

Shiekh Shabbir

1) Mistakes in perceiving reality

In the process of perceiving reality, a mistake can occur. This mistake has two forms:

- a) The mistake in formulating the direct perceived reality into propositions. Such that I perceive a reality in front of me with my senses but when I come to formulate the proposition, the mistake occurs in the formulation and not the perceiving of reality.
- b) The mistake that occurs when deriving a conclusion from a set of propositions. The propositions themselves could be based on direct perceived reality and there was no mistake in formulating it, but the mistake occurs when putting all the propositions together to derive a conclusion, which leads to a faulty conclusion

There is a possible third form but it is not actually a mistake, so we mention it separately: To not submit to certain axioms (قضايا بديهية) due to faulty perceptions, also included in it is to have a set of correct premises but not submitting to the self-evident conclusion of those premises. (An example is having a set of easy to identify correct premises that lead to the self-evident conclusion of the Existence of God, but not believing it in because it is too easy to be true, and since there are many people who are non-believers, then the truth shouldn't be this easy!)

2) Difference between Assertion and perceiving reality (إدراك)

Assertion is related to formulating propositions, while perceiving reality is a direct realisation of the reality in front of you.

When I say a Human is a Human, it is clear that the subject and the predicate are the same (i.e identical proposition), but there is no realisation nor does this proposition speak of anything in regards to the actual reality, all it says is that a Human is a Human, with no information of what a Human is nor applied any ruling to the Human. It becomes clearer with this example that an assertion is different from perceiving reality.

The mistake occurs in the assertions, and not in perceiving reality.

3) Origins of Assertions

A person may reach to an assertion through multiple different reasons, some of the reasons are:

- 1) Through perception of reality (direct knowledge): I see a laptop in front of me, thus I assert that the laptop exists. The origin of this assertion is through direct perception.
- 2) Through inference: Through perception of reality I formulate propositions, then I infer from those propositions a conclusion. An assertion through inference.
P1: I am a contingent being
P2: Everything that is contingent requires an explanation (cause)
C: I require a cause
- 3) Through Philosophical Analysis: breaking down a concept into parts. Example: The Human is a rational animal.

4) التخييل الموجب لتبديل الموضوع والمحمول (subject and predicate)
Illusions in formulations that cause to change the

Example: If something touches my shoulder, I immediately realise there is a reason for that and turn around to see what it is. Based on that I assert that "Every contingent needs an explanation/cause ". In reality "needs" is something additional to what I perceived, what I perceived is simply "Every contingent has an explanation" for there is nothing called "needs" when perceiving reality itself.

It is important to realise the above as it can be crucial in understanding certain concepts. For example a question that is asked is: We needed Allah SWT for our initial creation, but do we need His Existence for our existence to remain as well? Or if He created us then we're sufficient to exist by ourselves. Some answered that contingents need a cause, and we always are contingent then we always are in need of a cause and thus we are continuously in need of Allah SWT. Here you can see that a mistake in formulating the assertion "Every contingent needs an explanation/cause" caused further mistakes that depended on it.

Another mistake caused by an Illusion in an assertion is in the proof used that Allah (swt) is a necessary cause for this world. To give some info, some scholars have said that not all causes necessitate its effect, some do, while others don't. Based on the previous, they have said that Allah (swt) existed and He had the choice whether to create or not create as he is not a necessary cause for this world. Other scholars disagreed and said that the world is contingent, and a contingent is like two equal scale on a balance, one is existence and the other is non-existence, but the existence of Allah (swt) blocks all the doors of non-existence and thus necessarily creates the world.

The mistake the second scholars have made is to imagine contingents as two-equal scales of a balance, or that there are doors of existence and non-existence, and if we lift this illusion, the proposition changes.

Origins of Illusion:

First example: Imagine you're at home alone at night, all your family are outside and you hear the sounds of a lockpicking attempt on the door and the door opens. What comes to mind immediately is that a robber has entered the house, but isn't there a possibility that it is a member of your family who has forgotten their key? It is possible, but fear has driven the illusion and based on that you asserted that it's a robber.

Second example: Imagine a scenario where your brother and a stranger are vocally fighting, you're angry that someone is fighting your brother and that anger drives the illusion that the stranger must be at fault and you assert it. Once you calm down and review the situation you realise that anger was the reason why you rushed into that assertion. Because of the rage the proposition became "My brother does not make mistakes".

Third example: When you put a pencil in a body of water, the image of the pen becomes distorted and you assert the pencil is broken. What happens in reality is that you omit the very unlikely possibility that what your eye perceives may not match reality at times, and you assert what you see. This happens because typically it is not known to fault the perception of the eye, and thus no one considers the possibility of it not being true. In reality what reaches the eye is accurate, as what happens is that due to the density of the water the waves are distorted and such the pencil appears distorted, but is a distortion of an object as per my eyes see matches reality? In the majority of cases it does, but not always, because we don't usually deal with seeing bodies in different mediums of differing densities, and here the illusion plays a role in omitting all the possibilities and asserting the pencil is broken.

