallen into disbelief in three areas regarding theology. These areas are as follows:

a) According to them, after people die, their bodies do not revive. Only their souls will be rewarded and punished. They have fallen into disbelief by denying that bodies will revive.

b) According to them, Allah knows the whole, but not the particulars. The verse, *“Nothing in the earth or in the sky, even the weight of an atom, is hidden from His Lord...”* (Surah Yunus, verse 61) rejects this claim. Therefore, philosophers have fallen into disbelief with this idea.

c) Philosophers do not believe that the universe was created later and that it will come to an end. This is also clearly infidelity. Because this is contrary to the Islamic faith.”

Ghazali also states the following about moral philosophers in the same work:

“All the words of the philosophers in the field of moral science can be summarized as explaining the attributes and morality of the soul, explaining the varieties of these attributes and habits, taking the necessary measures and struggling to correct the bad ones. They have received this information from the words of the people of Sufism. The people of Sufism are those who fulfill their duty of servitude and progress on the path that leads to Allah Almighty. In their struggle with their souls, the morality, faults and flaws of the soul become known to them. They have written these in their books. The philosophers have also received this information and mixed it with their own words. Their aim is to make their words acceptable and to make their false ideas accepted. In that era, and even in all centuries, there was a community of men of Allah. Allah Almighty does not leave the world without them. They are the spiritual elders, children, and pillars of the earth. With their blessings, mercy is showered on those who live on earth. The Messenger of Allah (pbuh) says in a hadith: *“It rains for their (the saints) sake, and sustenance is granted. The Companions of the Cave were a group of them.”*

As stated in the Quran, the people of Sufism, the Saints, were also among the previous ummahs. Two disasters occurred because the philosophers took the words of the Prophets and the saints and wrote them in their own books. The first is those who accept those words and the second is those who reject those words. Those who accept have also inclined to the false ideas of philosophers. Those who reject have denied the true words spoken just because philosophers said them. Both situations are wrong. The correct criterion here is to first know what the truth is and then look at the words spoken. In this regard, it is necessary to follow the following words of Hz. Ali (ra):

“You cannot know the truth from a person. First know the truth, then you will know the people of truth. For this reason, an intelligent person tries to extract the truth from the words of those with deviant thoughts. I swear on my life that most people think they are very intelligent and skillful in distinguishing truth from falsehood, right from wrong. For this reason, it has been made obligatory to prevent people from reading the books of deviants as much as possible.”

3) “One of the basic concepts of moral philosophy is “good and bad.” According to moral philosophers, useful and valuable things that occur as a result of a

person's choice made in accordance with his mind and will are called good; Actions that are not morally valuable and are not wanted by society are also bad."

How can we determine whether the result of an action is useful and valuable? Can we know exactly what it means to be useful and valuable with reason? This is not possible. Because understanding good and bad with reason is relative. Because reason tries to define what is good with the thoughts it knows and has learned before. However, the knowledge acquired by reason varies according to the person's environment, possibilities and abilities. Therefore, there is no concept of absolute good that can be reached with reason here.

It is possible to talk about things that may be contrary to the definition of good given above. Nuclear weapons produced by physicists are good behavior and useful in their own opinion. However, the use of these weapons can cause great harm to many things. The decisions made by statesmen may not be useful for every segment of society. But they think they are doing good things in their own way. Those who lie and steal for their own interests think they are doing good for themselves because they benefit in the end. However, these harm others. It may be asked what benefit stealing has. As a result of stealing, someone earns property and money and strengthens their own financial situation. This behavior is useful from their own perspective. However, another segment of society suffers from this. According to all these, the concept of good defined above is inadequate and wrong. Because measuring goodness with being useful and valuable is a completely relative assessment.

If we define evil as actions that are not morally valuable and are not wanted by society, can we achieve complete objectivity? Are things that society does not want always good? Western societies see Islam as a religion of terror and want to destroy it. Is this a good thing? If you ask Western people, most of them will say it is good. But it is not for Muslims. Therefore, the concept of being morally valuable is a relative concept. The actions that societies want to be done are also things that change according to time and society. There is no objectivity here.

