

T H E   E G O



# T H E   E G O

By

**Prof. Ahmed Barqawi**

Review

**Dr. Manal Mohammed Khalif**

**And Elite of Translators**

Review

**Dr. Manal Mohammed Khlef**



# T H E E G O



©House of Philosophy LLC.  
all rights are save

Philosophyhouse.ae  
Philosophyhouse.ae  
Info@philosophyhouse.ae

Print permission number  
MC-02- 01- 4482261

ISBN international numbering  
9789948748397

Objective classification  
- Philosophy and psychology  
- Age group: E

Written by: Ahmed Barqawi  
Review : Dr. Manal Mohammed Khlef  
Cover design: Reem Al Mazroui  
Internal direction: Moza Al-Mazouri

Published in Fujairah - United Arab Emirates  
First edition 2024

The age group that suits the specificity of the books has been identified and determined according to the age classification of the Ministry of Publishing.

It is prohibited to use, reproduce, or transmit any of the materials comprising the book, in whole or in part, in any form or by any means, whether electronic or intelligent, including time-reproduction, recording, or using any information storage and retrieval system, except as approved in writing. From the House of Philosophy.

The ideas and opinions published in this book are those of the author and the poem does not necessarily express an intellectual opinion.



## Contents

<u>Preface</u>	9
<u>Chapter One: The Ego and Self- Consciousness</u>	11
<u>Ego</u>	13
<u>Transcendental System</u>	15
<u>The Normal Ego And The Mutinous Ego</u>	22
<u>Ego Fissions</u>	25
<u>Chapter Two: The Ego In Captivity</u>	30
<u>Chapter Three: The Negation Of The Other</u>	41
<u>Falseness</u>	43
<u>Ideology Of killing</u>	52
<u>Chapter Four: The Tragic Existence</u>	61
<u>Death</u>	63
<u>Frustration And Tragic Existence</u>	69
<u>Nostalgia</u>	74
<u>Alienated Existence</u>	79
<u>Alienation Of Woman</u>	83
<u>Alienation Of Refugee</u>	93
<u>Humorous Existence</u>	90
<u>An Isolated Ego</u>	94
<u>1. Bat Cultured</u>	94
<u>2. Aggressor Cultured</u>	96

Humorous Existence	90
An Isolated Ego	94
1. Bat Cultured	94
2. Aggressor Cultured	96
Morals Of Instinct	94
Ego In A world Without playing	97
Chapter Five: Awareness of Consciousness	101
Thinking According to Principle Of Beginning and The End	103
Danger Of Absolute Relativism	104
Science And Its Contradictions	110
The Death of Man	115
About The Utopian Consciousness	124
Free Ego	127
Conclusion	130
Fragments	138
Philosopher	138
Mutineer	140
Poet	141
Dictator	142
Trivial Egos	143
On Values	144

Piteousness	144
Love	143
Falseness	143
Death	144
Wolf Nature	144
Illusions	146



## Preface

In language:(I) is Subjective Pronoun, returns to the speaker (she/he). The term selfishness is derived from the word ego, which means Selfishness. I have been trying in vain to find adequate answer to this question: Why (I) Subjective pronoun? Why are there no two pronouns in English, one for the masculine and the other for the female, when they express themselves.

I'm a woman, I'm a man, while you are a woman and you are a man.

While the verb remains the same in (I), when connected to (am). (I said), it is said by both masculine and feminine.

(I) is pronoun that begins as affirmation of the presence distinct from the other. In the Holy Qur'an, "I'm Allah." The content of speech, I'm alone God and there is no god but me.

In Al-Hajjaj ibn Yusuf's sermon; "I'm the son of the obvious and exposed, the one who conqueror of difficulties". Where Al-Hajjaj preach in the mosque in front of a group of worshippers.

Oh worshipers, I'm unique, I'm not like other people, know me, for I'm distinguished.

"I'm free and the doctrine of every free one is main," Abu Madi says. Here, (I) Confirmation of the existence of essence, I'm free.

(Ego or I) refer to self-knowledge that I present to other; so as to he knows who I'm. The mystic declares in his appeal to God, "Oh I'm!" To confirm the non-separation between him and God, to declare absolute monotheism.

Ego can say to the beloved, "Oh, I'm," to the son or daughter, to confirm the highest levels of love.

Oh, the slaves of monkeys, I'm Master of Lords, this is dispraise to others who don't have an ego; because they are slaves. Every ego isn't free, not ego, as it should be, but everyone can say (I'm), in isolation from the essence of his ego.

When each of us speaks or starts with it, he knows himself as he sees himself, and in a definition of himself he wants to deny any definition of the other for him.

“Register, I’m an Arab,” the context of the saying: There is someone who wants to deny him, which means that he extracts his own identity, so the answer comes strict: Register, I’m an Arab.

And when one of us wants to exaggerate his expression the declaration of a unit that includes the group, he can say in the tongue of the people: I’m the people. Here people have become one ego, who expresses himself in the form of a single speaker. He adds: I don’t know the impossible, a universal essential characteristic, that made a lot (ego) ,by the poet.

Man can contemplate his ego, and knows most of his characteristics. He can be aware, if he is generous, stingy, brave, or coward.

But, how can I know the other as ego, and can I borrow (I) to I meditate his ego, and it has become his ego, of course, it’s impossible to do so.

I don’t know the other as (ego), but he shows the ego By word and deed, contemplating my ego, that helping me to meditate the ego, but how impossible! to reach a truth that I settled on.

So, my knowledge of the ego is to know only the states of its appearance, but my contemplation of ego spoils me to say; the ego is what appears; because what it shows may be less than it doesn’t. Likewise, I know this one thing that there is an unknown thing in the ego, but I don’t know this that doesn’t appear, alone the ego knows that. Suppose I discovered by chance a pattern of the behavior of a person, who doesn’t correspond to what appears from him. Here, I know what appeared, and that was hidden, but I can’t know the hidden thing before it appears. Many difficulties face those who confronts the ego by through reflection and meditation. But it shouldn’t prevent us from going through the research in this complex thing. However, another concern behind our approach to the ego, that it is a reminder of ego, which lost in the midst of forgetfulness; because of Uplift of “the we”. I want to rehabilitate to ego as a self- existence, rejoicing, grieving, suffering, tormenting, governing anger, revolting, and surrendering, hates and loves ... etc.

This is my book, not anyone else’s book.



## Chapter One: The Ego and Self- Consciousness



Who am I? A less posted question by the one to himself. As, man rarely contemplates himself inwardly. Even if he posts such a question to himself, he can't properly introduce a real answer.

Because, when the ego asks a question about itself, fissions into two parts. I meditate an ego, i.e. the ego fissions into subjective and objective, a matter that the ego can't do. The ego can't be freed from the subjective rule about itself, it can't reveal its internals, or explain why it is like this.

The ego knows its apparent biological qualities, and its emotional state at a definite moment. It knows that it's sad now, happy, angry, incapable of action, or capable to do it. But if one tells the other: "I share your sadness. I'm sad for your sadness." This saying may be a truth, also may be a lie. It is just a saying! Only the ego knows whether it is sad or not.

The simple and clear truth that the ego knows; it isn't the other. And its conscious of being different from the other is a real conscious that none can deny. But, the ego participates with the other in many external qualities. The common career creates similarities with my companions in the field.

I'm a professor, and so is he. I'm a professor is one of my qualities, but it's one of the other's qualities of my genres. But this quality doesn't make me him. I have the internal qualities that distinguish me from others, who share the same career.

I'm a worker: i.e. I exert physical work to earn my living, produce a commodity.

I create a materialistic effect in things, or do an effort in exchange for a certain wage. As I'm qualified as a worker, I have my dreams, and psychological qualities. My dreams, and psychological characteristics aren't only related to that I'm a worker.

When my ego's consciousness is the fruit of the other's external consciousness, the problem gets more complicated.

I'm a worker; how do I see myself, how do others see me, and what are the qualities that others give me?

The other determines my social Position, as he has Pre-awareness of my consciousness's level, and my attitude's pattern.

The rich other: he sees me in a lower sociable rank, and he doesn't make an intimate relationship - friendship, or marriage- with me. I arouse his feeling of pity mixed with contempt. That rich man grants me a stereotypical image that becomes common. The other one has prisoned me in such an image.

My career isn't a kind of my thing anymore, but a related image to the other, and a

career-related behavior determined by the other.

Consider this ruling; "That behavior isn't appropriate to a university professor." This rule means that the other has a previous image of a university professor. This previous image is related to the prestige of intellectual work.

The previous image of a university professor; the other drew it for the professor, and the professor drew it for himself. It became an image, not owned by the professor, but a standard norm to the other. The university professor wears an elegant costume, doesn't behave like the public, or fight by hand, and is well-endowed; he is »a respected« man in the public language. And any deviation for the professor from this drawn image by the other will produce condemnable reactions, or disapproval that he has deviated from the previous standard norm.

So, my consciousness of my ego has become subservient to the other's consciousness of me. Here am I -as we said- prisoned in the other's consciousness. I'm trying my best not to appear in an opposite way from what I'm in the other's consciousness. I must not violate him with my behavior's pattern; that I only interfere a little in making it. But I'm, as an ego, more complicated than that not measured from the stereotypical image; drawn by the other of me, who asked me to understand my ego as he wants.

So, I live a separation between what I hide from others and what I show. The thing I hide is the atypical image, my whims, desires, opinions, emotions, and psychological qualities that conflict with the standard image; Because if I show all of this, I will face slanderous judgments, and my stereotypical image collapsed; which I became - due to the tyranny of other over me - eager to abide with it.

Therefore, every ego lives his subjective consciousness with a real separation. An apparent ego, and a hidden ego. The ego is a world of secret and showing.

Everyone should think of his ego, he will surely find himself living this separation.

Therefore, the ego is a separated consciousness between an ego as it is, and an ego as it is shown. Since every ego lives its subjective consciousness in this pattern, so it generalizes this over each ego. Hence, in my consciousness to the other, I always suppose that the other has what's shown, and what's hidden. If we differentiate in the ego between the apparent and the hidden; this isn't because we know what the other hides, but because we live the experiment. As we sometimes live in the other's secret state, and exposing state.

From the question who am I? and it's an individual question, we take another step by asking a more general question; what's the ego?

## Ego

We reach the borders of the ego, when we ask “who am I?”, let go deeper and discuss the abstract meaning of the ego.

Let's start with the negative, the ego isn't a thinking substance. It is an incident, a state, and it doesn't exist except as the whole, and as a physical, spiritual, psychological, and a moral unit.

The ego isn't a separate individual, there is no existence to Ḥayy ibn Yaqzān.<sup>(1)</sup>

The ego is always a present character in a human community. It is a language, values, habits, ambitions, aims, refusal, and acceptance. This all doesn't occur except in the field of humane community at all its levels; the ego is work, and behavior. Also, the work, and behavior are related to others. The ego isn't just feelings, it isn't biology, but it is culturally sociable.

Therefore, the ego is a complicated universal existence. It doesn't acquire its differentiation, except by the subjective consciousness. It has a differentiated existence in the world. And as it is established in the world, and as the world is established in.

If we went back to the fission of the ego into an apparent and hidden, so we can't understand this the fission except by the existence of the ego in the world, and vice versa. But the existence of ego in the world, and the existence of the world in the ego don't cancel the objectivity of the world, nor the objectivity of the ego.

Therefore, there's the ego and the world, and the relation between them is a cohesive, and a repulsive relation at the same time.

if there's no repulsive relation between the ego and the world, the ego wouldn't fission into apparent and hidden.

What is the world, in which the ego exists, and forces it to fission?

The unconscious rigid nature doesn't establish relations with the ego, on the contrary. It is a one-sided relationship. It isn't one of the world's categories that make a cohesive

---

1- it's an Arabic philosophical novel and an allegorical tale written by Ibn Tufail in the early 12th century in Al-Andalus. (Reviewer)

relation between it and the ego. Nature is a material, hylomorphic existence formed by the ego according to its aims, and abilities.

The world that we mean is the world stored by the ego, and establishes a cohesive relationship with. It's the cultural, political, social, moral, and legal world.

However, this world is historically made by the ego, but there is no ego maker to it alone. According to this meaning, it's objective in its relation to the ego. But that objective world isn't neutral towards the ego, it forces the ego to live according to its will. Because it is an objective world, it is transcendent to the ego. It forces it to abide by its laws. Here, we reached the world as a transcendent system upon the ego, that forces it to walk according to its will, and orders. Every breaking, shifting, or mutiny creates a negative reaction such as astonishment, refusal, rejection, mockery, laughing, sarcasm, and punishment. Or in the cases of the world's transmission from one quality to another, - i.e. this breaking, shifting, and mutiny - gives the ego value: the ego that does all of this. The transcendent system to which the ego is subject, is historically, rankly, professionally, civilized, village, and Bedouin specified...etc.

Every ego finds itself in a pattern of the transcendent system. the universal transcendent system, i.e. the community system, forces the ego a public behavior, whereas the private transcendent system allows to multiple in the way of abiding with it.

## Transcendental System

We talked about the transcendent system in relation to the ego; because it is an objective matter that obliges the ego to act according to it. It is the Force authority that rise above everyone else, and all recognizes it without asking about its origin, and difference. It is an inner force that protects itself, penetrated into the ego, and became embedded of its structure.

This system consists of intertwined elements of religious, and social values, customs, and norms that arose historically, and gained their independence with the times. Even if it is affected by change and alteration; Which maintain the transcendent system in this way with a new pattern of elements.

The ego is adaptive- automatic - to this system. To the extent that each ago became a guard over its continuation, and refusing to penetrate it.

If we dismantle the elements of the structure of this system, which are practically indestructible, we would find that they are directly related to what is believed to be good for people. Let's go over some of these elements in detail.

### **The world of moral values, prevailing customs and traditions:**

The world of values is based on the concept of good, which contradicts the concept of evil. All positive values are attributed to the concept of good, and all negative values are belonged to the concept of evil.

There are many concepts that indicate positive values, and they have corresponding concepts denoting negative values. Honesty, justice, equality, humility, love for other, benevolence to parents, honor, conscience, generosity, relief for the needy...etc. They are all concepts of values, so, They are rules of behavior, with which contradict: betrayal, injustice, arrogance, selfishness, miserliness...etc. They are also concepts specified to human behavior.

The source of the world of positive values is the realization of the interests of others. Adjust the human tendency to evil. Good is the good of others and evil is the evil of others.

Simply, in common consciousness: the moral is good, and the immoral is the bad. This is a well-known issue. But the question we ask is if the ego recognizes the value, and the power of these concepts, so why should he act in contrast to it? Where did the ego get this power to penetrate what it believes to be good?

someone says: Values are relative, whether positive or negative. and The boundaries between them are not fixed.

What are the boundaries that separate generosity from miserliness? What are the boundaries between extravagance, generosity, miserliness, and economy?

Man may say that he is saving, makes sense, and not stingy, he knows full well that he is stingy. In fact, The problem isn't just in the relativity of values. Rather, it is in the interests of ego to comply with these values or not. In the position of these values, between a declared position, and a hidden other, at a time when a value can have a general consensus.

What makes the ego a representative of a world of value, and penetrating it?

If values are related in one of its forms to the form of human association, then each group has its own values, in addition to the comprehensive, and general values of society, and even humanity.

Let's take one concept; to apply to it what we are about to ask . as the concept of honor. It is difficult to put the concept of honor precisely into a comprehensive, a clear definition.

It is known, for example, that the concept of honor is linked to the human relationship with matter, "money, wealth, property." The honorable relationship with matter is legitimate gain, and from the two evils we obtain wealth illegally.

Or the connection of honor with jurisprudence, as the honorable woman is the one who doesn't commit adultery, just as the honorable man doesn't commit adultery. Or the association of honor with honesty.

However, a man steals, takes bribes, commits adultery, and lies, not because of the relativity of these concepts, but rather because of the realization of an interest. Bribery is greed for money, adultery is satisfying a desire, and lying is to achieve a private goal, or harm.

The relativity of values is explained by the difference of people about them, if it is different from one society to another. Love between a man and a woman in the West includes sexual intercourse. Thus, a woman, or a man isn't considered to be in a state of adultery, if they have made love. But honesty is Comprehensive, a universal value, as

well as not bribery.

In any case, the violation of values by the ego is considered an abomination.

However, the ego penetrates this world, but one day comes, in which cases of penetration of values are common without generating a feeling of shame for its owner. The climate of absolute corruption keeps only a few, who conform to the world of moral values. Otherwise, how do we explain a rich man who got rich through illegal means, roam at will among people, and without bat an eyelid?

In fact, the power of interest is often victorious over the power of values, and the moral deterrent is strengthened, and weakened in the ego according to the position of the ego. We don't know why the ego strengthens, or weakens in front of interest.

Perhaps the living climate is a condition for strengthening, or weakening the ego in relation to the world of values. Maybe it is the upbringing, or the social status, perhaps... maybe...but how do we explain the difference between Yousef Al-Azma, who went to meet Guru, He spent the day exchanging conversations, "until the sun went down, he was gone" according to Shawqi, and that who was said, to have pulled the Guru's chariot was one notables Damascus?

How do we interpret the difference between the one who betrays his home country, and becomes a spy for the enemies, and the one who sacrifices himself for the sake of the home country?

How do we interpret a witness who testifies only to the truth, even if all temptations are presented to him, and a false witness who swears by the Book, and lies in his testimony?

How do we explain the behavior of two university professors, one of whom takes bribes, and the other lives in a state of absolute integrity?

Despite all this, the world of positive values remains a transcendent system, that no one is able to utter a word against, or that penetrating it is often done in secret.

But the existence of evils on the earth is giving a scandalous meaning of the weakness of the ego, and the weakness of the transcendent existence, despite the apparent love for it, or the declaration of belonging to it.

Next to this world of values lies the world of customs and traditions, which are general Quasi-social laws, that forces the ego to take it into account. It is a pattern of behavior that is repeated, even it appears apparently a fixed nature of the ego. It's a world - a semi-static system, that takes a long time to change. And his slowness turns him into an inherited world. Man inherits customs, and traditions, just as his physical characteristics. he seems helpless in front of it. Rather, compliance with it becomes a spontaneous

state. Wedding rituals: marriage, circumcision, success, semi-permanent rituals, even if its image changes.

The gift, for example, is an element of the customs of congratulating the marriage, i.e. “wedding”. Whether the gift is a wreath of roses, or something material. It may burden those who can’t afford it, but the authority of customs is stronger than apologizing for them, as the hearts of those celebrated may be troubled from its absence, and for this you see a person searching for any way to adhere to it, even if that invites him to borrow from the other.

If the gift gives rise to such concerns among the financially needy, then how are some customs that require the practice of killing as revenge? The custom of revenge is a Bedouin peasant value carried out by the closest relatives of the murdered person, brother, son, father, cousin... Its action falls either on the killer, or on any being, who has a family kinship with the killer.

if one of them fails to take revenge, he is described as cowardice, and the shame is drawn to the family.

The murderer is a revenge that doesn’t achieve any interest for the murderer. Revenge is a material act with a moral goal. It is an act of perpetuating hatred, killing, and taking innocent lives, that have nothing to do with the original incident.

How many courtship customs in the East, and the consequent spending of money prevented two lovers from meeting in marriage.

How distressed the rural resident of the city is fed up with the habits of hospitality to family, relatives, or even the people of his village.

How many cases of mutual aversion between individuals, and friends due to non-compliance with the customs of joy and sorrow.

The ego finds itself in this state only as an element in a structure that is stronger than it, and is moved by the laws of structure, not by its will; because the structure here is a transcendent system.

As for religion, it is considered the strongest, and strictest, component of the transcendental system.

It is a set of beliefs, and ideas about creation, good, evil, and a set of symbolic rituals that a religious person performs. It is a faith is beyond doubt among its believers. It is belonging and identity.

In origin, Religion is a discourse, whose owner believes that its source is a deity. Or someone who takes the place of a deity - like Buddhism.

The authority of religion is based primarily on containing the concept of the sacred. The sacred, which ranges from deity to person to places. Everything that comes out of God is sacred, and must be ratified with unquestionable submission. Every character close to the sacred is sacred, and every place associated with the original Hallowed is sacred ... and so on.

Hallowed creates a strong solidarity among the believer, and the believers, that reaches the point of fanaticism.

And someone says: Religion is a relationship between the holy God and His servant, and this is true, but it extends - to become a sentence of absolute commands in life. Because it interferes in daily human relationships. And directs them to what they should do, and what not to do.