4) Realising the mistakes in an assertion

There are two important points in regards to realising the mistakes done in an assertion:

- 1) To realise that we ourselves can actually identify that we made a mistake. Many times we look back at an incident and say "I was mistaken", which means we have the capability to identify the regions of error in the assertions that we make
- 2) The importance of reviewing our assertions and breaking them down in order to confirm that they are indeed true. At times we may be emotionally motivated to double down on an assertion due to being engaged in a debate, but once the pressure of the debate cools down, you realise your assertion contained flaws that you hadn't noticed during the time of the debate. It is important to differentiate between an assertion based off evidence and an assertion based of my emotional feelings of wanting it to be correct.

The Qur'an points towards the same idea in Surat al-Qiyama: {Oh, but man is a telling witness against himself, (14) despite all the excuses he may put forward. (15)}

5) An application on Philosophical Determinism

Determinism can be presented in many different forms, but we will tackle one form and analyse the mistakes that occurred. Determinism saying the following:

Every contingent being needs a cause, and it needs a cause because it is contingent, for existence cannot exist without a cause because it would mean existence happened instead of non existence without any reason for it to have happened ¹.

In regards to the above, two different ideas were discussed:

- 1) Is it possible that the contingent being has a priority for existence over non-existence? Some have used the example of existence and non-existence as two equal scales on a balance and said that priority here means that the scale of existence would be slightly heavier and thus preferable over non-existence. Others have replied to them saying that this is a mistake in illusion, in reality there are no scales that or balances. Does this priority change the contingent being into a necessary existence? It does not, and it still remains contingent and needs a cause, thus this priority concept has no meaning and is rejected.
- 2) It is agreed that every contingent being needs a cause, but does the existence of this cause necessitate it causing the contingent being into existence? A group of scholars have said that the cause of existence does not necessitate the contingent being's existence, it can choose to bring it into existence or not. Another group replied back saying the following:

Consider A is the cause of B, in the morning A existed while B did not, and later in the afternoon B comes into existence. B in fact did not come with a cause, as A caused it in this scenario, but there is something that occurred without a cause, the allotment which is choosing B to exist in the afternoon instead of the morning. If you say that the cause of allotment of B to exist in the afternoon is A as well, then A becomes the **cause of existence of B in the afternoon only**, while in the beginning we said that A is the cause of B unconditionally. Either the allotment has no cause (which is impossible) or the allotment is caused by A which then contradicts the initial proposition that A is the cause of B, there is a third option that the allotment is caused by other than A (say C), then in this case the existence of B relies upon A and C together. Putting all this together results in the following: Nothing can exist except with its cause, and the cause is fully sufficient, which leads to Determinism. (Imagine you lifting your hands, the cause of this action is not you, but rather, the causes of this action are both you and the thought that occurred to you in that instantaneous moment, and if that thought did not exist, then your hands would not have lifted upwards. If you were a fully sufficient cause for your hands to lift then it

¹ Thanks discord Moosa

would have been lifted since you were created, thus you are not a fully sufficient cause, and both you and the thought need to exist in order for the act to happen. Let us take this one step deeper, is the existence of this thought by your own free will or not? If you say not, then Determinism is true. If you say yes, then we say: When did this thought come into existence? It only can exist if the cause of it exists, and you keep tracing back this chain of causes until you reach to the existence of Allah (swt), thus everything is caused by Allah (swt) as He is the fully sufficient cause, and every act of ours is basically a series of causes necessitating acts.

However, is what is previously mentioned correct? There is actually a mistake in the concept of "Allotment". It is true that we need a cause for B, but we need to ask, what does "allotment" mean? In reality all it means is that B did not exist in the morning, and existed in the afternoon, and there is nothing else other than B. This cause of "allotment" for B existing in the afternoon instead of the morning is something I made up with my mind, an illusion that is created when comparing between B existing in the afternoon and B not existing in the morning, when there is no such thing as "allotment" in reality, and thus there is no need for a cause of the "allotment" because its merely an illusion caused by our mind.

Al-Ardabili mentions an example that we can comprehend the faultiness of a fully sufficient cause by saying: Imagine the scenario of you falling down from a building and you walking down the stairs. When falling down, you have no choice but to continue falling, while when you're walking down the stairs, up until your legs reach the bottom step, you have the freedom to stop declining, and this difference is enough to realise that there is no fully sufficient cause that necessitates our acts