4) "A person can think of some moral laws with his own mind. But all of these are relative. A person and his mind are creatures. The moral laws that his Creator will set are the most suitable for the person and are absolutely right. However,

philosophers produce some moral principles with their own minds and claim that these principles are absolutely right. However, this is not possible. Because the mind cannot grasp the whole reality. Therefore, it is always inadequate when making decisions or comparing on its own. Only the one who produces it can determine how a machine will work most optimally. The machine itself cannot determine how it will work best.”

However, most philosophers do not even accept the existence of God and substitute their minds for God. While the mind cannot even know its own nature, it is claimed that it knows what is good and what is bad about everything. This is a great heedlessness and has never been proven true.

The powerful decide that they have gained this power with their own mind and see it as justified to oppress the weak. Today, communities in the world that consider themselves moral live by this principle. Because they never want to give up their wealth and power in favor of the weak. This is a natural result of the human soul not being disciplined. These people think that they have gained the intelligence, knowledge and power they have with their own efforts and skills. They look down on and despise those who do not have these opportunities and see all kinds of cruelty as justified for them. Among those who do this, there are also institutions that teach the most advanced moral theories.

A person may say many good things theoretically, but if he has not reached sufficient religious maturity, he cannot resist the commands and desires of his ego and, when he gets the chance, he commits all kinds of cruelty for his own benefit. He may not be aware that he is committing cruelty. He feels that he is specially created and these behaviors seem normal to him. Therefore, what does the mind theoretically produce is not important.

What is important is the application. What should be the rules of this application? It is not possible to determine these rules with reason. Indeed, throughout the history of philosophy, moral theories determined by reason have contradicted each other and different views have been put forward. If reason had known the principles of absolute morality, these differences would not have existed; every mind would have united in a common understanding of morality. However, this has not been the case.

Those who worship their reason and deny the Creator end up with inconsistency. Unfortunately, even many educated people cannot see this and still try to produce and implement a moral understanding according to their own minds.

According to Sufism, the laws of morality are the rules set by Allah Almighty, the Creator of people and the entire universe, who sees and hears them at all times, who is aware of all kinds of hidden and open things. These rules are expressed in the Quran and sacred hadiths. People's happiness in this world and the hereafter is only possible by complying with these laws.

Allah and His Messenger (pbuh) have detailed the necessary moral rules for people's individual and social lives. In the times when these rules were followed, people were comfortable. In the times when they were not applied, they were miserable. The era we live in today is one in which Islamic moral rules are not applied. Therefore, negativities such as wars, terror and economic crises do not leave people alone. The Islamic understanding of morality is very sensitive and has the most perfect structure designed for humans. Since people are being tested in this world, Allah Almighty does not force people to implement them. If He wanted, everyone would have to comply with them completely. However, since the life of this world is a place of testing, people are left free to implement them.

"We will test you with a little fear, a little hunger and a little loss of wealth, lives and crops. Give good news to those who are patient!" (Al-Baqarah, 2/155)

"We created the things on earth as an ornament for it, so that We might test which of you is best in deeds." (Al-Kahf, 18/7)

"He is a God who created the heavens and the earth in six days to test which of you is best in deeds..." (Hud, 11/7)

"Indeed, your wealth and your children are a test for you, and with Allah is a great reward." (At-Taghabun, 64/15)

Those who follow the Islamic moral laws will benefit themselves. Those who do not follow them will suffer losses. While some of the results of the test of human behavior will be seen in this world, the real result will be seen in the hereafter.

"On that Day (the Day of Judgement) people will be brought forth in groups (from their graves) to be shown the rewards of their deeds. Whoever has done an

atom's weight of good will see it, and whoever has done an atom's weight of evil will see it." (Az-Zilzâl, 99/6,7,8)

"Man will not find anything except what he works for." (An-Najm, 53/30)

5) "Some philosophers criticize Muslims for believing in fate. For this reason, they think that there is no moral value in Muslims' behavior."

This mistake stems from a lack of understanding of how Muslims believe in fate. They confuse the fatalism in Islam with the theory of fatalism. Their aim here may be to denigrate the religion of Islam. Because the West is constantly looking for an excuse to denigrate the religion of Islam. This search still exists today, and in the West, Islam is tried to be identified with terrorism.

It is a fact that Muslims' belief in fate is not of a nature that will diminish the moral value of their behavior and intentions. Muslims believe in both fate and that good and evil are created by Allah with their own choices. They believe that they choose which path of happiness or unhappiness they are shown by Allah. In this regard, Islam states that humans turn to the path of happiness or unhappiness with their own free will. As a result of this orientation, the direction they turn to is made easier for the person.