There is no authority stronger than the authority of the sacred. Whether this authority is appointed by a religious institution or not. And the authority of the Hallowed turns into a fixed universal authority, despite the religious schisms that all religions have known, its orders - in all its specific forms - remain absolute. It imposes on the other a commitment to it, an obligation that shouldn't be subject to discussion at all.

In most religions, there are worldly punishments, and divine other, in the afterlife. Indeed, the punishment of the hereafter is the most form of punishment that prevents a man from shift from the commands of religion. The idea of divine punishment plays an important role in socio-moral life. It imposes on those who don't proceed from an internal ethical motive a moral obligation motivated by fear of punishment.

Accordingly, we understand Dostoevsky's saying: "If God didn't exist, everything would be permissible".

But, if we leave the ethical issue aside, the transcendent religious system, since it includes a decisive saying in metaphysical problems, and in the origin of the world and God's relationship with it, the most important thing results from it, that the religious metaphysical saying is the confiscation of rational, or scientific thinking in the world. Hence, religious theology arose, which used the mind - basically - to confirm religious demarcations in the face of philosophical action that freely travels the world.

No doubt that the ordinary ((ego)) tending to reassurance, and comfort finds its way in accepting religious demarcations, while the ego that tends towards mental mutiny, sees God as alienated from a world that refuses mere contemplation of the truth as the mind wants it.

In addition to customs, values, and religion, sexual relations occupy an apparent posi-

tion in the transcendental system. And if the body is almost absent in the two previous elements, then the presence of the body here - in sexual relations - is a strong presence. Sex is the only instinct, that has its own discourse. it is true that there are cultural eating habits, and specific manners to this instinct - the eating instinct - but they, i.e. these manners, and habits, don't suppress the food instinct. With the exception of the prohibition of eating pork in Islam, and eating prey isn't desirable for most peoples. The important thing is that satisfying the food instinct remains free. Rather, humanity struggles against poverty, which is effectively Inability to meet the biological nutritional demands of the body.

While the sexual instinct was subjected to all kinds of moral, religious, and social oppression. the rhetoric, habits of oppression turned into an element of the transcendent system.

Sex is transformed from an instinct that requires gratification into an organized means of reproduction subject to laws, customs, and traditions. Gender was included in concepts alienated from it, such as honor. Marriage became the legal institution, in which human has the right to satisfy his sexual instinct.

It is true that a small part of the world has mutinied against this institution, and the scope of sexual relations between the sexes outside the institution of marriage has expanded, but most parts of the world still live as a transcendent system.

We don't need to narrate the historical transformation of sex into a transcendent system, It is a living reality to the extent that it is still the most oppressive system.

The oppression here is twofold: material- bodily oppression, and the suppression of a discourse on the body as the center of the sexual instinct, Rather, the body is reduced to a gender, and the sexual instinct wasn't originally suppressed except because it is a relationship between two bodies. It is the only instinct whose quenching requires the union of a body with a body - male and female. And since the female turned into a possessive ((ego)), into that which is absolutely subordinate to a male "ego", preserving this property took the form of regulating the sex according to a masculine ideology full of concepts: What is lawful, forbidden, betrayal, adultery, whore, and the honorable. The discourse becomes obscene, it is a description of the sexual process, or the use of words denoting the genitals.

Rather, the two elements of the transcendental system; i.e. Values, and religion have reinforced the suppression of the sexual instinct, and surrounded it in a closed world. The discourse of love turned into a romantic discourse in many cases, which expresses

the longing for communication with a strong crescendo.

when sex was transformed into a transcendent system, that imposes normal behavior, repression turned into a tool of repression, and so, repression into an unconscious, or conscious pathological state.

We said that we're not talking about the unconscious, but about the conscious repressed by adherence to the transcendent system. Therefore, the conscious repression of sexuality has expressed itself by concealing desire, or taking turns in expressing it, because it falls within the forbidden, deprivation area.

The problem generated by the transformation of sex into a transcendental system is greater, and more complex than we imagine. it is origin of the deprivation that is satisfied without fulfilling this. Satisfy at hand, but it is far from it. This is the source of the tension of the oppressed body, As the most horrible, and severe type of oppression is the suppression of the instinct by legalizing it, where masturbation in the adult sexes is an attempt to liberate from this oppression, or consider sexual relations secret to the extent that creates fear of their public appearance.

We have so far mentioned three elements of the transcendental system: values, religion, and gender. However, we have to point out the interconnect of the elements of this system, as many values are based on religious orders. Sex is linked to the world of values, and religion. The world of religion is originally a discourse about life in all its forms. Without excluding - of course - independent elements in each of the elements of this system.

sum up : The ego faces a transcendent, binding, oppressive system without the ego having any role in making it as an individual. It remains for me to refer to another system that is no less repressive than its predecessors, namely the political system.

The political system is the one imposed by the ruler, or rulers to exercise, and maintain authority. It is necessarily oppressive; because it imposes the subjugation of the other.

It is distinct in an important respect from the transcendental system. It is the existence of institutions, that watch over such submission: Security, police, army, and the existence of known penalties: imprisonment, exile, execution, deprivation of civil rights, travel ban ...etc.

Whereas, individual lives in, and submits to the transcendent system, without compelling institutions with a known function.

The ego stands - in front of the political system - almost helpless, especially, if this system is tyrannical.

The ego tries to adapt to this system by submitting to it, and its orders. Authority here is generally oppressive, but the varying of degree of oppression results in varying levels of submission.

There is a difference between a political authority with a democratic endowment, and that one came through the use of violence, and continues only through it.

In the first case, the ego appears in a state of acceptance, and is always full of hopes for a change of authority. Because, it is here the captive of the democratic system. In the second case, the ego is generally, with some exceptions, separate, rejecting, and forced to submit. Then, the tyrannical authority, knowing with certainty its contradiction with society, sets itself up as an enemy of the ego, and looks at it as a possibility of a permanent enemy.

The suppressive authority of public expression, critical behavior, and free political adherence to the party, and guild, marginalizes, and fears the ego at the same time. The ego, in turn, searches for a means of internal balance through undisclosed situations.

When authority itself identifies with the transcendental system, the ego rejects this identification, and even considers it contradictory to the transcendental system.

Here, we reach the point of absolute alienation between the ego, and the political system, an alienation to be aware of, while the ego doesn't reach the point of this alienation in relation to the transcendental system.

We Conclude: The ego is located, whether we like it or not, in a relationship with the transcendent system, and the political system, as an authority. If we say a relationship without specifying its essence, then at this moment of analysis, we have not revealed all the appointments of this relationship.

But since both systems are a repressive authority, and that one imposes obligation, the forms of relationship are acceptance, mutiny, neutrality, and indifference. As a result, we get the contradictory picture inside the ego, the one apparent, and the other hidden.

## The Normal Ego And The Mutinous Ego

We define the normal ego as that is openly, or inwardly adapted to the transcendental system, and the political system.

The ordinary ego doesn't make - practically to any kind of shift from the two systems, or one of them. Here we only know its apparent ego.

The majority of the population falls - in normal cases - into this category of ego. Simply, it is the ego of vulgar daily life. And it is the Satisfied ego with its reality, and is complies by the orders of the two systems, its complaint, if it occurs, doesn't amount to a practical refusal.

As for the mutinous ego, it was the one who was enough of the authority of the two aforementioned systems, and is mutineer against them in the positive sense of the word. Practically, it is refuser, in word and deed, to comply with their orders. In this sense; It is "abnormal ego".

The position of the normal ego from the Mutinous - abnormal ego, is different from the position of the Mutinous ego from the normal ego....

The normal ego lives in a catastrophic, internal contradiction, while it is satisfied with the world as it is, prefers peace, and fears adventure, it has a high appreciation for the mutinous ego, who imposes its prestige on the normal ego, and the latter is attracted to it out of respect, and appreciation. While the mutinous ego has an internal contempt for the normal ego, and makes it a subject of ridicule.

The mutinous ego occupies a prominent place in the soul of the normal ego, this means that the normal ego realizes the greatness of the act that it is unable to carry out, and for this reason you see it bestowing on the mutinous ego noble qualities. From here we understand the status of the popular mutinous hero, the free martyr, the prisoner for the sake of the homeland, the philosopher who transcends his world, the critical poet, the creative novelist...etc. in normal souls.

To avoid misunderstanding, we say, Not every ego that is shift from the transcendent system is a mutineer against it, and that is why we describe the ego as a positive mutineer. the transcendent system, despite its authority, isn't an absolute evil, So, stealing, bribery, and lying are shift from a transcendent system that rejects these patterns of behavior, and shift from it- from this aspect, this is shame that only by the trivial ego can do.

the trivial ego is selfish, and think only of achieving its own interests, while the other, which has the highly human value, is completely absent.

As, the mutinous ego is a sublime; because the other is present in it, and has an absolute presence. In the normal ego, The contradiction between the apparent and the hidden is often a great, while it is lessened in the sublime, mutinous ego. Until now, we still find difficult to highlight the relationship between the hidden, and the apparent ego.

The hidden ego is the one that harbors rejection, shifting, criticism, out of the transcendental system, and the like, i.e. the political system. in this means one asks: If the ego is hidden, how did you know it?

Every contemplator of the subjective-individual experience realizes this directly. Yes, let every person reflect on what is happening in his chest, what he hides, so that he realizes that what he hides, fear of the transcendent system is too much.

Let no one think that the hidden ego is like the "ID" according to Freud. The ID is a subconscious area of repression, that the ego is aware of only with the help of the psychoanalyst, while the hidden ego is that aware of what it hides, and voluntarily prevents it from appearing.

The hidden ego is unrevealed thinking in language, or behavior, intentionally suppressed emotions, silent mutiny, secret rejection, concealed behavior.

In this sense the true ego is there. In the hidden ego, the description of real here doesn't carry any value connotation. It is a reality that exists objectively in the ego.

The hidden ego may contain negative, as well as positive values, and the negative values are those that cause a bad impact on the interests of the other, and the opposite of it is the positive values. Therefore, not every shift from the transcendental, or political system is a positive act. What determines the positivity of this shift is its connection to the concepts of freedom, dignity, and good. It is the creative shift. While the rebel's rejection of an oppressive political system is a positive act, national treason is a negative act. Therefore, the hidden ego, which tends towards public appearance, isn't always positive, or negative. Here, we are facing two types of behavior, that lead to talking about two types of souls. The mutinous soul that thinks about the social whole, its freedom, and

the free of other is a noble soul, while the souls that penetrate the transcendent system for the sake of narrow self-interests, and in an immoral manner are trivial souls. The transition of the ego from the silent, hidden mutiny to the declared, apparent positive mutiny, is the ego that seeks a better world, while the emergence of the hidden ego to practice negative values, is the ego that has no worries, and has nothing to do with the concept of the freedom.

Envy is a negative value, which is rejected by the transcendent system; because the transcendent system, as we said, includes what is negative, and positive.

The ego hides the value of envy; because it is negative in the first place, and when it shows it, it is a disgraceful act.

While atheism is a mental attitude towards religious demarcations, it is difficult for the ego to declare it in most cases - it is a feature that characterizes some creative egos, such as the philosopher, the poet and the artist... but it-That is, atheism may appear when the ego reaches the point of indifference the religious transcendental system.

Here, the relationship of the hidden ego with the political system is an ideal for this hidden ego.

Indifference is an undeclared attitude towards the political system among many individuals, who take a hidden position, rejecting the political system. It is the silent, false image, While the real thing is rejection.

The same applies to Taqiyya (heedful of Good ). If indifference is a silent attitude, then Taqiyya is an explicit, false, and a silent, implicit position.

In any case, the concepts of normal, and mutinous aren't identical with the apparent, and the hidden ego. The normal ego also lives a separation between the apparent, and the hidden, even if it is the most committed to the transcendental, or the political system. But the contradictions of normal ego are done in the field of idle life, as they are absolutely fruitless. Because it doesn't live the tension, or anxiety of this contradiction, while the mutinous ego is the supreme abnormal ego.

And by that we mean the supreme abnormal, Unique, the creative, superior, anxious, tense person; because of his position on the world. We said the supreme abnormal to distinguish him from the natural abnormal, such as the fools, and the idiots, for a biological or psychological cause.

The supreme abnormal is a noble soul, diametrically opposed to the trivial soul... like a criminal, an informer, a dictator, a thief, a traitor... and the like.

The natural abnormal isn't responsible for what he is, while trivial souls are morally ill.

The hidden ego of the noble supreme abnormal is always impulsive towards appearing, and conscious mutiny against the transcendent, and political system, without caring about the responsibility, or punishment that this mutiny, brings about that doesn't belong to the punishment in the socially, and morally despised sense.

It is well known that the significance of the punishment of prison for people is multiple, while the punishment of prison gives rise to a politician, or an owner of an idea in appreciation of the people, the prisoner punished for bribery, theft, or crime is despised. Even the colloquial position of those who consider them heretics, or men of letters disgraceful to public decency, despite its negativity, doesn't include those punished as social punishment, as morally immoral. It, i.e. public awareness, is raised by the general leadership against those who believe they are able to influence minds.

Needless to say, cultural history is ultimately the fruit of the creative ego.

## Ego Fissions

The ego isn't a simple identity. It has a very complicated structure, internally diversified, contradictory, fixed, and shifting. It includes concealment, as we said, as much as emergence, and states of conscious as much as the subconscious.

The reasonable lives in it alongside the unreasonable, and what is the original adjoins the fake.

However, this ego that we singled out, and whose relationship we highlighted with the transcendent, and the political system, It reflects within it a prevalent structure in the comprehensive sense. So that the ego becomes an abstraction of the structure of behavior, knowledge, culture, and ideology.

Here, I'm talking about the identity of the ego in relation to what is fixed in structure. That is, about its relationship to historical time.

Here, the ego can only live in its specific historical time. And historical time is nothing but the structure of society in the present.

However, when we talk about a specific historical time, we are talking about the contradictions of this time, and how they are reflected in the ego.

In historical time, there is a level of technical, cultural, economic, and ideological development.

No doubt that the transcendent, and the political system belongs to a specific historical time, but this time is richer, and more complex than these two systems.

The farmer's relationship with the land is a relationship that the farmer doesn't make himself, it's the result of the level of development of agricultural tools, methods of production, the form of ownership...etc. Now, he uses the power tiller to plow the land, and the power harvester to harvest the crop of grains...etc.

Suppose a farmer insisted on using the traditional plow drawn by oxen, we will pass a direct judgment on this farmer, by saying that he is alien to the achievements of the age,

and that his mentality is ancient.

Nevertheless, what shall we say about an educated farmer, who uses the finest means of modern technology in agriculture? His uniform is new, and he is in a quarrel with his wife, and beats her, believing that wife beating is a legitimate matter, and a means of raising her.

Some will say that he is exercising his right, and others will say that he belongs to a by-gone era.

The event, and the attitude towards him, reflect the contradictions of historical time, and its reflection on the ego.

The one ego lives multiple times at the same time, and reflects different structures, whose contradictions it has experienced – without realizing it - which we call the structural ego fissions.

The structural ego fissions are closer to the subconscious state than to the state in which the ego stands conscious from the transcendental or political system. Here, the age of the ego is no longer measured by the years it lives, but rather by historical time. The one who believes in jinn, for example, is - according to historical time - more than a thousand years old. Moreover, who lives the same discourse in the Middle Ages - is the son of the Middle Ages, and so on.

But, in contrast, the ego itself may live alongside this past historical time, a present historical time, that is, it involves two or more structures, one of which belongs to the past, the other to the present, or is in between. In this case, the ego consists of contradictory structures, so it lives in behavior, awareness, and fissions for which it is mostly not responsible.

Ego fissions arise from the relation between consciousness and reality.

Here, our issue doesn't refer to which of them comes first, but rather to the very complex relationship between them.

Undoubtedly, the ego contributes to shaping its consciousness of the world, sometimes freely. However, the number of egos capable of this is almost insignificant compared to those that find themselves captive to a historically formed consciousness. And this latter often creates the ego as it pleases. This ego builds its relationship with the world based on the formed consciousness, and the movement of reality, which is faster than the movement of consciousness, puts the ego face to face-in front of the world- reality.

The ego retains its conscious legacy in its relationship with the world. This world begins to destabilize this legacy without mingling with it, or creating a matching pattern of

consciousness. So that consciousness fissions into old and new one. Then we won't get equal development in the movement of consciousness, and the movement of reality.

The truth is that the situation of society is ultimately responsible for the fissions of consciousness. There are three societies: a stagnant society, a stagnant and a moving society at the same time, in addition, mutant with vitality, and rapid development societies.

The historically stagnant society is whose construction is characterized by stability. Here, the ego lives, in general, identically between its consciousness, itself, and society, with the exception of some souls seeking to change the world by introducing a new consciousness. Here, we get individual cases of mutinous souls, and their influence is almost zero in the movement of society. They are alienated souls; because the separation between their consciousness and the living world is almost absolute.

As for the stagnant and moving society, it is a society in which the old structures are shaken, and the new structures appear without achieving a historic victory.

Here, The society lives in tragic contradictions between forces repressing the dissolution of the old structures, and forces attracting the new ones.

And so, we get three patterns of ego: the first traditional, that prefers the continuation of its old, the second tends to mutiny against the ancient, while the third lives the contradiction within itself. So, it is neither ancient nor new, or has luck from the ancient and the new.

There is the ego that establishes an absolute rupture with the ancient. Expressed the realistic historical tendency of the rising powers.

The second pattern of Ego – is that couldn't be free from the ancient, and tends towards new lives, the one who lives ego fission. The Ego in the same moment is in multiple realms, multi-realms situations, others that are contradictory.

Because there will necessarily be a contradictory, and difference between the values of a stagnant society, and of a new society. Between the consciousness in the stagnant society and the other in the moving society. The Ego maintains the two types of values without the victory of one over the other, this means that the ego lives fractured and contradictory. Because it involves many identities together, and seeks to fit them, thinking he's successfully balancing identities.

Take an example the idea of Asabiyyah “social solidarity. Traditional society is based on tribal, regional, or sectarian solidarity. While the solidarity in modern society – modernistic – is based on profession, class, or ideological solidarity.

Here, we got two types of solidarity in society that coexist in it, the traditional and mod-

ern structures: kinship or geographical location solidarity on one hand, and solidarity related to union and party.

When both solidarities coexist in one ego, then this ego will contaminate his consciousness, such that partisan contaminated with tribal, the trade union with local, and the modern ideology with the old ideology.

The biggest example of Ego fissions is the position of the woman or the oriental man's consciousness toward women. At the same time, he wants her, a worker with an old uniform, educated, has vernacular behaviour, freed, and has a cautious attitude toward man. She is sharing in the income, has an absolute home job, belonging to the social milieu by profession, and deprived of opinion in marriage. In addition, she should be effective, but within the limits of occupations decided by the man.

Indeed, the resulting problems of fissions of consciousness towards women, lead to many problems, that are not lived by either the stagnant society, nor the society in which the new structures have completely triumphed.

I swear that the most important result of Ego fissions is the diversity of his reactions to a specific situation, hence the absence of any expectation of what the ego will do. You don't know which identity will appear in the reactions of ego and as long as it is coexisting at the same moment inside the ego.

When the ego doesn't know the reactions of the other, it fear the other. It will be in a state of embarrassment if it decided to express himself without realizing the consequences of this expression. So it lives in a state of silence in front of the other. To prevent it from suffering moral or material harm. So, the state of expression narrows in front of a narrow circle of those who know them well.

As if, every ego lives as a stranger in the midst of others. Because it reflects his ego, which fissions on all egos, and it act according to this self-fission.

How many egos have been isolated, and punished for expressing themselves, without realizing in advance that its expression will bring woes upon its from others. It was even surprised by reactions it hadn't thought of - from people it thought that they shared its ideas or opinions.

How surprised we are sometimes astonished by the transformations of the thinking ego from one position to its opposite; because no identity has won a decisive victory for it. And, here I'm not talking about the difference between the visible and invisible in Ego, but about the manifestation of ego fissions in the issue of identity affiliation, which is multiple, and appears according to multiple positions.

In a society, in which generally accepted identities didn't prevail, the individual is given a state of multiple affiliations that he considers a constituent part of his ego.

Here, the ego is included in the "we" that expands or narrows in conditions that we can't define in advance.

The truth is that the more traditional structures coexist with modern structures, and the more forms of consciousness of belonging are diversified according to this coexistence, the ego fissions more and sharper to the point that neither the ego nor the other knows the time of the emergence of the old and the new.

With the exception of those egos, who made the choice of their identity to become, as we said, a minority alienate from the world.

As for the ego in a rapidly moving society, the ego lives in the same state of movement and at the same speed, and its identity remains in front of it; because it belongs to the current moment, only footprints remain of his transcendent system - it walked from here. It doesn't look back, and then the independent ego triumphs with the victory of freedom to express itself without a transcendent system that suppresses it. Hence, we realize the extent of ego freedom in a world like this. The ever-renewing cultural structure becomes - this becomes the case - the fruit of the egos that act according to their free will. There is no obstacle left in front of it except positive law, which is able to adapt to it, and protest against it, if it becomes narrower than it.

No doubt that this doesn't eliminate the anxiety of the ego, but it is anxiety resulting from the consciousness of the ego, about the gap that separates between its subject and what it stores from own world, that it seeks to specify and its own ability. The outside - the world here - is no longer the brake, but the power of the ego itself, and the potential it entails.

Someone says: A world like this doesn't really exist, but it's in a moving society whose existence is closer to realization through many mediations accomplished by this society.



## Chapter Two: The Ego In Captivity



We distinguished the ego with a special discourse, but it's an existence in the world, that is, the social, moral, political, and cognitive world.

However, it's a captive in this world, its consciousness of freedom doesn't arise except as consciousness of captivity.

The ego a captive in this world, it is a captive of structure, of cave, of tombs, and of idols; then, the ego is a captive of everything that is outside itself.

We will call what is outside "non-ego". the subconsciousness of the contradiction between the ego and the non-ego only means that the ego is addicted to captivity, and it's no longer able to distinguish itself from others.

But, when man faced up the silent nature, he was facing a peaceful world, that hasn't mean anything at all, so he defeated it with his intelligence, although nature wasn't an opponent, but he created another human nature. I mean a world that became objective in relation to him; this is because mountains, trees, rivers, seas, earthquakes, floods, and volcanoes are a peaceful world, Yes, it is as well, therefore it was easy humanize this world. On the contrary, structure, cave, tombs, and idols are a hostile world that is no way for the ego to be able to humanize it. So that, the structure is a system characterized by relative stability, here, I am talking about a social structure, not a physical one; Because the ego found itself thrown inside the structure, and became an expression of it. Actually, it is an abbreviation of the structure, in which it raised, and grew up, while the structure is spontaneously destroyed by history, but in exchange for a new structure. For example, Peasant structure isn't a relationship between man and land, but between farmer and property. And all values of the Peasant society are based on this relationship; i.e. The owner, the peasant leader, feudal lord, revenge, prohibition of love, dowry, language, house, kinship, mythical consciousness, savvy, suspicion of the other, envy, idle talk, miserliness, generosity, clan solidarity...etc. One says reservedly; you have spoken before of the transcendent, and political system, Isn't the structure this transcendent system? No doubt that the transcendent system is a structure, but I'm moving here from the moral, and value system, that imposes identical behavior to a structure produces the individual human, that is, his psyche, and behavior, and determines a large part of his future, without his interference...he is the man who arose, and grew up in a universal socio-economic structure.

That is why, we talked about the peasant, civil, and craft structure...etc.

Each of these structures has multiple elements, and different functions that operate spontaneously.

Also, the transcendent system is an essential part of the social structure, and the political system is mostly a result of this structure.

However, Society is the broadest, and universal structure, and it consists of sub-structures that can only be understood in comparison to the universal one.

In addition, it's known that political affiliation, theoretically, is an ideological choice which may surpass traditional structures; because it is a modern one. while we find that, for example, in Asian, or African, peasant society, that clan structures are what controlled political affiliation, that is, the party, not the opposite.

It's enough for a local leader to choose a political affiliation; In order for the clan, or the entire region to have a political affiliation that identical the affiliation of the leader, who in turn obtained his position as a result of a tribal, not a political solidarity.

The ego can't be freed from the captivity of the structure unless this structure it is destroyed.

On the other hand, the city is world of commerce, money, craft, and work, it's a different structure from that of the village, therefore, its values are different from those of village. Talking about Pre-modernism, or modernism world is around the state of structures, that make the ego. We had talked about the fissions of ego, as it is resulting from the failure of a structure to achieve a decisive victory.

Of course; it's difficult for the ego that is made by a structure to prevail this structure by a purely voluntary action; rather, it is related to the historical process itself, as an objective, almost spontaneous movement.

What I mentioned earlier about the ego, doesn't include that it surrenders to the structure. On the contrary, it necessarily implies that - if the ego wants it- the ego has to mutinies on this structure without waiting for direct results of its mutiny, as I don't want the structure to announce the death of the ego. Rather, the ego must know how to confront, or break into a castle, or although the structure is a castle, which it must break into it, and uproot, if possible, one of its foundation stones.

The structure resembles building a vault (Capstone), that can't be destroyed by striking from outside, rather, it must be destroyed with an internal movement, bottom-up. Perhaps uprooting of one stone from a vault leads to its whole breakdown, here, the role of the ego is very significant.

Vault will last for a long time, if we stay shouting above it...

By understanding the relationship between the ego and the structure, We seek to determine more precisely relationship of will to history. Actually, the ego doesn't confront

the structure only, but the most dangerous enemy of the man is the idols that he made by himself, and they began to tamper and dominate him.

Can we say that the history of man, in one of its aspects, is the history of his relationship with the idol.

What is the idol? Linguistically; An idol is a statue made of stone, wood, or metal, and it was believed that its worship brings human being closer to God; an idol doesn't differ from a fetish

except in terms of meaning, it's the embodiment of a God, or a sensory symbol for Him.

The idol in this sense is an idea taken on a physical character; it's a human-cultural act, in which a human being added some forms of nature, an idolatrous nature, such as the sun, moon, cows...etc.

Historically, mythical consciousness wasn't able to realize the world except through the idol - God, so the man made a God of good, a God of evil, and Deities of beauty, love, fertility, and rain...etc. The deities - idols, were associated with rituals, temples, and prayers.

A pure spiritual relationship has been established, a relationship of love, or fear of deities - idol. If humanity has transcended the era of idols - deities, it has preserved the art of sculpture, which is either an imitation of people, nature, or a strong artistic aesthetic consciousness expresses an idea, perpetuates either a preferred event to people, a national memory, a person of historical prestige, or literary or social Position.

Really, there is no city in the world devoid of statues expressing individuals, facts, and concepts.

but the concept of idol isn't related at all to this art, that is, the art of sculpture, but rather it took on a negative indication, which refers to the reality of man's submission as slave to what he made, and produced. While statues and idols, ancient and modern, indicate an aesthetic, religious, or national consciousness of the world, idols, in the sense of submission, have come to indicate to a miserable alienated consciousness, that objectifying human being; meaning that idols became a real tool of enslavement, the most dangerous thing is that many people aren't conscious of this objectifying relationship with the world.

In truth, money is the greatest idol, which tyrannizes modern man, and the ego falls into a strange and weird relationship with money; it unconsciously loses its freedom in front of money, although money is invented by man to facilitate process of goods exchange.

Money itself is a good, and became a repressive, a strange authority, and even the lord of masters, which millions of human beings kneel in front of its dirty feet, sitting on the throne of the world, and in hearts of human beings as the only God.

How did a means of exchange become an authority, on its doors human dignity is shed?

How did it become worshiped to such a superstitious degree?

How did this idol turn into a corrupting factor for life, man, and soul?

How could this deity become a source of conflicts, and bloody wars between humans?

Millions of people deplete their bodies for money, while other millions turn into tools to collect, and hoard it! It became a goal in itself! Money corrupts the relationship between friends, son and his father, and between brothers.

The fetish, which is money, God, and master, eats us with its sharp fangs, then throws us after chewing our bodies, and souls at the gates of nothingness.

Money throws us into the furnace of absolute evil, and there are rituals of worship for it, represented in looting, bribery, theft, corruption, exhausting work, begging, mercenary work, murder, human trafficking, and alienation in the spatial sense for it.

All positive values of the ego are shattered in front of the desire to own money; in front of love of money patriotism diminishes, or may be absent, also honor, in whatever sense, soon collapses, and even love of human, and his value collapses in the face of the love of money.

For examples, a doctor sees a person, that almost dies, but asks for money otherwise he won't extend his hand to save him.

A beggar loses his sense of dignity, modesty, his status among others, and extends his hand to far and wide... Allah's sake, give me money!

Another one steals money by killing, and a woman offers herself for money? If you have money, you will be able to buy everything, including humans, and there is no better description of this God, than Shakespeare's description;

"Yellow, glittering, precious gold, No, Gods, I am no idle votarist... Thus, much of this will make Black white, foul fair, wrong right, base noble, old young, coward valiant. this gold ... Make the hoar leprosy adored, place thieves, And give them title, knee and approbation... this is it that makes the wappen'd widow wed again... Come, damned earth, Thou common whore of mankind, that puts odds among the route of nations, I will make thee Do thy right nature...O thou sweet king-killer, and dear divorce' twist natural son, and sire! Thou bright defiler Of Hymen's purest bed! Thou valiant Mars!

Thou ever young, fresh, loved and delicate wooer... O thou touch of hearts! Think, thy slave man rebels, and by thy virtue set them into confounding odds, that beasts May have the world in empire!".(2)

Of course, gold is the symbol of money...the first fiercest most deadly idol of mankind, and it is unparalleled wealth.

Money: the idol, consumes the soul, and the body, while kneelers in front of its feet beg for mercy.

Just own money to give up yourself, although you think you are the owner; money owns you, and you know that. Money holds you, while you think you are storing it, money throws you into the furnace of absolute nothingness, while you think to get your appropriate existence.

Moreover, you are searching for money in the foreign land, in order to bring it back as a sultan, but it leaves you in this land to be eaten little by little, and your life ends searching for him without realizing it. I own, that is the sin that no one seeks to free from.

Good turns you to Good, and life's generosity turns into miserliness in your pocket, you think you are a master over it, but you don't know that you are a small slave in front of it.

All human relations are distorted, Oh money, when you enter, like a thief into their windows that are open to love and fulfillment.

Karl Marx realized the secret of money barbarism, property, thinking that he would be able to make humanity happy, if he freed it from this idol; but the idol defeated Marx.

The deepest question is what are the morals for which money founded?

Morality only means a relationship between humans, and every value has a function in people's lives. Morality, negative or positive, enters into fabric human existence, and to determine good and evil, and there is no value without its realistic Specifying; If I ask what honor is, multiple answers will soon come: honesty, fulfillment, preservation of chastity...etc. The answers vary by varying peoples, and all of these values have interrelation among an ego and another.

Money as a good is a means of exchange, production and organization of material life, but it turned into a value, the value of values.

It's property of properties. Values determine behavior, although they aren't originally an end in itself, It never happened that values became independent of humans, except

when money is transformed into an end, which transcends human thing.

An end that transcends the human thing isn't a transcendence to a higher rank than human thing, but a decent to a lower one.

Paradoxically, the descent of man to that lower rank makes him in a higher prestige in the eyes of society, what does this mean? This mean you, in your value or in one of the aspects of your value, you are what you own; meaning that you are an amount of money. You are an amount of money means that you are the value of the goods that you can buy.

so, you are a set of real, and possible goods. The good, money, turns your human identity into an object one "I own so I exist", so you acknowledge my existence as an owner, and my large property gives me great prestige, then, my existence abroad. There in a world where it was thrown in such a way that I seemed apparently free, but I'm a captive to what I have property, searching for my captor...

The way to money is the one that turns me into something, a good, and a destroyer of the world of positive values.

Among these way, trade, industry, bribery, embezzlement, banditry, construction, voyeurism, miserliness and beggary.

in the world of greedy capitalism, everything is permissible to the merchant, who builds a bondage relationship with all means of collecting money, while the other, who generates money for the merchant, exists as a pocket not as a human being.

The merchant thinks he is an authority, forgetting that he is a slave, so he monopolizes, raises the price, dumps the market, fawns the authority, hoards money and smuggles.

On the other hand, the industrialist, the manufacturer, the first enemy of nature and humans, provide the man with goods for money and its accumulation. Ten manufacturers may own as much as all the members of society own. he simply owns what human beings should own.

The bribe: steals the other in broad daylight, and the other's stance from him is no longer

valuable; because he considers the other only as a subject of theft.

The embezzler is like the bribe, and the informer is like the embezzler...money...money, it's the biggest idol.

Now, we can't live without money, it's the way of providing means of life, but there is a difference between providing means of life and submitting to idols.

Nothing frees us from the idol, Unless we free society from property, that is what Marx said, Yes, he was disappointed, as mentioned before, but the truth is the truth.

The truth is all wars of human being occurred for money, and dominance other, and sources of wealth.

this seems clear starting from the first invasion to the Frankish wars, to the wars of Europe, to the colonization of the world, to the dominance of peoples.

I have no hope of liberating humanity from this idol; because it is the biggest idol. The other idol, or the political authority, is an idol that doesn't have mercy, and its mechanisms of devouring humans are harsher than those of money. The idol is authority, Idol authority turns its seeker into an idol, and an absolute captive with unparalleled vanity; kill for authority, waste your dignity for it, destroy nations for it, and execute free for it. Dictator's authority is the most grievous kind of authority, that a dictator transforms himself into the greatest idol, composing a chorus, that is strangely and wonderfully fluent in worship rituals; such as villainous kneeling to his false greatness, false praise poetry composed for him, decadent songs praising his uniqueness, banners expressing loyalty to him, and mendacious cheering in his name by the flock.

Dictator, This is the only idol, who summarizes all the idols that humanity has made, in its legendary stage.

He is the God of wisdom, who only speaks the truth, His words that mean nothing become not only an absolute wisdom, and a dictum, but rather the standard of truth, on which every other speech, reality or event is measured, empty heads are adorned, and glorified people are cited. Nor does he speak from [his own] inclination, but rather it's inspired by him, and he is Revelation.

Dictator, God of goodness, idol that his only job is happiness of humans, and even humanity, source of giving, donor of sustenance, source of bounties, giver of gifts without accounted, and everything that is good in the world is from Him, and the master of the kingdom who divides livelihood on whomever, He wills and doesn't ask.

Dictator, God of goodness: due to his kindness roads are paved, schools are built, factories only work, and everything that the other of His servants do is inspired by His bounty. The God of goodness swaggers with his gifts, while hungry people applaud for the great goodness that they are granted.

The idol dictator is the God of joy...the joy of absolute submission to him; the day of his inauguration is a feast in which the all dance like monkeys, his birthday is that of the homeland and human, the day he looks on the balcony is the feast of the sun, and the day of his decree is Thanksgiving.

This God of joy leads all sufferers to laugh, and sing false chants.

Moreover, the idol dictator is the God of beauty, even Venus didn't reach his extraordinary beauty. His various images adorn streets, lanes, schools, and entrances to cities, and his memorials, and statues adorn squares, and roads, while his face is seen on banknotes and coins. The God of beauty is present in his graphs, showing all his poses: sitting, laughing or frowning, with his half or all body. He dressed in them all various types of clothing; he appears as person performing the Umra pilgrimage,(3)drinking wine, wearing a necktie or dressing an abaya (cloak) ...the God of beauty is present in all his ugliness, and wherever one goes, he sees his face.

Dictator is the God of revolution, he does, and makes what he wants; kills with cold blood, commands to be obeyed, pardons, or punishes when he will.

This idol is the God of war, yes, don't be surprised, he decides to push millions of human beings into death whenever he will, and he doesn't ask why he is fighting. He isn't defeated even if his nose is rubbed in dust. Moreover, the wisdom of war waged by the God of war is only understood by every wise minded man. He smiles in front of thousands of dead, orphans, widows, disabled, and lost land, everything gets easier as long as the God of war sits on his ornate chair like an always vectored leader.

Dictator is the God of mercy, power and courage...his authority turned him into an idol of slaves, while the slaves convinced him of his idolatry, but he alone realizes his slavery to power.

A tyrant isn't an individual, but a case, in which a society suffers the most severe illness, paralysis of mind and heart

This condition gives birth to fetus, it grows little by little until the authority abbreviates itself into the greatest idol.

No doubt that the people's real history, culture, and consciousness level determine the dictator's image, his action, and destiny, despite the external similarity in their behavior. Hitler and Stalin are Contemporary models of human idols. While our idols are far less important to allot a special research to them, they are the caricature of major idols.

---

3 - Muslims perform it, and they aren't required to, and during it they visit the Kaaba and the holy places therein. It is no less important to them than the Hajj obligation. (Reviewer)

Here, Hitler, the defeated wounded lying soldier in a hospital, thought about the reality of Germany captured by the Treaty of Versailles after World War I. He addressed dreams, and emotions of defeated Germans with a demagogic racist ideology, he introduces an irrational discourse, that the people carry as he a savior, to the helm of power. The discourse of race, of power, and religious rituals, which transformed him from a loyal person in the eyes of defeated Germans into an idol that tears of millions were shed when he overlooks them from his balcony.

In contrast, Stalin, the quiet malicious ordinary person, turned into an idol by killing all opponents in the name of the party, the state, and socialism. He turned from a moderately smart person, who only occupy a position of Lenin's subordinate, to an absolute ruler.

These, as models, indicating turning of a ruler into an idol, they destroyed culture by turning their discourse into absolute truths.

Sum up, what Hitler and Stalin said, and all young students do is their turn into explainers.

Explainers for their books, i.e. "Mein Kampf", Argumentative Materialisms, and Historical materialisms.

Both the idol money, and the idol dictator are coexisting with the idol idea, and when the ego falls into the trap of an idea, and its captivity, the ego moves into a narrow world of illusion, it's the illusion of the absolute truth, that is seen outside of space and time.

The idea, any idea, is a human cognitive production, and a possession of an image of the world. The idea is a saying, and a judgment that involves some of the truth about the world, but the idea turns into an overbearing force, when it becomes alienated from the world. Furthermore, it alienates its carrier from world, controlling his behavior, and attitude towards the other, who bears another idea. As the idea is an alienating force, it turns into a subconscious force that prompts a human being to behave only in accordance with it. The idea as the universal truth, contradicts the logic of ideas production, and its relation to reality.

Idolatry of thought is a domineering idea, with which reality is no longer a criterion of its truth but contrarily, the domineering idea becomes a criterion of the truth of reality, so that, it makes its bearer in a state of absolute waiting. There is no an absolute idea in science, or so it should be, that scientific knowledge is more related to facts and

experience, so the logic of science is the logic of development, or Rupture.

While the dominant idea appears in ideology, or religious consciousness, and is transmitted through education, culture, indoctrination, and propaganda to another generation, each generation finds itself in front of ideas, that were ingrained in it, but it believes its realization, and its absolute correct.

Here, I'm not talking about the illusions spread among the public, rather, about the idea that moves active human beings socially, politically, or morally. Then we get a crowd of people, who play roles in shaping consciousness, practicing their actions inspired by this idea without asking about the relationship of the idea to reality or possibility.

I swear that , the most important result of the idolatry of the idea, that dominates an "ego" is negation of the different other, and this in turn, in front of the ego, alienated by the idea, is evil, absolute error, or an utter ignorance. There is nowhere for disagreement among captives of the idea- the idol, so there is no place for criticism in its life. Strictly speaking, a critic of the authoritarian idea is an enemy to its bearer of idea, and his presence, So it has no meaning or value; because a human being's value for an ego, who is alienated by the idea, lies in presence, or absence of this idea in the consciousness of another. If the other participates the idea with its captive, he has a human value, otherwise he isn't. This is a fanaticism itself, and one of the dangerous consequences resulting from fanaticism to the idea is suspension of dialogue.

Dialogue is essentially a communication language between two egos, who may be different or bearers of complex vision angles towards a certain issue, or it's a way to get to the right. It's a human relationship that takes place through language, that is, the language of questioning, discussion, and argument, so this relationship isn't possible except by acknowledging both the right of belief, and the freedom to express this belief .This human relationship through language performs the function of searching for the truth, even if it's not reached.

For clarification, there is no dialogue without a problem, that is subjected to debate, while the problem is defined as a difference of vision about a matter, or a phenomenon capable of plurality of understandings, and interpretations, but any phenomenon doesn't turn into a problem except when it has different explanations, and interpretations.

It's known that the development of natural, and social human science owes, in one of its aspects, to the emergence of the problem.

In order for a problem to be that, and a subject of a dialogue, two conditions must be met, firstly: It must be able to have a number of answers, and secondly: it must be a real problem, and not a false one.