If a person does not have the power to choose, how can some things be allowed and others forbidden to them? In this case, what is the difference between a good and a bad person? In this respect, a person has the freedom to choose his path and is responsible for his actions and intentions. The verses and hadiths that clearly express this are as follows:

"And say to them: The truth is from Allah; whoever wishes, he will believe and whoever wishes, he will remain a disbeliever." (Al-Kahf, 18/29)

"The one who does good works for his own benefit, and the one who does evil works against his own harm. Then to your Lord you will return." (Al-Jathiyah, 45/15)

"Every one of you is a shepherd and is responsible for his flock." (Muslim, Book of Faith)

Criticisms on Some Moral Philosophers

Socrates (469 BC-399 BC)

“According to Socrates, the aim of moral actions is happiness. Happiness is achieved through knowledge. According to Socrates, moral concepts and truths are hidden in the human soul. The duty of philosophers is to extract these truths.”

These views are unacceptable from the perspective of Islam. How realistic is it to say that good and evil exist in the soul of a person? What is the nature of the soul? What kind of structure does the soul have that all moral concepts are hidden in it. However, according to Islamic belief, the oneself is a separate entity from the soul and always commands people to do things that suit their desires. The oneself needs to be disciplined. If a person restrains the evil desires of his self, it is possible for him to live a moral life. Disciplining the oneself is a goal of Sufism. Accordingly, being moral is not something that can be achieved by the self alone, as Socrates said.

A person can do evil despite being knowledgeable. Because if the desires of the self prevail over everything, no matter how knowledgeable the person is, he can do a bad action. There are many examples of this in history. Although Socrates' understanding of morality contains good intentions, it expresses wrong judgments. Therefore, it is not acceptable from the perspective of Islam.

E. Kant (1724-1804)

Kant states the following in his work “The Metaphysics of Morality”:

a) “The foundation of moral philosophy is good will. According to him, the real purpose of reason is to produce an intention that is good in itself, as long as it is practical or can affect the intention. Good will is an indispensable condition for a person to determine whether something will make him happy.”

Good will, as the name suggests, is to want something good. However, here it is necessary to determine what is good. Because one cannot intend something without being convinced that it is good. So what is good? Can we know what good is with reason? Examples of these have been given above. If we consider

the concept of goodness according to the interests and happiness of individuals, we understand that it is relative and does not express an absolute value. All of these show that a moral understanding that bases good will on itself is shaken and that good will is not a consistent principle.

b) "The most important indicator of good will is the concept of duty. Duty is the responsibility to act out of pure respect for the moral law."

What is the moral law here? Who determined this law? Kant's idea of duty is a matter that has a purely theoretical quality and cannot actually find a place in hearts. This idea cannot go beyond being a "mere wish" that adorns the dreams of moral philosophers. Because this principle has no power of enforcement over people.

Islamic ethics is superior to Kant's understanding of morality or rationalist moral theories in general. The greatest aim in Islamic ethics is "Allah's Pleasure." Accordingly, the measure of an action being morally good depends on whether it is done for Allah or not. The superiority of Islamic ethics is not only theoretical. The real superiority of Islamic ethics is that it manifests itself in practical life rather than theoretically. Islamic ethics has achieved a success that no other philosophical theory has been able to show in spreading the idea of duty among various layers of society. This is because the Islamic religion has paid great attention to concrete incentives and punishments, and the details of otherworldly happiness and unhappiness. Therefore, people do their actions for the sake of Allah on the one hand, and for the hope of reward and fear of punishment on the other.

c) "Act in such a way that the universal rule to which your will is subject, that is, the law you obey, is in the form of a universal law principle."

This principle is called the "absolute command." The deficiency in this concept is that it contains some unexplained terms. What is the law that your will obeys? If you believe in God, these are the laws that He has established. If you do not believe, what are these laws and what is their origin? Philosophers do not have the answer to this. They can only take this origin as far as reason can reach. This limit varies according to the person and society. Therefore, it is not possible to present a universal law through reason. In addition, philosophers do not take into account the spirituality in the heart of man. However, in the hadiths of our Prophet (pbuh), it is stated that the center of measurement of behaviors defined

as good and evil is the heart of man. This feature of the heart cannot be perceived by the mind.