A questioner may ask: What is the reason for the emergence of European Racism? Here, we are faced with a multiplicity of answers to this question - the problem, as European Racism is a phenomenon defined by practice, and discourse. So some may refer it to the crisis of capitalist development, while others may refer it to the ideological employment of biology, and some may attribute it to the growing sense of scientific, and technical superiority, and a sense of absolute power...etc.

Then, it is a real problem in the sense that it is a living reality, experienced by some Westerners and felt by people of the South.

Contrarily, if one asks: What is the nature of ghosts? Here, the question doesn't refer to a fact, so it doesn't have answers; that it's an illusion. but if the question's nature is changed: what reasons makes one believes in ghosts although they are an illusion. Here, it is a real question; because there are a number of people, who believe in ghosts, and the answer is necessarily multiple.

The captive of the idolatrous idea has no problem; because this the idea acquired its full validity, and became an absolute truth. If it is a prior idea, to which falsehood can't come at it from before it or from behind it, then it will cease to be subject to dialogue, in the first place, knowing that it is the starting point to consider any other issue, as it is the basis for answers.

If one of the conditions for a dialogue about a problem is knowing and acknowledging that it's a problem, the captive of the idol idea, doesn't admit any problem unrelated to what he is captive.

Idolatry is a slavery, in the strict sense of the word, therefore freedom as a necessary atmosphere for a dialogue is missed for this slave. But the matter becomes more dangerous; because such a slave doesn't consider you as a free man, consequently, he deprives you of both the right to disagree, and the right to believe. So that, the prisoner of the idea doesn't dialogue, but duels, and doesn't acknowledge or deny the other. he denies him, through negation the right to free belief.

When the right of free belief is mentioned, this is to establish an interrelation between right and freedom. Basically, freedom as a human right is started first, then the right of freedom necessarily leads to the right of belief, therefore no one has the right to deprive the other of the freedom, or the right to freedom of belief. The captive of an idolatrous idea turns his right to believe to a private right to himself, denying it to others, or rob them of it.

No doubt, the belief is a belief in a truth, It's natural for the person with the belief to rise up to defend him in the face of attempts to refute what he believes, but placing his belief in the field of freedom of belief is a matter, and considered his belief as the only necessary condition for belief is another matter.

It is normal for a person to act according to the idea, which he believes, but if he declares his belief, and behaves in contradiction, he doubtless lives in a state of abnormal separation.

The ways of belief as a state experienced by the ego are diverse, this variety gives it the degree of adherence to it.

The religious idea, from a believer's point of view, is of a divine source, so it's the most idolatrous idea in life, and can be inherited across hundreds of generations. It appears as a fanatical idea only in cases of a religious conflict, in its conversion into a religious, political idea, or when an ego experiences a crisis, however the public, the people or the nation, are subject to such beliefs without showing their fanatical effects.

How do we explain the phenomenon of fanaticism? I didn't ask this question with the intention of answering it, but for revealing the fanatical ego, who has reached a point of alienation of the idea, and submission to it as an idol can't be answered with the historical condition for the emergence of fanaticism alone, But without this historical condition, we can't acquaintance the issue.

For example, a debate in a talk show was supposed to take place between two of different backgrounds, and ideas. They actually met, but the dialogue didn't take place, or it didn't complete, What happened that one of the interlocutors, who one from captives of the idea, began to issue absolute judgments.

The captive said; "The idea of human rights is a Western Jewish idea", and there is no freedom in Islam, "I'm against democracy, and terrorism is right as it was come by a text". The other was looking with a kind of astonishment, strangeness, and disapproval, while his features asking: How can someone come up with these ideas?

It's clear that every ideology has an idea, that may lead its convenient to treat it as an idol, and its caretakers used against others, who try keep other people away from it, all the concepts that indicate fanaticism, such as apostasy, mutiny, forgery, and keeping away from the right path...etc.

As the ego has alienated in the idol, it has lost the spirit of mutiny, and adventure in life, and has become a thing...of course, it's Reification.



## Chapter Three: The Negation Of The Other



We define the other as the ego, who has a relationship with another, we won't determine this relationship now. But I exist, a human being is living in a small or large society.

Hence, not every ego the other, but it is the one, with whom I have a relationship, such as love, hate, interest, affection, profession, hostility, suspicion, harm, avoidance...etc.

The other is the person towards whom I take a stand. Then, I'm another. As I said, by analogy to ego take a stand against those above-mentioned positions. Because a social being, I'm, whether like it or not, a prisoner of the relationship with those who surround me From all directions. When I talked about the transcendent system, and the political system (the state in particular), I didn't mention the fact that all this has historical in one respect to regulate the relationship between human. Or with a more precise word, in order to curb my exile to the other, or to deny the other to me. No one can imagine the transcendent system, especially outside the preservation of the existence of the ego-individual.

Why was the task of values, law, customs, and religion to preserve me? If the relationship between human beings wasn't originally one of exile, assault, and murder, great efforts wouldn't have been made to preserve the ego. So that, the contradiction between human beings is the first truth of humanity Entity.

Not all efforts have succeeded so far in curbing the man tendency to exile man. someone says, Friendship, brotherhood, companionship, marriage, and family, The bond of blood, and love are all concepts, that indicate human co-relationship based on recognizing the importance of the other.

Yes, how do we explain the breaking-through friendship contract, the enmity between brothers, the divorce between husband and wife, the imprisoned or execution of comrades, and the conflict between the son and father, or mother and daughter? How do we explain the torments arising from human relations? How do we explain the existence of crime, torture, sadism, lies, calumny, murder of ideology, racism, and war in general? How does the word become cause of murder? How does a football match become the cause of a crime, in which lives are just clapping with joy? Why does envy generate such a trait that doesn't benefit the envious? Is it a manifestation of struggle for survival? Of course not.

In order not to suspect that we tend to be Darwinism-Social, we say: the negation of the other isn't due to the struggle for survival. Although predation for survival is a case of humanity Entity. Domestication for the other is nothing more than fear of him.

The Arabi poet said, "The wolf howled, so I was taken comfort with the wolf howling .I

almost flew when I heard human voice”.

What made man feel domesticated, when he heard the sound of a monster known for its brutality, and cunning, and why did he impress him, and fear the voice of a human being

supposed to be from his same genus?

I think that the answer to such a question exposes the nature of the mindful person, we are, in front of the wolf, fully know all the possibilities of its behavior, and are able to ward off his danger with our mental strength. But what does it know about the possibilities of human behavior? The stories of treachery are endless, isn't said:

«Injustice is a characteristic of souls, and if you find someone who is chaste, he maybe not commit injustice.»

Yet, we don't want to exaggerate the wolf nature of *Homo sapiens*, we sufficient for us that humans invented the two concepts of good, and evil. Hence, Evil is human; because it's evil that comes out of consciousness. The animal is neither evil nor nature, as the earthquake that destroys a village is kinder than the man kills a child, or rapes a woman. Not to mention those who drag people into wars, in which thousands and millions are killed. These are wars that meaningless at all.

In civil wars, all human aggression, and violence explode, thousands of innocent people are lost; because of a word that is notated on his personal identity. In racist behavior, the harshest and maximum extermination of man appear. Racism is nothing but discourse first, and practice second, or less intensity of violent discourse with destructive practice. And the negation of the other doesn't specific of killing him physically. Murder is one of the many forms of exile. Let's consider some of the forms of this negation that are widespread and continuous throughout history.

## Falseness

Falseness is defined as a statement that is intentionally and consciously far from the truth, it maybe incarnates in a practical, external behavior that contradicts with hidden goals. The effects of falseness fall on the other, whether it's in word or behavior; because the falseness is to the other. When we talk about falseness as a conscious behavior in say and act, that is because we aren't talking about it as a subconscious pathological case, but rather about falseness which is having institutions, and detection devices.

The word falseness has been mentioned in Arabic dictionaries, such as *Al-WASEET* dictionary, (falseness: Lying, deceit, a lie, belie or deny the words of a person, a liar). And he is a liar, he tells about a thing other than what it is in reality, and accordingly, he tells about it something that wasn't in it... falseness is the state of being untrue.

Hardly a person escapes the feature of lying, But, in such characteristic, falseness has levels, and degrees, in which people differ. Why do people lie? It's an old question that is still asked today; every generation of human beings finds itself confronting this phenomenon.

We said: falseness is an act which falls on the other. In fact, It's an assault on the other; because it hides the truth that the other seeks, and it's a sort of deception to the other, and it could be motivated by abuse.

Indeed, the experience of lying begins earlier in the child's consciousness, he lies to avoid punishment. So, fear is the main cause for perpetrating the degrading a lie, fear of telling the truth continues to be one of the fundamental causes to practice lying. If we analyze the idea of punishment, as a way to prevent committing sin that falls on the other, we will find that the principle of punishment is to prevent practicing harm on the other. Fear of punishment as a primary cause for perpetrating the sin of lying means that punishment is a way to ward off evil, and lying belongs to the concept of evil. As lying is a human characteristic, man invented means to detect, including: investigation through

language, and reveal contradictions of lying, torture, punishment threat, and devices... etc. So, at the same time when man invented punishment as a deterrent to a person from committing a sin, especially the sin of violating values, and law, punishment also created lying to avoid the punishment.

this type of falseness - as punishment avoidance - involves two harmful acts on society at the same time.

There is act in contrary to law, customs, traditions, or to the social profession in general, such as theft, bribery...etc. Then the act of lying itself in order to avoid the reaction of Social agency. The ego, from an initial point of view recognizes, and appreciates the code of ethics, but for many reasons is unable to commit to it, so falseness comes as a form of this recognition, and appreciation. Rather, the conflict of values often forces ego to lie through a higher value to hide a breach of a lower one.

Here, you are on a date with a friend. This date has two values: Firstly, value of punctuality as a pattern of respect for the other, and secondly, the value of friendship, which is respect, and love for him. for example, you didn't commit to the friend for reasons that you are responsible for, such as (being busy of- self-interest, of watching series, you don't want to stop watching it, or because you found difficulty to cut the distance to him...or similar reasons. Your friend blames you for breaking the date, So your response will be, "excuse me, my friend, I missed my date for obligatory urgent reasons". You may invoke an illness for which you aren't responsible, may invoke an illness of a beloved one, or because of the arrival of a guest from a long travel. Here, you are apologizing; because of a higher value than of commitment, such as the value of caring for the guest, who suddenly comes.

From a certain point, you offer an excuse to convince your friend that you keep the value of friendship, a value that is also dear to the friend. You destroyed the value of honesty through falseness, while keeping a higher value by scarifying for a lower value \_ falseness.

The question asked, are you a moral person? You are an immoral person! in two terms: First, in terms of falseness, and in terms of the fact that friendship itself is less valuable than yourself-interest, and in this sense, you lied twice; once when you didn't stick to the date, and once when you deceived your friend that friendship was a higher value to you, because if it is, you wouldn't break the date with him.

Here, we are in front of falseness as a deception of the other.

Deception is to pretend to be other than your character, or to claim in front of the other

what you don't have. If falseness in the first paragraph results from fear of punishment, then falseness in case of deception in the hope of prestige in the front of the other. In deceiving, you pretend in front of the other what isn't in you, hopefully, you will attain a prestigious position. The truth is that this kind of deception is a fruit of the presence of contradictory values, both positive, and negative. There is; generosity vs stinginess, courage vs cowardice, love vs hate, undesirable desire vs chastity, loyalty vs betrayal, fawning vs frankness, dignity vs villainy, knowledge vs ignorance...etc.

In such a contradictory world of values, it's normal for the ego to attribute to itself all positive values. However, these boundaries among these values aren't fixed, and not always clearable in human behavior, as the ego can consider courage as recklessness, cowardice as rational, generosity as extravagance, stinginess as economic, fawning as kindness, and frankness as rudeness, all so, that ego avoids judgments of values against itself.

Such a case of social lying produces a separation between say and act. At the level of saying, rarely you find man, who condemns generosity, courage, or loyalty, but you find One who practices stinginess, cowardice, and betrayal, then a say is the falseness, and the practice is the honesty, meaning, it's the expressive reality of the ego. Although man is able, even, through practice, to fake his own morals, how can a man recognize the importance of positive values, as the expression of human existence as it should be? How can he recognize its necessity to achieve the sublime human existence on one side, and acts in a way that contradicts it, meaning, he is practicing falseness in the practical sense of the word?

We believe that there are two reasons for that, the first, what we termed for its distinction, i.e. the distinction between trivial, and sublime souls, which we don't know exactly its causes. The second, is the interest that motivates the ego, and makes it annihilating positive values in exchange for achieving purely self-interests.

Everyone acknowledges that cheating is Vituperated, disgrace, and an act, whose consequences directly affect the other. It's a form of falseness. In fact, condemning cheating is a religious matter; "Whoever cheats isn't from us". i.e. it's a divine command in one sense, However, some people commit this flaw. This matter shows the brute force of self-interest, and confirms human selfishness, the absence of the other, and the weakness of the human conscience in the face of self-interest.

In fact, the brute force of self-interest explains to us many behavior patterns, that we deplore, whether individual or collective behavior patterns. Isn't it the selfish-interest

as a brute force that explains the emergence of the opportunist in our political, and professional life? I swear that the tyranny of self-interest of the ego isn't equivalent to any tyranny of any kind. The opportunist is totally tyrannized. He is excellently, a liar because of the brute, tyrannical force of interest, as position and wealth, are two brute forces for many people. We are here in front of a clearly visible materialistic interest, leads its owner to practice outright falseness. In opportunism, the unity of the rhetorical, and practical falseness is achieved. However, we are here in opportunism in front of a funny, and strange situation; it isn't only the opportunist, who knows his false self, and the other isn't the one who knows that the opportunist is a liar, but the opportunist knows that the other knows that he is a liar, and despite this he practices falseness. So, the liar often hides his lie from others, while the opportunist practices it in board, for him the other is dead, so his dead soul doesn't see others except as dead.

The liar hides the truth for social prestige, or to avoid punishment, while the opportunist sits aside any relationship to the concept of truth. In case of lying to the other, i.e., a friend, there is an acknowledgment of friendship value implicitly, but in the opportunist case, there is no place for value in his life.

As the other has no value, and values have no existence in the opportunist soul, he turns into a brutal monster in his relationship with the other, when he knows with certainty his trivial position to the other. He seeks revenge on the other, and turns him into an object of oppression.

Simply this pseudo existent wishes that the other turns into an existent of its pattern. He realizes the lowliness of himself in comparison to the other that exists in principle, so he stands hostile to every behavior that sensitizes human dignity. As opportunism in one of its features is a loss of a person's human dignity, and the sense of his human value.

Thus, the opportunist creates an independent world for him within a circle of people like him, and in the appropriate environment for the emergence of his opportunism. falseness reaches its peak when the entire institutions specialize in an authority contradicting in lying with society.

It is media organizations, and authoritarian ideological departments, where a group of workers in these agencies, and institutions profane lying to the other.

The evidence of this is that the contradiction between the authority, and its society is a stark incident. So, members of the agencies are rushing to draft a discourse that has nothing to do with reality, and the language becomes an alternative to the world.

Institutions of falseness realize that their influence on the other is almost zero, and they

are able to change the attitude of human beings towards Authority, and realize that is unable to form pseudo consciousness, however it exercises it to satisfy powers that be. The more these institutions practice lies the more they produce cynical reaction from people through humor.

The truth is that the wider the scope of political tyranny, and its institutions' lying the greater the scope of falseness widened, weather it's the lying that comes from the institution, or from individuals to prevent evil, and that is what taqiyya means. I'm talking about (taqiyya) here, as a sort of falseness that legitimized by a climate of tyranny, or felt by Individuals that they don't intend to lie, but rather they are enforced to it.

I swear! the most dangerous types of falseness are those carried out by authority's intellectual, and this issue has another discussion that we will highlight later.

When falseness becomes a general state that nests in society, produces two phenomena: backbiting, and suspicion of the other. Backbiting is a social ritual, and is based on a conversation between two, or more persons about and absent they know, undergo a trial in absentia, presented to his negative traits, especially those that belong to lying category, for instance

backbiting, saying what isn't said about a person in his presence.

If we had examined this ritual that prevails in most traditional societies, which most of it are full of lies, and its forms, We would have concluded that it's ritual of criticism for which isn't declared to the person being criticized, that is absolute negative criticism.

Here, the backbiter's behavior, and saying conceals his true traits, or claims traits that he doesn't possess, in both cases, he is in a state of concealment or claim...he is lying.

Then, the backbiting mostly is a ritual of truthfulness, in saying with the closest circle among those who know the person, who was backbit. There is a concealed verbal contract among the backbiters that doesn't reach to the ears of the one who was backbit with any honest statement against him; because there is a relationship between all parties, friendship, blood- relationship, shared career...etc, that are feared to crash, then, the value of honesty, and frankness in front of the other is almost non-existent except in cases of advice, that indicates a kind of interest in the other. The fear of disintegrating co-relationship, is what creates the ritual of backbiting.

so, as soon as, one of those is alone in revealing the secret, i.e. the secret of backbiting to whom was backbit, suspicion falls on him that he is transmitting words.

as soon as calumny happens, until the game of gossip, accusing of lying, proof of innocence begins. Everyone is spinning in a vicious circle, they often don't get out of it except

by rupture. Specially, there are almost dominant relationships in societies of fear, and ambiguity, which is the hypocrisy relationships, and hypocrisy is lying. Backbiting, and hypocrisy are almost synergistic phenomena, so the most hypocritical people are the most backbiting.

Thus, the circle of falseness is completed as a pattern of pseudo- existence, so falseness is a false-existent, and the false- existent is a false-existence. Where the circle of the false-existence is complete, ego live in the idle talk world. As the experience of false-existence continues, the existent becomes in search of his happiness in the idle talk world, as a world of entertainment, almost alone, in which the ego spontaneously engages. falseness won't generate remorse (a sense of conscience) any more, how is it born after being a habit and pattern- existence!?

The expansion of the world of falseness, and its transformation into a pattern - existence, creates the devastating phenomenon in the relationship of the ego to the other, which is to doubt the other. Doubt about the other means that the other lies, claims, leans on, shows, and plays a role...being this way, the other transforms believing into a commentary belief in a need to evidence to reach to, I mean, believing the other.

Doubt is a hesitancy in belief; i.e. believing saying or behavior of the other, hesitating to believe the recount, so in pseudo-existence, a friend sometimes turns into a pseudo, the governor turns into a pseudo one, and so does the governed...Co-relationships among human beings, simply becomes a burden on the ego, so, how can we live without trusting the other? The contemplative on the objectionable statements of the oral discourse, that demand the other to believe, realizes how much the ego seeks for the other to trust to the true of his words. So, he says: "I swear to Allah, I'm honest to what I say", "On my honor, I heard this or did that", or "You have to ask so- and- so to be sure of what I said".

The ego uses all these statements without being asked to, and the reason is that the ego realized that the other, the listener, stems to doubt the validity of what he says.

The suspicion of lying, which has become a reality to every human being turned the relationship between the ego and the other, into suspicion, and accusation relationship, even to the closest relatives, certainty and trust has been defeated in front of successive cases of lying in its sorts that I mentioned.

The position of the other in the life of the ego has been shaken, and doubt became a state of mind enshrined in the history of falseness, till doubt seemed a pre- position.

Because it is difficult to isolate falseness from its history, and social causes subsequently,

it is hard to isolate doubt from its social conditions.

Rather, the concepts, that indicate doubt, reflect the human experience, which in turn is always specified by countless affiliations.

Here, I don't deny the differentiation among individuals in degree of falseness and suspicious' presence in their lives, but at the moment of analysis, I indicate to the historical condition of denying the other through doubt.

there is a hypothesis that some put forward, that the peasant society, for example, is a society in which falseness, malice, hypocrisy, envy, and suspicion are common, because malice and hypocrisy are cases that generate suspicion.

This hypothesis proceeds to demonstrate that the formally simple peasant world (agricultural) is a closed in on itself, and based on a direct relationship to land, agriculture, and irrigation. A world in which the blood bond, clan prevail. It's a world of fear of abstract power that is, unspecific by clan relations.

So, it is said by common people "peasant malice" in a closed world in which these negative values prevail. The pseudo- existence, world of idle talk, envy, prevail; for the culture here is limited, and the relationship with the stranger is a relation of doubt. As behind the simplicity in life, there are endless moral complications, the reason is, the closed world gets only the closed person.

The example I mentioned is Bedouin society, whoever watches a Bedouin series, watching nothing but cases of conspiracy, malice and murder. It's too and difficult to deny a great part of this hypothesis' validity. The world of the city is also a world in which suspicion of the other prevails, even in a lesser way.