According to Kant's strict command, moral understanding is specific to actions only. A person is not held responsible for intentions that do not turn into action. However, according to the moral rules of Islam, we are responsible for all our intentions that do not turn into action, whether they are good or bad.

"...Whether you reveal what is in your hearts or keep it secret, Allah will call you to account for it. Then He forgives whom He wills and punishes whom He wills." (Al-Baqarah, 2/284)

J.P. Sartre (1905-1980)

"J.P. Sartre is a representative of the philosophy of existentialism. According to Sartre, the essence of all beings, except humans, precedes existence. For example, all trees exist according to the essence of trees, and all birds exist according to the essence of birds. Only in humans does existence precede essence. There is no such thing as human essence or nature. Humans complete their own existence and create their essence. Man creates moral values such as good and bad with his free actions. He determines them with his own will."

The philosophy of existentialism is completely contrary to Islam. Because according to Sufism, every being in the universe has a reality in the unseen world which was created by Allah beforehand (The fixed signs). These fixed signs gained their existence in the world by being revealed to the visible world by Allah. In this respect, all of Sartre's ideas are not accepted and rejected by Islam. Therefore, Sartre's understanding of morality is completely contrary to Islam.

The fact that man can define good and bad moral values with his own will is the deification of man. Identifying man with God brings with it many problems. If man dies, then does God die too? The idea that God dies is completely absurd and meaningless.

F. Nietzsche (1844-1900)

"According to F. Nietzsche, there are two classes of people in society. These are the common people and the elite class. The common people are in the state of

a herd. Therefore, the morality of the people is the morality of the herd and slaves. The morality that suits the elite class is the morality that is selfish, ruthless and in line with human nature. Moral laws should be established by the elite. Because they are the masters. According to Nietzsche, people should be saved from morality and together with morality, the concepts of crime and punishment should also be removed from the world.”

Such an understanding of morality only creates anarchy and chaos in society. Nietzsche’s views are the expression of a state of mind that rebels against society and nature and is not a healthy thought. Thinking of different moral laws for people is completely contrary to Islam. All people are equal in front of Allah and everyone is responsible for their own actions. Nietzsche’s sick understanding of morality is unacceptable. If all people thought like him, there would be no peace in the world, instead there would be constant war, terror and massacres. What can be said about a philosopher who cannot see the end of his thoughts?

T. Hobbes (1588-1679)

“T. Hobbes is the representative of the philosophy of selfishness (egoism). This philosophy argues that it is good for a person to act in accordance with his own interests and ego. According to him, man is selfish by nature. Therefore, the dominant factor in morality is selfishness.”

This understanding of morality leads societies to chaos. The selfishness in human nature is something that the oneself commands. However, a person must discipline his self and get rid of selfishness. Sufism exists for this reason. Otherwise, society cannot survive healthily. Wars and terror are applications of this understanding. Islam never accepts this. What is strange and sad is how the respected philosophers of the West perceive a feature that will fundamentally shake the order of societies as a moral goal. It is extremely difficult for a Muslim to understand this, and therefore he should completely stay away from such philosophical views.

E.N.M. Farabi (870-950)

“According to Farabi, human mind can distinguish between good and bad, useful and harmful, right and wrong. According to him, if a person acts in accordance with mind, he acts morally.”

In the explanations above of our article, we stated that reason is limited and therefore cannot understand absolute good and evil. Therefore, if we leave moral rules to be determined by reason, the result will be wrong. Farabi is an Aristotelian philosopher. He uses such expressions under the influence of Aristotelian metaphysics. However, these ideas are contrary to Islam and are unacceptable. Because of such ideas, Farabi was declared an unbeliever by some Sunni scholars, such as Ghazali.

B. Spinoza (1632-1677)

“B. Spinoza is a pantheist philosopher. Pantheism is the doctrine that the universe (nature) and God are one (the same thing). Acting in accordance with the laws of nature is acting in accordance with God. In this case, the laws of morality are clear. Acting in accordance with the laws of nature (God) is good, and acting inappropriately is bad.”