The city is a vast, spacious world of commercial, craft, and industrial relations. All of this produces a kind of ethics, values associated with this world that is firstly, disintegrating in terms of tribal, and clan relations except for some special, and narrow relations related to direct kinship. Secondly, it's a world in which individuality grows much more than the world of the village.

But, the urban artisan is a more independent person in his world. He isn't just a worker, but a teacher who is proud of what he produces. The more he masters his craft, and sincere in it, the more he gains customer's trust, and increases his social prestige. The craftsman's consciousness of his career consists of three elements: income, and its increase, prestige, the other's recognition of him, customer and his fame expansion in respect of the other.

In this sense, the interest of the craftsman is based on creating trust of the other, That

is, Consumer client. Someone says: what moves the craftsman is profit, and that's right, but for profit to continue, trust in him must continue, it isn't good for him to create even minimal suspicion in the other about what he crafts, or prepares. Craft ethics is mentality, that originally based on trust not suspicion, This is why you find the difference between craft ethics inherited by civic, and those of the new which began to be formed as a result of cities' expansion, and villagers' movements to it, where large numbers of them got involved in craft world without the ethics of this craft, and because of failure experiments of the new craftsmen, suspicion penetrated the ethical craft' world.

However, what increases the element of suspicion in the mentality of the ego is its existence in a political system based on tyranny, repressiveness, buying the other, and distrusting him.

We have clarified the state of the opportunist, and the conditions for the spread of the phenomenon of the opportunism under the repressive political system. But there is something more dangerous than the existence of the opportunist, which is the existence of the informer, who widespread suspicion as a catastrophic case in society, It's the absolute negation of the other.

Now, we are sitting around a table in the café, "We" here refers to a number of friends whom a state of mutual trust has arisen, and the co-relationships have reached a level of honesty, faithfulness, and love. "We", a group of individuals who chat an impermissible talk which is often about politics. We are Individuals, who practice criticism, honest expression, and a real attitude towards authority, its individuals, or its exercise.

All of a sudden, a strange, unknown person sits near the table, he is stranger; because no one recognizes him, browsing the newspaper in black glasses on his eyes.

The group feels fear, suspicion, anxiety, accusation, and glances begin to sneak up stealthily on the stranger, silence spreads, and a state of whispering, and stammering prevails, and everyone in their eyes a hidden question, who is this person? In any case, the suspicion falls on this stranger, he is an informer, He may be an informer! perhaps he is! the subject of the conversation changes, it's now a normal, out loud talk in literature, or about television series, but loud refers to a desire to deliver this talk to such suspicious stranger, and if he continues setting, the friendly meeting often ends, and each return back home.

such person who we don't know might be a normal one, or just a passerby who got tired of walking, so he decided to rest in the café, might be a poor careworn person, who left his house after a quarrel with his wife; because of poverty, he might be travelling from a

remote location, and wanted to spend some time, waiting for a date with others...it might be...might be.

But the café goers of friends, who are familiar with all faces, can't deal with him except with almost absolute suspicion as an informer.

Rather, the case may reach to what is more tragic; when a friend suspects a friend, relative, profession, colleague; it's the informer, the daily life corruptive, who has become a part of people's lives, and of the evil that must be avoided. The informer who lives among us is an absolute enemy of the other, he is a hidden existent in the university, institution, work, village, neighborhood, prosecution, even in furthest countries. There is no need to search for his political existence reasons, and the link of the informer's existence authoritarianism. All know these reasons.

but how can a certain person become an informer, and why this person chose to be an informer?

It might be said: the poverty (tightness) is behind that, well, but millions of people live in poverty, but in no need to become informers.

Here, I return to the distinction among souls, the trivial and the noble. Why this particular man a trivial soul? We exactly don't know!

Let's analyze this trivial soul that is in the state of enmity to the other, and denial of him. Where, "Bader Shakir al-Sayyab" starts his poem "The informer" by saying in his words:

I'm whatever you want, I'm the despicable, Invaders' shoe dyer, the seller of blood, and conscience to the oppressors, I'm the crow, feeds on the corpses of chicken, I'm destruction, and ruin...

I'm whatever you want, I'm the mean, the stupid, and the spiteful.

Here is the informer standing to face in front of the other, declaring that he is neither interested in any negative judgment of what he does, nor any vile trait the other describes him.

Here, the other no longer exists, and the informer lacks a human relationship with him, he lives away from positive values, that prevent, or limit harm. He is a creature conscious of what he is doing, conscious of being evil, void of conscience as a deterrent force, subsequently, there is no limitations for practicing harm, and negating the other. Practically, there is no existence for the informer without the other; he is linked to the other by one of the strangest relationships among human beings. First, he turns his ego into a tool to hunt down his prey from human beings, then he turns the other into an

object for predation, into something.

He is paid tool, builds his relationship with an executioner, invader, his ego is the tool, the thing, losing all the traits that turns him into a human being, without mercy, pity, religious, or ethical deterrent. Everything in front of this “Thing” is permissible, his eyes turns away from the beauty of the man, and nature, to stare at the other, they turn into a trap for hunting the prey. his self-unconsciousness is identical with his behavior, meaning that he realizes being a slave without feeling to the desire to be freed from his slavery. The other in respect of the informer, isn’t a particular individual, the other is each other, with what the other holds of moral code, social convention, and prevailing values that keep man free.

The other is a prey, in return, loses all of his human qualities in the informer’s consciousness. The other is no longer the man; who suffers, has no hope, fatherhood feelings, family, children, pursuit of livelihood or work. Therefore, the informer doesn’t think about man, or the consequences of his evil on the man.

The informer’s loss of his human consciousness, that is, of his awareness that he is an ego, leads to the other loses his ego. And the relationship between him and the other turns into a relation of something to something.

The informer neither hates nor loves the other, he doesn’t think of him, or give him any value other than the reward he will receive from betraying the other.

Truly, the informer as al-sayyab shouts “I’m whatever you want, I’m the despicable”, but he always tries to hide, that is due to two reasons: to fully carry out his mission, none must recognize him as informer. He doesn’t practice his profession, he might be a farmer, worker, engineer, teacher or an employee, his profession is one thing, and his transformation into informer is another. To be a successful informer he has to live with other in disguise; because his exposure ends his services, that he constantly seeks.

Secondly, he realizes the lowliness of himself, and the ugly image of the informer to others. He absolutely knows that he is contemptuous, and despised, that’s why he lives in a state of constant fear of the other; Because the other has ethical, and social authority, he fears the transcendent system.

It’s a seldom case, that the ego is forced to live in as informer, which is its self-contempt, and consciousness of others’ contempt to it, especially since nothing forgive the informer his shameful act.

The beggar finds thousands of people who provide him the ethical, or religious justification for his beggary. His poverty intercedes for him to shed his face in front of the other.

Many ordinary people, or sociologists forgive the prostitute for her behavior in selling her body, and call for overcoming the conditions that turn a woman into a prostitute. Acts of murder resulting from revenge, honor or right defense are tolerated by law, and society accepts the repentance of a thief, or drug addict, but none will forgive the informer's aggression, and meanness. The informer spreads cases of fear in society, since he is always in disguise, no one can be at ease with those who can't trust with absolute confidence or previous knowledge or experience. so, suspicion quickly arises to an unknown, it's caution sometimes, lying at other times, and silence a third time.

He spoils good co-relationship in the city, village, institution, and work.

In the city, where there is a world of institutions, and factories, there are professional relations among people, that lead to a kind of fellowship, or friendship, when the smell of unknown informer spreads, it's justified by arrest case, or summoning because of saying, until these relationships are ruined, and limited to the minimal, and the talk world of politics, and criticism disappears. Here is the informer has ruined everything; the ordinary life in institution, neighborhood, the ability to speak out loud, and he ruined honesty, sincere, trust and friendship values.

As for the village world, where the co-relationships are strong; because kinship, lack of space, and persistence of social solidarity values. The informer turns this beautiful, most placid world into hell. He attends their weddings, and their sorrows rituals, he knows them one by one, tours the village, exploits its beautiful relationships.

The village realizes that so - and - so was led to the investigation; because for what he uttered at a wedding, or a funeral, so they become suspicious, and tend to the world of caution, and Taqiyya.

The informer involves a shackled soul, he is the slave in the strict sense of the word, and while he is conscious about his slavery, he has the deep hidden feeling of making all others slaves. He establishes antagonistic relationship with the free person; so, he seeks to bind the others with shackles, thinking that it turns the free person into a slave, forgetting that the free soul remains that way, while it is chained with iron.

The more the informer denies the other, the more he desires to be exiled, and seeks to hunt prey, and he turns into an agent of total destruction, especially when he knows that others have known him.

The moment his case is exposed, his destructive energy emerges in a way that he is no longer interested in the transcendent moral system; so, he kills those closest to him, even if it is his brother or father.

## Ideology Of killing

In the human narrative, there are countless facts about killing, torture, and the representation of corpse. History books include between its covers the wars of human beings, and what the tragedies it left behind that are closer to the imagination. Every day, in the era of the communications revolution, the small screen puts us in front of familiar scenes, without arousing in us a sense of bereavement, especially if the scenes don't concern us directly.

The murders in Palestine, and Iraq, which are practiced by the Zionists, and the Americans pass through civilized people, (they are watched by the world through media only), and hardly produce a verbal condemnation.

Technology - the fruit of human science - has created, and continues to innovate killing machines that take lives that didn't commit a sin to be punished for it. The killer is man, and so is the murdered.

In 1914 The Times of London wrote in its editorial: ((There is no civilized nation, on the face of the globe, that accepts to bomb open cities with bombs from the air"),<sup>(4)</sup> Within a few decades, the great historical capitals of Europe - Paris, London, Berlin and Moscow - were reeling under bombardment. A few decades later, atomic bombs falling from planes wiped out life in two cities in Japan.

Do you think killing and torturing the other is an inherent trait in man to the extent that it can't be eradicated? Is it an instinctive characteristic in him?

"Sade", from whose name the pleasure in other tortures is derived, has shown in his stories an aspect of the pleasure felt by the torturer, or the murderer. Freud indicated that "there is an instinct for destruction in human beings, along with the instinct of love". And it was said in the past that "injustice is a characteristic of souls".

In any case, the phenomena of killing, torture, cruelty, tyranny, contempt, ridicule, humiliation, war, as well as revenge, vendetta, and individual crimes are still present, and their presence is increasing in all society without exception. Social sciences strive to understand these

phenomena: from sociology, psychology, to anthropology...etc.

But, the problem, we are about to solve, is the ideology of murder. That is, the ideological justification for the act of killing, i.e. killing the other.

The ideology of killing is the one that legitimizes the act of killing, It's who provides for this annihilation of the other justifications that reach the extent of describing it as a heroic act.

Thus, we must distinguish between murder as an individual crime, and the killing behind which an ideology that calls for, and justifies it.

So, the thief killed the owner of the house on the grounds of theft, an act that drew public condemnation; Because The motives for the killing are clear, and unambiguous.

A father kills his daughter because of honor, and holds his head vainglorious, proudly, a large number of people share his feeling, and it generates approval among them.

For this act there are two types of killing: the first is a crime in custom, and the other is a good deed.

The first has no ideology behind it, and the second the ideology calls for.

The truth is that murder legitimized by ideology is the most dangerous, and the most disgusting thing in history. If we examine the source of the ideology of killing, we would find that it isn't just some thinker preaching this ideology, but the real contributors to its industry are the human groups, and the institutions, the tribe, the people, the nation, the party, the secret organization, and state authority.

The question remains aske: if man hadn't been involved in the first place, an aggressive tendency towards the other, Would the ideology of killing have become a factor of influence on human beings?

Murder: the killer and the killed. Ideology glorifies, and denounces. The killer praises his killing, and the victim denounces his killing, so when the Americans bombed Hiroshima, and Nakazati with the atomic bomb, and thousands of human beings' lives were lost in minutes, the American glorified this act of the American nation and viewed it as a victory. While the Japanese still commemorate this act as a heinous crime against man. The driving element of the ideology of killing is "killing for the sake of", that is, the one who committed the act of killing for the sake of, and the one killed for the sake of.

Either way we are to die for. This “for the sake of” implies a result that is more valuable in the eyes of the killer and the killed, than the man. it’s more valuable than the killed; Because he who goes to kill may also be killed. This phrase: “For the sake of” is the sacrifice of the ego, and the other. The purpose transcends the ego, and the other.

Let’s define “For the sake of”, An exponent of Ideology of killing. Especially the ideology of war, which is the blatant form of the ideology of killing.

This phrase “For the sake of” is divided into two parts, The first is apparent, which is the declared false goals, and the second, hidden is the real goals. Thus, we are faced with two ideologies together; one that gives the war moral, rational, and rightful connotations- which is the overt ideology; and the other that is contaminated with all worldly goals.

The first is directed at the public, at ordinary people who must be excited, and controlled by values they see as what deserves a man to die for: God, nation, race, freedom, external danger... As for the second, it’s what he knows very well, who planned, and orchestrated the war, he keeps it secret; because it doesn’t work in the same warrior.

On January 26, 1095, Pope Urban II delivered a discourse to the gathered crowds, in which he called to take up arms against the Persian tribe of the Turks, which massacred, and captured many Christians, to liberate the tomb of Jesus Christ in Jerusalem, and to liberate the brothers living there. ((I say this to those who are present, and I undertake to inform those who are absent - this is how Jesus Christ commanded)), The Pope didn’t forget to tell the crowds that the Lord will forgive all their sins, if they fight the infidels Muslims, He will reward them in eternal paradise in heaven...(5)

The Frankish knights, and feudal lords knew what was behind this discourse, So, started fighting for the country of honey, and wealth. While the soldiers carry out the will of Christ.

Christ: a symbol of Loving, peace, tolerance, and morals, Christ who came to save people from their sins through their redemption. Christ turns into justification for killing.

So, the ideology of killing borrows from the sacred elements to falsify human consciousness, and push them to annihilate the other for the sake of what is worldly.

In a situation like this, sacred turns - due to its striking influence on the believers - into an inciting discourse: liberating the tomb of Christ, Jerusalem, and the brothers. And take revenge on the infidels. The cross turns from a symbol of Christian redemption for the sake of human beings, into a motive for killing them.

The Napoleonic wars in the Arab East took place under the propagation of the concepts

---

5- see; Michael Zaborov, “The Crusaders in the East”, Moscow, 1986, p. 46.

of brotherhood, love, and equality. Colonialism was carried out under the pretext of helping people to develop, the wars that Hitler fought under the name of the second Aryan race, and his global message, the Zionist-Jewish occupation of Palestine took place in the name of a divine promise, the American aggressive wars against Iraq were launched in the name of

ridding the Iraqi people of dictatorship, and disarming weapons of mass destruction that threaten neighbors.

Historically, expansionist empires seem to be the factory of the ideology of killing. But these empires don't address humans with their goals of expansion, wealth, theft, and domination, but rather in the name of sublime values. The invading armies must be charged with concepts that have nothing to do with the origin of aggression: a divine promise, the glory of the nation, the people's message, the liberation of the other.

Ideology of killing is the ideology of the strong against the weak men. Or is the ideology of blind power, the ideology of tyrants, and invaders. The concepts are almost the same. The tyrant's discourse to justify his tyranny is also based on raising the status of the country, the people, and freedom with a strange unification between all these concepts, and his person. At that time, the ideology of tyranny divides society into those who are with the tyrant, and thus with the homeland, and those who are against the tyrant, and thus against the homeland. Then the ideology of killing is a formula for defending the homeland against its enemies. The enemies of the homeland are the enemies of the tyrant.

The tyrants don't say that we are executed, and deserve to defend the authority, but rather, destroy the traitors, and the conspirators. All the trials conducted by Stalin, which ended with the execution of his comrades, were carried out under the pretext of their treachery to the homeland. Bukharin - whom Lenin called the party's darling - became a German agent, and was coldly executed.

Power, whether it belongs to an expansionist empire, a tyrannical system, or a fascist party, gives rise to all instinctive morality that negate the other. It announces the defeat of human values that elevate the status of man. The ideology of killing unites with instinctive morality, and killing the other becomes the heads feature of such unity. The values of tolerance collapse, as does the sense of others' grief for their murdered relatives collapses, and the shreds of children no longer evoke any feeling of sadness, or guilt.

The ideology of war pushes children to kill. Since killing is the killer, and the murdered, as we said, war - the highest form of determining the ideology of killing - also takes the life of the killer.

The killer, and the murdered on the battlefields are driven by the power of the ideology of killing. This ideology is absent from its dictionary the concepts of widowhood, orphan hood, loss, and grief. indeed, the mobs, who were empowered by instinctive morality to hold dance circles, out of pride drove them to kill, even though death had befallen everyone.

The ideology of killing is, in the end, sacrificing the other - the one who decides to kill pushes people to die in the furnace of war, and overlooks people enjoying the blood, that was spilled from his own people, or from strangers. Take, for example, the case of a father losing his son in the war, the son who went to be killed, or the son who was killed by the next killer.

It's the greatest tragic situation for a father. The affection of fatherhood, or motherhood is the truest of one's emotions. As only the father, or the mother can sacrifice with absolute consent for the sake of the children . The father, who raised a picture of his son, who was killed in America's war of aggression against Iraq, addressed Bush, saying: (Rejoice, President, you lost my only son for your war to own oil), And the Iraqi mother lost consciousness, when she lost her own son. Both examples indicate the magnitude of the great tragedy, but the biggest

tragedy is that the son is killed in his father's lap, as Muhammad al-Durra did.

And the religious story about Abraham, and his son is a witness to the holiness of the son. The story says: Abraham, peace be upon him, asked Allah to give him a boy. When guests of the messenger angels came to him, they gave him the glad tidings of a forbearing boy. And Abraham said, when he was preached: He is, then, sacrificed to Allah. When the boy was born, and he reached the age of dealing with him and helping him in his work, that is, working for Allah Almighty, it was said to him: Fulfill your vow to draw nearer to Allah Almighty . And this was the reason why Allah commanded his prophet Abraham to sacrifice his son.

The story adds: Abraham saw in a dream that he was sacrifice with his son Ishmael. He said to his son: "Take the rope, and small knife, then go with us to this mountain paths, to gather firewood". When Abraham became alone with his son in a large mountain path, he told him what he had been commanded to do. "Oh, my dear Son, I have seen in a dream that I must sacrifice you", he said. But his son said to him: "Oh, my father, tighten my bond so that I won't be disturbed, and hold back your clothes, so that my blood won't be splashed on it, my reward decreases, and my mother sees it, and she grieve, and sharpen your blade and hasten to drag the knife across my throat, so that

it will be easier for me to die, for death is severe. If you come to my mother, send her greetings from me. If you want to return my shirt to her, do so, for perhaps it will be more pleasant for her than I'm"...So, Abraham did as his son commanded him. Then he approached him, and kissed him. He tied him up crying..Then he put the knife to his throat, but the knife did nothing. The story goes that Allah fixed a plate of copper on Ishmael's throat.

Then, Ismael said: "Oh father, lay me on my forehead, for if you look at my face, you will have mercy on me, and I will catch you on me as a delicacy that will prevent you from the command of Allah Almighty". Abraham did so. Then he put the knife on his neck, and flipped. and We called out to him, "Oh Abraham, You have fulfilled the dream, this is your sacrifice, and We ransomed him with a great sacrifice". So, it was.

Many are the symbolic implications of this religious story. God wanted to test Abraham with the most difficult test possible, which was to slaughter his Son. Yes, it is the hardest test ever for a father to slay his own son. God is undoubtedly aware of the relationship of absolute unity between the father and the son, or the mother and the son. Also, the son, in turn, is aware of this fact. He realizes that his father is inevitably reluctant to carry out God's command. He also knows what will happen to his mother, if she finds out that she lost him. That is, Ismail is aware that Abraham's love for him is stronger than God's command for him, and that is why he helped him bear the divine command. And as soon as Abraham succeeded in the test, God intervened, and changed his command; because God knows what the value of the Son is, so He decided to ransom him with a ram from heaven, that is, an animal that was originally the subject of slaughter.

I wonder what motivates the ideologues of war to push the sons to kill? In order to they kill, and to be killed, Who gave the right to these people to sacrifice what they don't have from the children, and then raise the toast of victory sitting on the skulls of the innocent. So that they kill the son in the lap of his father, or mother, then smile.