Pantheism is not a correct philosophy. Considering God and nature as the same is polytheism. In this respect, the moral understanding of this philosophy is completely contrary to Islam. According to Sufism, the universe emerged from its fixed appearance in the unseen world to the visible world through the manifestation of existence by God. In this respect, God and the universe cannot be considered the same thing. This subject is explained in detail in our article titled "[Existence in Sufism](#)". Therefore, natural laws cannot be perceived as moral laws.

Conclusion

Good morality is one of the most important goals of Islam. Because Allah Almighty has defined and praised good morality in many verses. The Messenger of Allah (pbuh) also has many hadiths regarding this. Therefore, the duty of a Muslim is to know what good morality is from the perspective of Islam and to work with all his might to achieve it.

However, today in our society, the moral philosophy of the West is introduced as good morality. The words of many moral philosophers are served in the media. In this way, attempts are made to spread non-Islamic ideas and beliefs in society. Muslims need to be very vigilant against these activities. Concepts such as goodness, beauty, happiness, and freedom are explained to people based on the moral philosophy of the West. In the article above, we have explained in detail that the moral philosophy of the West is contrary to Islam. Accordingly, Muslims must protect themselves against these wrong ideas. For this reason, they must learn what true Islamic morality is. In order to learn true Islamic morality, the books of Ahl-i Sunnah scholars must be read. We can give the following as examples of Ahl-i Sunnah scholars: Imam Ghazali, Imam Rabbani, Ibn Arabi, Ismail Hakki Bursevi, Said-i Nursi, Abdulkadir Geylani, Mevlana, Erzurumlu Ibrahim Hakki, Mahmud Ustaosmanoglu, Hoca Ahmet Yesevi. In particular, one must be very careful in reading the books of newly emerging theologians today. Because there are people in our society who appear to be theologians and who work to distort Islamic morality. Every Muslim must make an effort to be careful against them.

The good morality of Islam is what will save Muslims and Muslim societies in this world and the hereafter. Therefore, in order to experience happiness in this world and the hereafter both individually and collectively, we must equip ourselves with the attribute of good morality. It is obligatory for every Muslim to learn the verses and hadiths on this subject. By implementing this obligation, we will ensure that Islam is exalted and dominant in the world again. Let no one have any doubt about this. Because every society sees the reward of what it has done. If the majority of a society does not live by the beautiful morality of Islam, that society is condemned to live in instability and turmoil. This is a sunnah of Allah.

In the 143rd verse of the Surah Al-Baqarah, it is stated that the Islamic community will be a witness over other people. The Islamic community has superiority over other communities, and Allah shows them as witnesses to all people. This superiority is in beautiful morality. In this respect, beautiful morality is an honor for Muslims, as long as we are worthy of this honor. Therefore, let us both learn the beautiful morality of Islam and teach it to our surroundings; let us live it ourselves and help our surroundings live it. Indeed, Muslims are the victors

in the long run. May Allah grant all Muslims the opportunity to work on this path!
Amen.

References

“El-Münkizû Min-Eddalâl”, Imam Ghazali, Hakikat Bookstore, Istanbul, 2008

“Ethics”, <https://tr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ethics>

“F. Nietzsche and Moral Philosophy”, <http://ahlakfel.blogspot.com>

“Fundamental Problems of Moral Philosophy”, H. Özturan, Nobel Publishing House, Istanbul, 2015

“Fütûhâtı Mekkiyye”, İbn Arabi, Litera Publishing, Istanbul, 2008

“Ihyaû ulûmî’ d-dîn”, Imam Ghazali, Bedir Publishing House, Istanbul, 1974

“Kur’ân-ı Mecîd and Its Commentary with Meâl-i Âlîsi”, Mahmud Ustaosmanoğlu, Yasin Publishing, Istanbul, 2009

“Mektubat-i Rabbani”, İmam Rabbani, Yasin Publishing, Istanbul, 2008

“Mesnevi”, Mevlana, Kırambar Library, Istanbul, 2013

“Metaphysics of Morality”, E. Kant, Macmillan Company, New York, 1891

“Moral Philosophy”, <http://webders.net>

“Reason and Faith”, M. Peterson, et al., Küre Publishing House, Istanbul, 2009

“Rûhu’l-Beyan Commentary”, İ.H. Bursevi, Damla Publishing House, Istanbul, 2010

“Socrates and Moral Philosophy”, <http://ahlakfel.blogspot.com.tr>

For your comments and criticisms: oryanmh@gmail.com

[Home Page](#) [Articles](#)