The ideology of killing is killing the other, sacrificing the other, ((for the sake of)), in contrast to the ideology of killing, the philosophy of resistance emerges. Why did we say the philosophy of resistance, and not the ideology of resistance? For the simple reason that resistance is an act that is devoid of any lies, of any hidden ideological burdens; because it's simply a position on the world, therefore, the philosophy of resistance is a philosophy in the sense of life full of dignity, and freedom. Say: Resistance is a philosophy in meaning.

Two bright symbols of this are Henri Gouraud, and Youssef al-Azma; The first is a

symbol of the ideology of killing, While the second is a symbol of the philosophy of resistance. Gouraud came with armies from behind the seas during the colonial occupation stage. It acts in the name of the French nation - as an expansionist empire. Gouraud carries with him a deed of mandate for legislators from the League of Nations. But it's the legitimacy of the victorious power. He came with soldiers, cannons, and planes. He came to plunder, strip, to rule, to share the spoils with France's ally, Britain. Gouraud contradicts ideology in its declared falsehood, and in its hidden truth. i.e. The behavior results from what is hidden, and undisclosed.

Youssef Al-Azma is the son of the homeland, this aristocratic minister realizes that he doesn't have the material strength to confront Gouraud, who is armed with the latest weapons. But he went to meet the colonizer's army, knowing his fate. al-Azma fought Gouraud until he was killed. In the national-Islamic sense, he was martyred.

The text of the act of al-Azma appears: He is haunted by the act of the free homeland, the concept of dignity, the act of independence, the mutinous culture of humiliation. All this

constitutes the meanings of existence, without which there is no meaning to his existence. So, he freely sacrificed himself for a sublime meaningful existence, or for a supreme existence. In this context, he is a philosopher of resistance, but he wrote the text in his own blood.

Gouraud receives the order to march on Syria. Youssef Al-Azma responds to the free vocation. Sacrifice the ego as free is the philosophy of resistance. There is no forced action in the philosophy of resistance. It's, as I said, a vocation, a call to the meaning of existence. Therefore, the popular memory preserves Al-Azma as a symbol of sacrifice, and heroism. And Sincere poems were written for him. A free act, and awareness of the meaning of the act, leads to self-sacrifice, while the ideology of killing is a sacrifice of the other in order to kill the other, and for the killing to achieve an interest, that has nothing to do with the murderer, who is paid to kill.

And someone says: The act of resistance is killing the other as well. This is correct, but the resister didn't ask the other aggressor to come to his home to kill him, he is simply defending himself, he is practicing a right. Resistance is the right to face aggression in defense of an existence, or a soul that has no value except in an existence, that is satisfied by the ego. From here we realize the extent to which resistance is linked to freedom, that is, Freedom as an inner value, and mode of existence. What prompted al-Qassam to resist the British in Palestine? No one but the vocation, only a philosophy of life linked

to a philosophy of the homeland. The goal wasn't false, ambiguous, or hidden, but it was clear: liberation. The resister, then, isn't a killer. The concept indicative of the act of resistance is redemption, and from it the redeemer.

In the act of redemption, the concepts of homeland, nation, and dignity return to their reality, which was falsified in the ideology of killing, and the sign of that is that they are present in behavior. And specified by doing is by nature.

Resistance as a redemption, as we said, stems from a philosophy in life. It has a moral dimension - values - and its most important element is liberation from everything that is vulgar in life, i.e. asceticism.

Redemption is the sacrifice of the ego for the sake of others; Because the deeper meaning of the act of resisting the redeemer is to unite with the other, and look at him as an ego. The other here are the people of the country, to which he also belongs.

From here, the philosophy of resistance seems to be an absolute salvific act, i.e. ridding the world of the evils of instinct ethics, and the ideology of killing, and the act of killing associated with them. In addition, it's an explicit declaration of mutiny, in word and deed. It is popularized by "no" as the decisive response to murder, and its ideology.

The philosophy of resistance is, in its origin, a new philosophy for the body. The resisting spirit is inseparable from the resisting body. The pinnacle of the philosophy of resistance is martyrdom. It's the pleasure of the ascetic body of life.

Ideology of killing views the act of resistance-martyrdom as an act of terrorism. This is because the aggressor faces people, who don't obey the rules of his war. He wants the death of others, and is afraid of their death. He is afraid of the way their death, that destroy him. Where the act of liberation is self- sacrifice of redemption. The aggressor armed with the machine, and the ideology of killing doesn't have the idea of sacrifice, but "I kill the other (for the sake of)". He encounters ego declare it to die for. The ego, who declares its death for the sake of its free existence, announces at the same time the death of the alien, invading other, who fears death. Here, we understand why aggressive war appears - This is the reality of war - In the most severe form of annihilation of the other - Killing innocent people, Truly massacres, mutilation of a bodies. Since it originally starts from the annihilation of the other, the necessity of victory over him, it will be no means left to achieve this annihilation.

At the moment when the philosophy of resistance appears as a specific act, the barbarism of the aggressor increases, as the idea of total annihilation appears. (The behavior of France in Algeria, the behavior of the Zionists in Palestine, the behavior of America

in Vietnam and Iraq), and the murderer armed with the ideology of killing shows all his stock of sadism, and destruction, and turns into a total monster that loses any relationship to cultural life in the anthropological sense of the word, the culture that establishes cohabitation relations between Humans.

He, having directed all his destructive reserves against the other, turned the other into a mere object. The other - he is no longer a human being, and he has also turned into a tool, that is, he has lost his human characteristics. He is only a trigger, and a trigger.

One of the falsest concepts in the ideology of killing is the concept of heroism. This ideology practices ritual glorification of the killer. By ceremonies attended by the servants of the killing temple.

Medals are attached to the chests of the killers, as the nation's heroes, and defenders of its security, and elevation. Heroism here doesn't carry any sublime moral value, rather it's a reward for the fighter, who carried out the killing orders.

Heroism wasn't a behavior, whose most important feature was the sacrifice of a vocation in defense of a higher value; because the "hero" of war is essentially the annihilating beast. As well as, the popular memory doesn't store any of these symbols that time comes upon, while the memory of the resisting people stores the true hero, A symbol of resistance is a popular hero, sacrificed for the sake of the homeland, and the people, without leaving them. He sacrificed on his land in repelling the aggression. So that, the rituals of glorifying the popular hero are present in the song, the anthem, history books, and commemorations. ((Al Qassam as an example)) present in the name of a street, school, club...etc.

The real, popular hero turns into a part of the people's culture. The resisting people soon invoke him as a way to reinforce their belonging to their philosophy of resistance, where the concept of freedom is always present.

The philosopher wonders: how many wars, massacres, and killing for man have passed through humanity? Why has humanity not recovered of this phenomenon, and of these rituals of killing?

He wonders: How many wisemen, prophets, and writers wrote in glorifying the value of man, and called for renouncing the killing of man. Germany, which produced Kant, who said; "If the happiness of all mankind depended on the killing of one innocent child, this act would have been immoral", This Germany is Kant's country: it killed millions of people in the name of Germany, its glory, and its race of sons.

Should we have satisfied with what Freud says; “It is the killing instinct inherent in the human soul”, is it the interests, and the greed for wealth that explain to us the war on the other, the continuation of the ideology of killing? Or are empires, with their tendency to expand, occupy, and exploit other, the origin of the evils of war, and the ideology of killing? Or does retaining authority, and fear on it, push the ruler to exalt the status of killing?

I wonder, do we seek to show power, whatever it's, as soon as we feel it - by negating the other - as if power can't imprison itself inside its bearer?

Or, is it all of this?

Suffice it to say: There is nothing more dangerous than killing here than the ideology of killing, the ideology that legitimizes, and flirts with it.



## Chapter Four: The Tragic Existence



We said the tragic existence, and we didn't say the existence in the tragedy; Because, when the tragedy is designating some existence, we can't erect a barrier between existence and tragedy, for the tragic ego is the one that agonize, ache, grieves, worries, frustrates, fails, fears, and pessimistic...Suffering, pain, sadness, frustration, failure, fear, anxiety, and pessimism are patterns of ego existence. Whatever the time of tragic existence, the ego lives in universal state, long or short.

So, the tragic existence is a conscious emotional state, from which no any ego can escape, with variation in the severity or weakness of this state, the variation in the motive for this conscious, and the ego's reactions to a particular motive differ due to the nature of the ego itself.

It is true, that literature has reflected the tragic in life, but it remains immeasurably less than its realistic presence.

Here, we aren't talking about the heroes of a tragedy, but rather about ordinary individuals, who live it as, as I said, a specification of their existence. A living human life is a journey, in which joyful existence is only one of its specifications, as is the case with ordinary existence.

So, the human existence is a tragic existence, a joyful existence, and an ordinary existence. And if the joyful existence is the happy existence, the feeling of happiness, and its basis is contentment, tranquility, success, and pleasure...etc. then the ordinary existence is a routine existence that doesn't produce any type of the two feelings. The ego lives all these specifications of existence in different moments, and if its returning existence is the dominant one in general, without denying that the existence of egos, its tragic existence remains the continuous state.

What is the motive for transforming the existence of the ego into a tragic existence, what are the forms of conscious that designates this existence, and how does the tragic ego act?

## Death

I will leave everything that theologians, and philosophers have said about death, and deal with the subject from one angle, it's death as the tragic existence. The man, whether he believes in resurrection, and immortality after death, or he is a natural, proceeds from the fact that death is a natural event; because all human beings - with the exception of special cases of sacrifice - fear death.

They - that is, humans - are absolutely certain that they are mortal, and no one deviates from absolute faith in this absolute certainty.

No human condition has refuted this truth...((All humans are Mortal)), ((every soul will taste death)).

I swear, Death is in the hands of God,  
leaves no one behind,  
even if he is a young man,  
who enjoys strength, and activity.

It comes to him at any time, just as it comes to an animal, whose rope is loose. But despite this undoubted certainty, the ego fears - all its life - death. In fact, you see that the people most clinging to life are those who have reached a very old age, and the least fearful of death are those in the prime of their youth, where the love of adventure characterizes their behavior.

The initial experience in the fear of death didn't arise except through seeing the death of the other, and the dead other highlights death as a subjective experience for the living. The other ceases to exist - so the fate of the ego - in the end is the fate of this other, who has come to naught. The death of the other is a reminder of the truth, that is absent in the busyness of daily life.

But the depth of subjective experience of nothingness appears only with the loss of the dear, and beloved other, with whom I have a union relationship.

Here, I'm listening to the newscast, in which it came: Hundreds of people died in a devastating earthquake, dozens of dead and wounded fell victims of the American bombing of Afghanistan, or hundreds of Indians drowned in floods. On the one hand, I listen

to this news of death, I may be sorry, but I soon forget what happened, for their death doesn't concern me except within the limits of my hatred of death, and tears won't flow from my eyes as an expression of sadness.

On the other hand: The one who lost his mother, father, or brother in the earthquake will suffer grief to the extent that he will lose his balance, and consciousness.

Also, the mother whose son was lost in the war may bring him to nothingness out of grief... and so on.

So, the tragedy generated by death is of two types: The tragedy of anxiety, fear for the ego from nothingness, and the tragedy of grief generated by the loss of those we love. When I use the concept of love here, I refer to the universality of the meaning of the intimate relationship with the other, The love relationship between a father and his son, a mother ((and her son)), a brother and his brother, two friends, or between two lovers. Anxiety because of remembering the annihilation, sadness resulting from of the annihilation of the beloved other, or the anxiety of losing him. In both cases we are facing what contradicts the love of survival; I love to stay alive, and so does my beloved other, I won't talk about the desire for the death of the other, which is present in the ideology of killing as I mentioned previously; Death is nothingness, for me and the other, whose survival I would like.

But the ego's realization of nothingness, and the anxious that this generates about survival has generated the idea of immortality, and the idea of eternity man is nothing but revenge against nothingness. The idea of immortality transformed death into a temporary moment through the belief in resurrection. Faced with the absurdity of death, the burial rejection of it, and the desire for eternal survival, immortality became a way out of this unreasonable dilemma.

Everyone knows that the idea of immortality, and man's belief that death is a way to survival is ancient, and it turned into an absolute belief in all ancient civilizations.

The prevailing division between the body and the spirit is nothing but an attempt to give the spirit an eternal nature, since it has no end, but rather its transition to another world. Here, I'm talking about the public awareness prevailing among people, as this awareness is an integral part of their general culture.

Most ordinary people still reject the idea of eternal death, believe that there is another world, in which the spirit that was separated from the body lives, or that there will come a day when man will be resurrected, both spirit and body.

The spirit in Christianity is immortal, and doesn't die, and Islam also tends in this way,

with the addition that there is a resurrection of the spirit and the body in the afterlife, where man will be punished, or rewarded by God; Heaven, and Hell are the abode of the afterlife, where all human beings are immortal without exception, and some esoteric sects still believe in reincarnation, where the spirit leaves its body to another body in an endless process.

The truth is that we don't find a big difference between the consciousness of the ancient Egyptian man - in the Pharaonic era - and the contemporary man in the space age on this issue. Rather, there is no difference between the Babylonian and the contemporary man in his consciousness of the fate of man. Few people have realized that death is a natural phenomenon like any other phenomenon in nature, and that death means- an end- albeit an unhappy one, for this being. There is absolutely no separation between the body, and the life of the body, which is expressed by the public awareness - in the spirit, With the exception of this small number, most of the world's population rejects death as the final fate of man.

In any case, the feeling of death, whether for those who believe in immortality, or for those who are natural, remains tragic, So, it results in anxiety, sadness, crying, and regret. Rather, the rituals of burial, mourning, and commemoration of the dead indicate the tragedy of nothingness, which is expressed in tears, anguish, black clothes...etc.

There is what we call the metaphorical immortality, with which man obsess over after his death, Through the effect that he leaves deliberately, for others to remember him, All the words of lamentation received contain the famous saying :((His memory is eternal, he is present in his tracks)), The talk here isn't based on the immortality of the thinker through his creativity. Most of the creators don't think about this matter. Here, the talk is about some wealthy people, who leave behind an orphanage, a church, a mosque, or a water source...They seek to perpetuate a praiseworthy memory for them.

Form of metaphorical immortality for many fathers, and families is the presence of male children who bear their name.

How great is the joy of the father when a son is born to him, and bears his name, especially in the countries of the East; because he believes that the male boy is the continuation of him. As the eldest son also looks at his son as a continuation of the body, and so on. All of the above wouldn't have been possible without the tragic character of death, and the rejection of such a fate.

If a man has overcome death with the idea of immortality, then on the other hand - and for some - he has born ascetic behavior in revenge for this life that doesn't deserve to be

lived, or the idea of indulging in life to the point of obscenity, and exploiting it to the last breath, as long as annihilation is undoubtedly coming.

I swear that asceticism and obscenity are two attitudes that have the same origin, which is the feeling of the tragedy of death. They are a protest against annihilation.

At a time when Ascetic sees that life isn't worth the trouble in order to meet the needs of the mortal body, and that physical pleasures distract the man from true happiness, spiritual happiness, then the Obscene doesn't see happiness except at the moment of living, indulging in physical pleasure, and achieving the pleasure of the body always yearning for satisfaction.

If the man knows his inevitable destiny - nothingness - So, in what sense does he occupy himself with the temporary and temporal according to the ascetic, then, in what meaning is there for the days to pass without missing out on the only and possible pleasure in this world for Obscene.

In fact, Obscenity is giving up everything in life, if we consider it carefully. Obscene lives in the moment, not greedy for wealth, authority, or prestige. He only listens to the call of the body waiting at the gate of death.

Ascetic, too, only listens to the call of the knowing spirit, waiting for its inevitable fate.

Asceticism may not be linked to a religious position, but to a philosophical view of the world, as is obscenity.

Rather, a life of obscenity, and indulging in pleasure may lead to asceticism. At a certain stage, a man lives in a physical inability to practice pleasures, after he has experienced a portion of his life, the pleasures of life, so his asceticism is a protest against the temporality of pleasure, which is also destined for nothingness. He may turn his asceticism into an ideology to convince people of the insignificance of the life they live.

Mysticism, isn't far from this state, that is, the asceticism, but what distinguishes it from asceticism is its transcendence towards the absolute union that doesn't cease to exist, It perishes absolutely in order to remain immortal in it, He transcends the tragedy of death with his immortality with the immortal "Allah".

The lived experience of death experienced by the souls mutinous against death shouldn't to be seen from the perspective of faith, and atheism, rather according to the attitude towards life itself, it's devoid of meaning in its substance, whether for the ascetic or Obscene, and for this reason the meaning here has deposed man - with his tragic feeling - about life.

Remembering death as a tragedy turns life into a path of buried pains in the ego that

realizes its inevitable fate, and the pains of the ego resulting from fear of the fate of the beloved other.

The feeling of fear, anxiety and pains reaches its climax in the relationship between the father and the children; because an intimate union is established between them to the extent that the parents prefer the lives of the children over their lives.

All parents live the experience of fear for their son, or daughter from any harm, especially in cases of illness, and they live the experience of fatal fear, especially in the event that they lose one of the sons, here we reach the climax of the tragedy that arises from the awareness of death.

Illness, especially the deadly disease that afflicts man, puts him in the midst of tragedy, and creates in him a sense of the futility of existence. In disease, the ego realizes the fragility of the body, which is the symbol of life, whether the ego believes in eternity or in absolute nothingness, it can't be convinced of the reasonableness of the body's annihilation. So, ego want to live without pains, sickness, or sadness, even if he acknowledges his coming immortality or resurrection in another life.

In the previous paragraph, I talked about the feeling of death, and the tragic existence through the consciousness of nothingness, However, the issue has another side, that of forgetting nothingness, and acting in life according to the absence of consciousness of the inevitable fate - death.

This is the case of the common people, who don't remember nothingness except at the moment of its presence, or on an occasion that reminds them of it, but they soon forget this moment, or that occasion, and return to their first life.

He is forgetting death, fate, and the ego's behavior in life, as if he was immortal in life itself.

No doubt that life is impossible, as long as man waits for his fate - nothingness. there is no meaning to this short life, in which we are certain of our end, and if humans didn't circumvent this fact, the tragedy of death would have turned them into dead people while they were alive. this is the only positive aspect for oblivion of death.

But the negative aspects of such a situation are much more than what is positive; because of its connection with the love of survival, forgetfulness of annihilation arises, rather, say that the forgetfulness of mortality, and the power of the love of survival are the primary creators of human selfishness, and those responsible for forgetting the other, and even his absence. If we are permitted to talk about the phenomenon of the death of the other, he is present thanks to the forgetting of death, and the tragedy generated by the forget-

ting of nothingness falls this time on the other.

I had talked about idols, the idol of authority, and the idol of money. The ego, whose existence is viewed as a permanent existence, and doesn't think of death, behaves without thinking of the transitory, and transforms the ephemeral into eternal, so it estranges itself from the transitory, and calls for clinging to it by all means, whatever to preserve it, even if that leads it to destroying the country, and the people.

The dictator, who sends thousands, or tens of thousands of people into prisons, and graves, forgets that he will meet the same fate due to time, and the bright end – death.

The rich man stores the wealth that needs to be spent for a thousand years, and seeks to increase it, and he can't live more than a century, if the time is long, he monopolizes, steals through legal trade, smuggles money, does every harm to the other for the sake of money, and forgets that he is destined to not be.

How harmful are the tragedies resulting from forgetting nothingness to the other?

Nero burns Rome, and forgets that death burns him as well, but the problem is that those who ask these questions from the public quickly ignore them, when they have authority and money. Rather, the public people often ignore nothingness in their daily behavior in banal worldly conflicts, that generate thousands of tragedies in all their forms for the other.

So: remembering nothingness generates tragedy, while forgetting nothingness also creates it, as if the existence that we live in is the tragic existence in its two forms: the tragedy that generates human elevation, and the tragedy that brings him down to the lowest level.

## Frustration And Tragic Existence

Human existence, in general, is swing between possibility and reality, what should be and what is, Hopes and facts, success and failure, what is wanted and what occur, between dreams or what is achieved, ambition and disability.

Here, we are in faced with concepts full of language to express desires, possibility, what should be, hopes, success, dream, ambition, and will. these are concepts that make a person always drawn to the future, as the future turns into a motivation for behavior. Rather, the meaning that the ego attaches to its existence is based on what is coming, and what is coming is stored in consciousness, the ego tries to turn it into reality, but life is like the wind goes against the wish of the ships, when this is the case, and at a moment when the ego contemplates its failure, the tragedy of human existence emerges, the tragedy of the frustrated ego.

At the individual level, individuals vary in their reactions to their failure or frustration, as they differ in the degree of their ambitions, and dreams, between small aspirations and large ones, between hopes that are not separated from reality - that is, about achieving it, except for a small moment of time, and hopes that require a long time.

Souls full of great hopes, and ones satisfied with little dreams, souls are satisfied with small successes, others hoping for total success that immortalizes them, souls surrender to reality when they admit that their hopes are unattainable, and stop dreaming, then the future dies. While there are souls who remain rejecting, mutinous, striving to achieve the hopes they store, souls that prefer suicide when failure, and ones that whose resolve is increased by failure.

We say again; we don't know the reasons that distinguish souls from each other, but rather we acknowledge an existing reality in life.

We return to frustration, which is the ego's feeling of inability to achieve what it wants, and the feeling of helplessness is a feeling of psychological pain that can't be cured,

except in the case of a moment in which the ego feels successful. The ego that is full of dreams, and hopes is most likely a mutinous ego, and it's difficult for it to reach a moment of contentment, and permanent reassurance, it faces its life, and life in general, with what it should be, or what reality should be.

In the case of very individual hopes, i.e. those hopes that don't exceed the ego, such as a professional future, wealth, the love of a beautiful woman, fame, a home, (a luxurious house)... the recurrence of frustration in such an ego may lead him to perish from two angles: either he surrenders to day - dreaming to compensate for his rejection to his reality, and in such a case its life with day - dreaming may develop into a kind of schizophrenia, so that lives the personality as wants it, acts according to it without being the same personality in reality, of course, and then he may reach the point of not distinguishing between the world of illusion, and the world of reality, and he is attributed to himself hidden abilities, heroics, and miraculous facts. In the colloquial sense, he is "crazy," and in the scientific, medical sense, "sick." I'm talking about realistic personalities full of life. Failure in love due to ugliness prompted "Odeh" to talk about a secret love affair with one of the most beautiful girls in the university, and the failure to occupy a political position prompted him to talk about discussions with him to be the first man.

Who is this "Odeh"? He is a realistic personality, who came from Gaza to the Jordan Valley during the days of the Palestinian revolution in Jordan. He is a solid fighter. He moved to Damascus and became a university student, during the days of the uprising of youth and students, when love relations became very natural. Odeh always loved one-sidedly. With the days, Odeh started talking about imaginary love stories. "Odeh" failed in his studies, and devoted himself to an office. He was previously the president of the Student Union. Now he is an employee, not a student leader. His ambition is to rise to the top and become a leader. "Odeh" failed, and found himself outside the regular job. He went to cafes, then he started talks about the next position for him, it's the highest position. "Odeh" is no longer able to livelihood himself, and pay the rent for the house located at the end of Mount Qassioun. He lived in illusions, and disappeared from sight, then it was said that he was found dead in his home.

This "Odeh" lived the brokenness of permanent individual dreams. Did Odeh commit suicide? Perhaps; because the end of a pattern like this is suicide, that is the second angle of perishing, this "Odeh" is repeated in daily life. He is on the street, in the café, searching for the other's recognition of his delusions, and because the other who knows his morbid delusions, treats him like a madman, and shakes his head approvingly.

This doesn't mean that every feeling of frustration may generate such a tragic fate; because "Odeh" one of the people originally didn't escape from frustration, therefore didn't escape from the tragic feeling, the pain, here, I'm not talking about the transient feeling, but about the permanent feeling of pain generated by frustration, which leads its owner to the meaninglessness of life.

In fact, the pains of some souls, who live in the frustration of universal dreams associated with the group, the nation, or the party...are more severe; because their souls are greater, they live in a state of futility, surrender to their powerlessness through a kind of complete alienation from the living world. they take refuge in the world of silence, and expresses her alienation with disgust. Until they reach the futility of writing, of struggle, of hopes, and others, they store their pains silently sometimes, and distanced from the group, they live in a state of isolation at other times, or may put an end to their life in a third case.

Silence; there is futility in frank speech, It's hidden talk that means "there is no point in saying". Solitude; there is futility in human beings. Suicide; life is useless. Silence comes after saying (writing), solitude comes after being included in the midst of people's struggle, and suicide comes after seeing the collapse.

Silence, solitude, suicide, the specifics of the tragic existence of the ego escaping its dreams, and defeated in front of its mutinous ego, but the defeated ego doesn't become so as a result of its inability, but rather because of the inability of history, reality and human beings. Because its dreams are universal, and not individual, it originally proceeds from the responsibility of the world for its dreams; because creations are the ones who achieve its universal dreams, and they are the ones who defeat them, this is why, you see that it takes a pessimistic position about the ability of his effectiveness to transform human beings into active.

Writer; the thinker who prefers silence will quickly answer the question, why did your pen stop writing, for whom do I write? What is the use of writing in a world where the word no longer affects? who reads? The writing of the mutinous ego, who chose to broadcast the activity, is writing for the other, and here he is, the other drowning in the world of vulgarity, daily life, the search for stillness, tranquility, and the escape to a subjectivity, that narrows the world until it becomes immediate benefits.

Silence is a position that says: The other doesn't deserve to hear my words. Silence is the death of the other, who destroyed my hopes.

The tragedy of the frustrated ego increases in its choice of solitude, which in turn is

silence in place, a protest against people, and it's the height of pessimism. The ego indulges in its self-reflections, and replaces its grand dreams with alone with itself, which is incapable of community participation, even in the simplest forms of these relationships. Secluded man only appears by chance, in order to confirm his isolation from people, and he may find in his self-reflection answers to the questions of existence as he poses them: He is now a metaphysical being, who accompanies the book, or immerses himself in written history, or retracts into a religious awareness, as if his mouthpiece is saying: my solitude is uniting with what is worth uniting; that is, for, Meditation, God, and History. A fighter, who risk one's life, and was defeated by life, taking refuge in his hermitage, disbelieving in the future. Here, he is now not part of the movement of life, but he carries a considerable past, so he turns into a past that affects reality, and the future. However, his frustration, despair, defeat, and his escape from life are often accompanied by his pride with his ego, in order for this pride to help him live. He isolates in the name of dignity, self-glory, and rejects the gains of authority, and renunciation. Thus, his defeat, and frustration turns into a defeat of the values that have triumphed for him. It's an example, that he presents deep within himself to others, and acts as a role model that must be emulated. In fact, others deal with him on this basis, and praise his virtues. His rare presence among people, enhances his self-consciousness through the medals, that they place on him.

If we look deeply into the frustrated, and isolated ego, we will find that it realizes, within itself, the importance of its isolation from the other. it assumes that people feel its isolation, that it has an impact on their consciousness, and that the other is present to it, and it's present to the other.

I talked, in all of the above, about the frustration of the individual ego. The ego person, who is looking for his position in this world is the ego who is dreaming, and his dreams are shattered before his eyes, but what is more dangerous than the frustrated ego, the frustrated group, and does the group have dreams? Yes, people have dreams, nations have dreams, political groups have dreams. Rather, say that the vitality of any nation, people, or group doesn't exist unless it carries great dreams related to the collective destiny, and as soon as its dreams are shattered, historical stagnation prevails, and it succumbs to feelings of despair and indifference. Then, its connection to divine salvation increases, and its tragic existence becomes a reason for individual withdrawal from collective life, especially, when it's afraid of expressing its dreams, and every ego in the group, people, or nation feels that it has been defeated, and that there is no way to salva-

tion, this why self-sufficiency becomes a means for the continuity of the meaning of life, but it's a narrow meaning of "wealth," "family," and "vulgar well-being."

However, all this doesn't mean a sense of tragedy, or the tragic existence, that the true existence of those frustrated.

This is a condition suffered by people, and nations that live in a state of authoritarian tyranny, or a state of poverty from which there is no way out, or a state of constant feeling of the prevalent unreasonableness, and it's not on the contrary to the truth, if we say that the most vivid expression of this tragic existence is the emergence of the Islamic fundamentalist phenomenon in all its political, violent, and social forms.

However, if I'm referring to the tragic existence of the ego, people, and its manifestations generated by frustration, this doesn't mean that there is an absolute correlation between frustration and forms of withdrawal from life, as we find souls becoming more attached to life, more effective, and courage, regardless of the forms of individual, or collective frustration that befall them, and they remain souls, hoping, and believing in the near future of their dreams. While there are people turn the historical defeat into a genuine factor of action to build the hope-for life.

The moment of tragic existence experienced by the ego may turn into a moment of creativity in its many forms.

"Abdel Nasser", who witnessed the corruption of royal power, Egypt's subordination to foreigner, and the calamity of 1948 in Palestine. "Abdel Nasser", who was besieged in Fallujah, transformed his personal, and collective frustration into a mutinous act that produced the 1952 revolution with comrades who shared this heartbreaking feeling.

"Abdel Nasser" is a tragic hero in the true sense of the word. When the tragic hero was defeated in the year 67, he returned to announce that what was taken by force can only be restored by force, and when the tragic hero died, the world he and those around him dreamed of turned into a farce - a comedy, and the dreams of people with which shared the tragic hero in his dreams were shattered. and the heroes of comedy spread, turning society into a stagnant quagmire devoid of dreamers, with the exception of a few faction of mutinous souls.

Once frustration generates a tragic existence among some, it leads them to withdraw from life, while the tragic existence pushes others, who feel frustrated to transform this existence into a creative, mutinous act. So, they continue their mutiny, such that their tragic existence becomes the field of their authentic action, or that their original action becomes the result of this tragic existence itself, so that it can be said: that most of the

great ideas, or mutinous symbols beloved by others are the fruit of tragic existence.

I swear that, others who don't live a tragic existence are nothing more than things. Man is the only thing, who doesn't experience the moment of pain generated by frustration, and the only one for whom life turns into a vulgar world.

## Nostalgia

There is no human being, who hasn't experienced nostalgia for a favorite moment, that disappeared, and became a past. Nostalgia is a bitter feeling of a living experience that is no longer present, it's the negative resistance to time, and a feeling of absolute helplessness in front of it, and a sign that the desire to restore the experience is impossible to achieve, this Hope lived by man fully consciously, yet he can't be freed from nostalgia if he wants, and none of us even think about the necessity of freedom from it, and at the time when nostalgia enters us into the world of tragedy, it enters us with a kind of joy of equal measure, and for this the state of sadness and Joy together in a moment of nostalgia.

This contradictory, and coexisting feeling that roots the experience in the memory, for not everything that the memory stores generate nostalgia, but rather the situations that provoke us with wishes to return to a beautiful moment, or we think of it as such. We preserve this moment as part of our emotional being, for a moment, it might sleep a little in our preoccupation with daily life, but it quickly wakes up at any external or internal alert, so we conjure it up, and leave it in a tragic consciousness, protesting against the time that carried it to a world that can only be restored in consciousness, that reproduces the moment, to which we are, and puts on it a beautiful world. Rather, nostalgia recreates the moment, not as it's, but as it appears in the new consciousness of it. The one who lives the living experience doesn't feel its value, and with the days this experience turns into a past world beginning with rebirth in an image that is far from its origin.

Here, he longs for childhood, each of us lived childhood a special experience, and no doubt, but nostalgia for childhood is now taking place from the site of the ego, that watches the world of childhood, and follows children's games, behavior, and innocence, so he longs for childhood in a field of childhood consciousness, which he didn't have when he was a child, hence the childhood that he yearns for is the childhood of a person who is aware of the beauty of childhood, as if his mouthpiece is saying: "Oh, if I go back

to childhood.” I’m aware of the meaning of childhood. The ego neither realize this case, nor the mixing of its nostalgia for childhood with the consciousness of the man, who stands before childhood as an external observer.

That is why the place in which the adult lived becomes a child other than the place that creates nostalgia, and the home isn’t the home, and so on, then nostalgia builds a tragic world. It’s the world of returning to childhood, of lack feeling responsible at a time when he is responsible, of play when he can’t play, of innocent quarreling, and he can’t quarrel unless he knows the consequences of his dangerous quarrel. It’s the world of the mother’s tenderness, and he misses her, the world of the father, who represents the embrace of safety, while he no longer has an apparent presence in life. Nostalgia is a new plastic drawing of the world that raises the absent moment to the level of a beautiful painting, when the ego awakens from its nostalgia, it exhales a groan in protest against time, then it enters the moment of tragic consciousness of existence, and once again the lost world haunts it for the rest of its life.

But if we go back to our example; nostalgia for childhood, we will find that it doesn’t appear in the vigor of youth, for youth violence is a world full of life, man lives in all its parts, it’s the world of love, study, loitering, and rioting “demonstration”, it’s the world of burning dreams that the ego seeks to achieve, so the ego is preoccupied with its dreams, immersed in life, and living is a rich, new experience, this ego has no time for nostalgia, its memory doesn’t go back to the past, and its beautiful world is more beautiful than his childish world.

As soon as the ego leaves its beautiful world, and begins to feel time, and then time begins to dig its paths in its psychological life, and body, until the seed of nostalgia begins to bloom to reach its full growth in old age, nostalgia for the beautiful world, or that becomes beautiful in comparison to the living world.

The ego has left the space and time filled with human experience, the integrated world, nature, the home, people, the memories that rear its head in association.

The rural poet, intellectual, the rural man in general dreams about the city world, here, he lives the spacious world of the city, village leaves him, or he leaves it in moments of searching for a place in the city, the years pass, and nostalgia brings him back to the village, or the village returns to him with its calm world, but it is the return of the existing in the city, he mentions in his poems the names of mountains, rivers, and villages, and gives the village meekness, love, goodness, sincerity... etc.

The village child returns to villager-urban, and then nostalgia for the village turns into a

dream of returning to it.

The immigrant: Nostalgia pushes him to visit, or to return permanently after he has reached an old age.\*

The refugee experience remains the deepest tragic experience generated by nostalgia; I mean by the refugee who was forcibly moved from his place, while living through time in all its richness.

So, the experience of the villager remains a voluntary, he chose the city that he became bored with time, and the immigrant couldn't migrate, but a specific value that prompted him to prefer another place to his original place. the refugee was forced to leave the place, he is now in another temporary place, He waits for the moment to return, after the conditions of his asylum are removed. So, the waiting is a permanent nostalgia; because the temporary place doesn't allow him to dream except to return.

A very blatant example of the tragedy of nostalgia is my refugee "mother". even though I didn't realize, when I was a child the extent of the tragedy, she was experiencing. I thought that she was exaggerating in nostalgia, or in drawing a picture of her presence in Jaffa, and I live the refugee experience in a different way, I'm also living an experience the temporary place, that of a rupture of human dignity, and that who lost his right, or whose right to his homeland was stolen, and for this reason my belonging to Palestine, in all its parts, remained a conscious, spiritually, practically affiliation, but I don't have the nostalgia experience that my mother lived. Every morning we would gather around the breakfast table. Jaffa, and Jerusalem attended directly. She remembers the names my grandparents, relatives, and friends, the names of Jaffa's streets, and neighborhoods. She recalls Jerusalem, the teachers' home where my mother taught, the names of the English, and Arab teachers. She remembers stories of all kinds, studies, riots "demonstrations", songs. For my mother, evening is no different from morning, Jaffa, Jerusalem, and the beautiful time, Al-Manshiya, Al-Ajami, Iskandar Awad Street, Al-Zahra School, Al-Hamra Cinema, Miss Young, Miss Lagrove, Hussam Al-Din Jarallah...etc. it's all names that we hear daily, and between every story there is a sigh of relief, and her eyes fill with tears. My mother lives for permanent waiting moment, her nostalgia is absolute, the place she stays in is temporary, and it's temporary in everything, she lives in a time other than her time, her time is there, and little by little my mother's presence became there, and not here.

My mother became a collection of memories, and the absolutely absent present. Nostalgia killed my mother, her longing for Jaffa, and Jerusalem killed her. There are no

fish in the world except in Jaffa, and there are no oranges except in Jaffa, and there are no beautiful streets except in Jaffa, and Jerusalem, there is no education except in Jaffa, and Jerusalem, and Abd al-Wahab's voice was more beautiful in the theaters of Jaffa... Nostalgia killed my mother when she was sixty years old, and months before her death, she thought that she was in Jaffa, she used to deal in shillings, tariffs, and a quarter of a pound. In the morning she would recommends that, when my grandfather, who died in Jaffa, sends us fish, we put in the kitchen, and she thinks that in the evening she will go to the sea. So, her longing had no temporary, or permanent cure, the refugee's longing has no healing except in return.

As for love, and nostalgia, there is nothing wrong with that, especially the love that a person - the man or a woman - lives in when he is young. Failure in love generates a permanent nostalgia in the lover, or for the experience of the love that has passed. How many love stories, in which nostalgia is a subject, I mean real stories, and everyone knows how to recover the experience of love through the language and talk about it. It's an experience that the lover narrates, as if he were living it once again, especially when the ego lose power during times of drunkenness, or intimate sessions.

The lover stores in his memory a world of beauty, and the small events that took place, a world of songs that remind the lover of his beloved, a world of places that witnessed this or that meeting, the place that witnessed the first embrace. Both loved ones wear beautiful, and new clothes in the memory that burns on more than one occasion, the time that has passed from the experience dates back to the present time, the longing for the lover is the constant presence of the lover, the feeling persists for days that are difficult to disappear.

On the surface, the issue seems to remember the face of the beloved, but in depth, leaving a total state, leaving the most beautiful moments of life, leaving permanent deprivation, that generated by failure in union, and communication. Creator transforms this nostalgia into a text, a poem, a novel, or emotional prose. He is somewhat liberated through this escalation of deprivation through language, but he won't free the lover from nostalgia; because it's an incurable disease that accompanies a person throughout his life, while the average man turns this longing into an oral narrative at every appropriate moment, but the feeling is the same in both cases, a feeling of tragedy renewable.

In fact, It's difficult for the ego to be completely liberated from nostalgia. when we live the experience of returning to the place of the past, or see a lover after a long life, or watching the friends of yesterday...etc. Freedom from longing, or say, his slow death

begins without his breathe ones last. The world he returned to wasn't the one he lived in; because the place, and the beloved's face have changed...everything changed in her. He is facing reality face to face, the beautiful image that memory stores vanished in front of a new, and different image, an image that evokes sorrow, and sadness, it's the ruins, the shock of the fluid time awakening him to the bitter truth, nothingness. The nostalgia thrown into an almost permanent tragic existence gives the place for another tragic existence: the feeling of the fragility of existence.

I spoke of nostalgia as an amazing, living, and alive experience, it's a memory that burns whenever facts force it to association, to remember, to recall the past with a tragic feeling, a desire to go back to the old days, but humans, or some of them live artificial nostalgia. The latter is a nostalgia for the experience of others, not for the intimate personal experience. It's the experience of a stage of human pride, or of the bright history that was cut from real history, it's simply nostalgia for a past, in which the ego didn't participate. Here, he is listening to the Friday sermon, to the stories of the ancestors who conquered the world, to the biography of the famous symbols of courage, justice and asceticism... Gradually, he develops a nostalgia for the restoration of the lost world, while he lives in a rejected world, and soon the question arises before him: Why don't we restore the past experience, and recall the world of olden glory? This artificial nostalgia, as much as it's a rejection of the lived world, is a regress back, a pathological regression, and a false consciousness of the world, history doesn't repeat itself, its events, or its symbols...The regressive ego seeks a past that it didn't make, or participate in its praise, yet you find it weighed down by impossible hope. It lies to itself without knowing... it doesn't realize that its nostalgia is artificial, and with the days it despairs, retreats, defeated and helpless, it returns to the books of the bygone, alienated from the books of the contemporaries, from the present in the immemorial past, it lives the absurd that won't find its place in reality, it lives the artificial nostalgia, that is an illusion.

## Alienated Existence

When the contradiction reaches an unstructured limitation, between ego and the world, ego is considered alienated. Since ego is consciousness, benefits, nature, and lives in the world, then any contradiction between its conscious, benefits, nature, and the world in which he lives creates in it a feeling of alienation from this world, and ability to adapt to its surroundings, either difficult, impossible, almost impossible. It's natural that, the relationship become nervous between ego and a contradict world, a tension like this resulted from that, originally ego can't live out of the world, it's compelled to be inside, not outside of it. It sees, listens, building relationships, reads news, watches event, talks to human beings, works with others, and dreams, yes, he is in the heart of the word, which is society.

Alienation can't occur except through consciousness of it, it's always been lived, however, a case can create itself consciousness of alienation, or the case of ego alienation, but doesn't create it in another ego, which isn't feeling it.

Someone says: alienation is a relationship with an objective reality, this is true, but the relationship with an objective world isn't the same. For instance, the employee who can feel his alienation isn't alienated, to be this way, he must be conscious of his alienation, exactly, as the slave who doesn't feel his slavery, it means nothing for him. Ego could have a possible consciousness of alienation, and if consciousness of the real alienation occurs from outside, its possible conscious becomes real.

That's why the more alienated people are the most conscious, that is, knowing the contradictory mentioned before.

Basically, the alienated selves are the elitist ones in relation with consciousness, without denying the naïve feeling of alienated consciousness, which in turn doesn't referring this consciousness to its reasons in reality, and ego.

When we confirm that alienation is a case of the conscious of world, we don't deny its realistic base, all we want to say is that the realistic base of alienation doesn't necessarily

generate conscious of alienation.

the alienated ego is a universal case, tragedy existence, moves by conscious of the contradiction with the word without an ability, as we said, to take out this contradiction. Only philosopher can determine an alienation of ego, which isn't feeling its alienation, as will be mentioned later. this matter requires us to differentiate between a conscious alienation, and realistic, unconscious alienation. Because alienation is what has been mentioned, it's wrong to speak about it as a universal word meaning.

For example, The religious alienation that Ludwig Feuerbach talked about, for him the man created God as his substance form, and established a dissonance between him and God, between the human nature and divine nature, then transformed what he had created into a world alien to him. A world which must be submitted to, and respected. furthermore, the man has alienated from his nature, when he transformed it into the nature of another being different from himself.

Generally, when man is alienated with relation to what he has created. This is what the religious doesn't feel, however, he isn't live the relationship with God as an alienation, only a philosopher who understands this relationship is able to be conscious of this alienation. As the religious alienation in this sense is a realistic case that isn't felt by the general public.

Oppositely, the ego that hold true conscious of the basis of religion, lives in a state of alienation; because its conscious has been alienated from the common conscious, contradictory to it, and building its relationship with others, whom aren't sharing its conscious, on the basis that they don't know the truth. Moreover, the alienation of its consciousness is alienation from the truth, so it transforms its alienation into two contradicted consciousness: true, and false consciousness.

Originally, the alienated truth is the alienation of its bearer, truth isn't existed except as consciousness that ego considers itself as a truth.

poverty for example is the most real alienation, basically, it's a case, in which the ego is unable to fulfil body's demands or needs in general, or that of people, who it's responsible of (paterfamilias for example), practically, every poor person is aspires to overcome his poverty, lives in a contradiction between his needs and their realistic fulfillment. In general, poor people may not know why they are like that, and without realizing why they are poor, live a real case of alienation, or have a false consciousness of their poverty, when they believe that their poverty is fate, caused by livelihood maker.

In this case, a poor is living two alienated styles: Realistic alienation, which is always mak-

ing him in the case of tragic existence, due to the contradiction of his needs with their obtaining's conditions, and an alienation of consciousness, because he doesn't know the true reasons of his alienation, which he brings back to another world.

Here, we are faced with the dilemma of alienation of consciousness of the ego; which we considered that it has consciousness of the truth in a world dominated by alienated false consciousness. Oppositely this, false consciousness is in turn alienated from the truth, but the difference is that true consciousness, i.e. its bearer, is reconciled to itself, and alienated from others, while the bearer of false consciousness is reconciled to others, and alienated from the truth without feeling it. Here, the importance of the philosopher revealing to people the truth of their unconscious alienation; although they live it; because the conscious of living alienation is a moment of liberation in consciousness, that leads to the practical practice of liberation from the reality produced for alienation. However, self- liberation through consciousness doesn't lead to mutiny in order liberated from realistic alienation automatically. Because self- liberation has passed alienation on the level of inner ego, and lived alienation at the

realistic level, so as to, here, it become a pattern of alienation based on the contradiction between a consciousness that transcends alienation; because it has revealed its origin, and a consciousness that doesn't feel alienation, and is in fact alienated.

Let us start from the simplest cases of alienation resulting from the contradiction between what I should be, and what I actually am.

Here, I'm employee governmental department, but I hate my job so much, even so this hate, I can't leave off work, because I have no any other choice to provide my livelihood paths, and those I support. Now, I'm aspiring to work as "x", which will bring me harmony and reconciliation between myself and the job. In situation like this, the ego live alienation from the job it does; because job simply doesn't achieve what I want, result: I'm not free. This simple but tragic incident of alienation is a case of losing freedom to be who I want to be.

I will talk to a simpler, yet complex case, I'm a political being, and I have the desire to express myself politically, by affiliating to some party which will express my viewpoint in judgement, also, I have a strong ambition to live under an authority, which is the result of social contact, doesn't practice tyranny, I'm sharing thousands of people in my case, but in fact, I can't specifies myself politically, and say, here is no political party to which I belong, and authority doesn't express my political consciousness; because it contradicts the picture and the content that I want the authority to have.

Therefore, I as a political being, that is, I have a political consciousness, I'm an alienated. When this kind of alienation prevails, it becomes mutual, so, (We) are alienated from their authority, and an authority is alienated from us, that is (We)- society. Again, the concept of freedom is present, I'm not free in the political expression, political affiliation, and political choice, Then, my consciousness of political authority becomes an authority against my freedom. Oppositely, alienated authority which is conscious its alienation, practices tyranny, my political existence is a universal tragedy existence; because, I started from being primarily political existence.

In the case of my existence as an alienated worker, I can take the chances to find a job that identical to my desire and ambition, at that time I will overcome my self-alienation, and obtaining self- reconciliation through reconciliation with work.

As for In the case of my existence as an alienated politician, I can't overcome my alienation on the individual level, but I will try to achieve some kind of psychological balance by acting a mutinously in some way. However, I keep alienated by alienation of authority from the society, and subject become more liberated when its mutinous shared by others, or it shares others.

Existence reaches its peak of alienation, when a man reaches the point of absolute contradiction with the world, an alienation like this isn't lived only by a few creative souls, who are express their alienation like through a complete isolation, such as "Abū al-'Alā' al-Ma'arrī", or through a universal- metaphysical- mutiny, as "Friedrich Nietzsche". In most cases, creative people in general live in varying states of alienation, so much so that the creative person can be defined as the alienated, whether those who prefer the complete isolation, or who face the world with utopias that express hopes for a very different world, or the revolutionaries who led the major mutiny movements. Here I'm talking about the moment, in which they expressed alienation from their subsequent fate. A man can remain mutineer until the last breath, like "Che Guevara", or end his mutiny by becoming a person authority, and those are a lot.

Our talk about alienated creative souls doesn't mean there is no speak about the alienation ordinary souls, but the difference is that the alienated creative person expresses his alienation through artistic or practical creativity, while ordinary souls express their alienation through forms self- protest, or with stifled groans, or negative pessimism. but when Consciousness of its alienation and transcendent ways comes to it, turns into an active element in history, which is well-known.

## Alienation Of Woman

I devote this paragraph about the woman; because she is a unique model of alienation that makes her existence tragic. She - that is, the woman - the tortured, and tormented ego. She is the victim of a male consciousness that is specified in values, customs, and general culture about women, a consciousness that alienates her from her humanity, and turns her into something, or into a less humanity being from the male, one doesn't need much trouble to realize the position of women in the prevailing culture, and for this reason I won't list religious, or social discourses, and even some discourses of science that affirm the superiority of man over woman, and also her conviction that she is inferior - strength and intelligence - than man.

Let's ask the simple question: What is a woman? None of the ignorance of the language think that asking the question with "what" is the use of "what" for the unreasonable, rather the question that begins with "what" refers to the essence, as if we are asking what is human, what is freedom...etc. What is woman? A question about the essence of a woman, the simple, and honest answer: a woman is a humanity being, or a human. Here, we have defined the woman by Genus "human." If we asked what is a man, we wouldn't have given a different answer: the man is a human.

Let's further specify define the woman: the woman is a human with a feminine organ, while the man has a masculine organ. The difference here between the man and the woman is a difference in the function of the genital system, while they agree in the main characteristic: humanity. So, in terms of humanity nature, woman and man are one being: a human.

But if we define woman in their specific reality, we would say: Woman is a human being alienated from its humanity, what is the meaning of this? The human being is an existence specify by work, culture, creativity, and freedom. Each ego shares these qualities with other egos... When the ego loses the right or the ability to practice work, thought, creativity, and freedom, it's necessarily alienated.

Rather, we are talking about the ego's qualities as effective qualities, a human activity, and consciousness, therefore it's the ego that determines its attributes in conditions not all of which were chosen.

Here, the biological is cast aside as attributes that have nothing to do with it. The woman is alienated as she turns into a biological being only, or becomes in her consciousness, and that of the man in a pure body, so she loses her humanity as an active, agent, and free being.

The body isn't an alienation of the ego except when it's isolated from the humanity thing. This is because The demands of the body aren't only biological, human and cultural.

Ego is the unity of the body as an activity, and the distinction between body and spirit is nothing but an arbitrary, and artificial process. The ego is one unified entirety, so, the woman by her transformation into a body that is an object of pleasure, she becomes alienated, and separated from her human entirety, she has become a subjective object, that of man's instinctive gratification.

Likewise, the woman's body isn't only alienated by its separation from its human whole, but rather it is alienated when the body is turns into a part of the body, into an incomplete body. Thus, the woman became alienated through her transformation into a body, then into an incomplete body, and then into a property.

When we make the body lose its entirety, we say that it is incomplete; as its senses, reactions, our consciousness of it, its pleasures, and our fear of it. Here, the female body has been reduced in the consciousness of man in general to a multi-faceted consumption tool.

Consumption to satisfy the instinct in its pure nature, where the woman is an imperfect body: flesh, buttocks, a charming look, and a feminine organ. Rather, say that in her entirety she turns into a feminine organ.

The body, having become a feminine organ, and an external object of masculine instinctive satisfaction, has also become external, not only to the man, but also in the consciousness of the woman. This is the most dangerous aspect of the alienation of the woman's body, it's alienated from its ego.

Because the woman, with her distorted consciousness of herself - as an imperfect body-as an object, transformed in her self-consciousness into this image, and became a thing through the property, the legal property of the man.

When the body was separated from its totality, from whole ego, the consciousness of

both man and woman has been transformed into pudendum, and sedition.

The pudendum is defined as the shame, and defect in something, when a woman is seen as the pudendum, she is seen as an absolute defect and shame. A man's private parts - in the general consciousness - are only his reproductive system, while a woman in this consciousness - that is, in general - is a complete pudendum. People may differ regarding the limits of pudendum, excluding the face, or the hands, but this doesn't prevent many from looking at the whole woman as pudendum, why is she pudendum? Because she is nothing but the body that provokes lust, everything in her awakens the sexual instinct, she is an influence that calls for a response on the part of the man, and because she is in this way, her body must be besieged, either in full and permanent residence in the house, and not appearing, or house arrest in the dress that hides her body from her head to toe. This distorted consciousness alienates the woman by force first, then with the days she herself looks at her body as the pudendum, and behaves with the man through her distorted consciousness. The concept of pudendum doesn't differ in terms of results and content from the concept of sedition, which is a disturbance and confusion in thoughts. It's a sedition that means it causes turmoil in man, therefore she shouldn't seduce the man also by covering any feature of the body, such as the eyes, with which she sees the world, her hands and all parts of the body. As a sedition, she should be imprisoned and besieged, just as she is the pudendum.

Here, I'm not talking about a mere partial incident in this or that society, but about a general ideological phenomenon in Islamic societies in general, considering the varying presence of this ideology in this or that country.

Such isolation of the woman makes her lose the human relationship with the man, and she won't know him in this situation, as she only looks at him as a monster that wants to devour her, she is waiting for this predation through the institution of marriage that has nothing to do with making it.

If the concept of sedition in Islamic societies besieges woman and imprisons her in the home and dress, then the same concept is present in western societies, when the woman's apparent body turns into a means to seduce man, she is at the forefront of advertisements, newspapers and sexual films, and even the dress itself has been made by western capitalist society to show a woman's body as a sedition. I swear that, there is no difference in principle between the ideology of sedition and the pudendum that besieges woman and the ideology of sedition that unclothes her. Both ideologies turn woman into goods, sometimes through concealment, and once through showing, and in

both ideologies, woman alienated from her universal humanity.

In the East or the West, the phenomenon of prostitution is widespread, which leads woman to the highest levels of alienation from her body. In prostitution, a woman rents her body to a man who pays her for preying on her. She doesn't practice sex as a human-cultural process that is the fruit of love, but rather sells her body, which is already lacking the inclination towards this pleasure. She doesn't listen to the call of the body seeking sexual satisfaction, the call that transforms the mutual sexual process between two free wills to a ritual full of love, life, and ecstasy.

She has sex, while already lacking sexual desire, as well as, the man doesn't deal with the prostitute as a human being and a woman with emotions, feelings, desire and inclination towards pleasure, but as a subject only, as soon as he dissolved his marriage with her, his contempt for her increases. Yes, for the man predatory of the prostitute, despise her, and treat her as something devoid of any human aspect. She is, from his perspective, an imperfect body reduced to the reproductive system that frees him from his sexual repression in exchange for a sum of money. The prostitute is well aware of this relationship, knows herself as a commodity, and aware her image in the eyes of man, so she lives in a tragic alienation, and her existence is tragic to the extent that it puts an end to her natural dreams. She dreams of being a mother, but her dream is shattered by the predation of a strange man. Her tragic existence becomes more and more tragic when she is old, and finds no men who try to prey. That is, she has ceased to be an alienated body that satisfies the male. In fact, the most beautiful person who summarized this tragic, alienated existence of the prostitute woman is the poet "Badr Shakir al-Sayyab", so let the reader return to his poem "The Blind Prostitute." No one believes that prostitution is an alienated work, for a woman doesn't rent out her body as the worker rents his labor force. The worker is alienated from his work, when the product of his work is separated from him, and he only gain his labor force, but his labor, the commodity, is transformed into a material effect, and a production necessary for the continuation of life. While prostitution is the alienation of the body from human, and has no productive effect on life. As well as, alienated work is ultimately inviting its owner to be proud. It's a muscular effort, so as to a person to live in dignity; therefore, society doesn't look at work in terms of its alienation first, but rather of its moral value, and that is why it looks in part at the one who can work and not work, while looking at the prostitute woman as a totally immoral being. In prostitution, a woman loses every form of her freedom and human value, loses every sense of dignity; because she doesn't live her alienation from her

body, but from the society that rejects her, especially in non-European countries. The strangest thing is that many countries legitimize this cruelty, and open licensed brothels called “public shop”, where an army of prostitutes who compete to hunt customers, This creates a feeling that they are practicing a profession approved by law. In some countries, the law prosecutes a prostitute as guilty, but without creating any conditions to provide the humane circumstances for her life. In any case, this manner of combating prostitution wasn’t effective in eradicating it.

One of the glaring manifestations of the woman’s physical alienation is its transformation in all parts of the world into a means of advertisement for the commodity, or a means to serving the capitalist in order to create incentives for the consumer to purchase the goods, that is often unrelated to women’s goods. Where women often assume a sexual position, she drinks Coca-Cola half-naked, devours ice cream in a way that reminds the male of a sexual ritual, and shakes the waist with joy at having this or that commodity... Chewing gum, washing powder, tissues, the car...etc. In a way that always reminds the consumer of its association with the beautiful, swaying, and naked body. Thus, we are in front of a commodity in the service of another. The song that is text, music and sound no longer have a place in the sense of the listener in isolation from bodies practicing nudity, and the organized movements that stimulate sexual impulse in what is called today “video clip”, the singer herself presents her body in multiple situations, So the viewer forgets the sound, the word, the music, and is stuck in front of the sexy body.

She forgets to belongs to art, but to the world of sedition that she practices with an alienated consciousness of her body, a consciousness indicates the degeneration of the human ego in it, and the reduction of the ego to only an external image.

This is the case of fashion models, with only a quantitative difference, and the farce ritual related to the so-called selection of Miss World, this great lie that they have introduced into the consciousness of others, a woman among almost two billion women in the world, who is set up by a committee as the most beautiful woman in the universe. Oh, How ridiculous is that! this woman believes the stand out lie, she is nothing but a mathematically proportional body, and the examination of culture or information shows her as completely illiterate. The poor body is subjected to the test, swaying before the committees, revealing its parts like a dead body, in which every organ receives a mark. What a degeneration of the concept of beauty in the human sense of the word.

One of the familiar phenomena of the alienation of the body is the phenomenon of buying the body through marriage. Here, I’m talking about marriage as a way for the

rich to buy the body, the ability of the rich to barter money for the body. The body is a commodity exposed to the riches, were, one of them chooses the body for consumption, and once the goods are consumed, and the buyer dissolved his marriage with her, he throws her in the trash.

In this case, marriage is no longer a co-relationship, and a social ritual that brings together two human beings, the fruit of a free, and mutual choice, or the result of love that brings harmony between two bright hearts, but rather a relationship between a buyer and a seller, the buyer is known, but the seller is the father, mother, brother, or the woman herself, the seller sells In the body. That is money - the idol I talked about, and that turned into an idol created this alienation between the ego and the body.

Seller sells a body regardless of the characteristics of the buyer, and his barbaric and despicable tendencies. There is nothing wrong with the buyer being old, married, disabled, or a stranger about whom nothing is known. All of this doesn't matter if he can pay. As for the goods, it's mostly the weak body of an ego full of dreams, and romance. All these dreams are shattered in the face of money. Even, some women seek the buyer for money, and as soon as the dream of money is fulfilled, the alienated body jumps screaming, searching for human pleasure with dream man. In the end, neither palaces, the latest fashion trends, nor gold bracelets prevent a woman from to seek the realization of the unity of her ego, that is, the unity of the body that seeks love, because every relationship between a man and a woman outside the relationship of love is a real alienation, a false relationship, a representation of the original relationship. In this, have we answered a way leading to transcend the alienation of the body?

## Alienation Of Refugee

He was forced to leave his homeland, ejected and alienated from it forcibly. He is a refugee, lives in a homeland other than his one. His ego fled fearing of death, or something similar. It's an alienation, that he has never asked or sought to. He is a refugee with a partial trait, that becomes his special essence, distinguishes him. This trait will accompany him until he returns from his forced alienation, or dies before achieving that and he will inherit this trait to his offspring if they remain refugees.

Refugee means that he is distinct by a trait that he doesn't share with people of a refugee homeland. Everyone is differentiated by a name, a surname, and a shape. The name is my ego consciousness that this is me, and I'm distinct from others by my external shape—the shape, and the color of my face, and the color of my eyes, everyone is distinct by his shape, but the refugee alone is distinguished by an extra trait, it's an emergent trait, the other calls him “oh refugee”, he immediately realizes that he's cursed, that he is a foreigner. He is abused by public with a trait that he doesn't interfere in, and he has no mark of it on his body, or on his general manner, and it doesn't refer to a trivial psychological trait. The caller “oh refugee” may not mean abuse, but it isn't said to a blind man “oh blind man”. Any way, he doesn't want to be a refugee, to have this extra trait, and to be distinct by the refugee. He wants to get free from the tragic feeling of the homesick through returning back to his homeland.

A refugee isn't who has no a homeland, he belongs to a homeland over there, but he left it forcibly, as we said, even it seems that he preferred the refuge by his consciousness to be secured, he isn't an immigrant; because the immigration presents a free choice, it implies a desire to live in another homeland seeking for more happiness, fleeing from poverty, or he found the life in the other homeland, came to temporarily for a purpose, is better than returning back to his native one, or the new homeland became more inclusive than his original one. But the refugee was in front of two choices: either an imprisonment, torture, death in his homeland, or escaping from all of that.

A political refugee: a person who is threatened by punishment ranges from imprisonment to killing under the name of law, and ending with assassination, he has no place in his homeland to live free or to save his life.

A refugee running out the war: a person who fled from the death, to survive from a shell, a mortal enemy, or a rape of women of his family...etc. He is a refugee hoping to return back after his refuge conditions are no longer existing.

Let's contemplate the identity card of a refugee, or what is called a personal identity card.

At the top of the card: refugees' temporary residence card ticket, name, surname, date of birth, and country of origin.

A temporary residence card for a temporary residence, so the residence card is temporary and the residence of a refugee here is temporary. This means that he -the refugee- lives in a place other than his native one, it's a temporary place, the refugee has two places: a permanent place, in which he doesn't live, and a temporary place, in which he resides. A place where he was born in, but lived abroad it, and he is alienated from the place only. The temporary place is an objective existence: it's the city, the village, or the neighborhood, it's a fixed place that doesn't budge, but it's still a temporary place for the refugee, or let's say the refugee is temporary existence in a fixed place. What is this? The house he lives in, the neighborhood, the school, the university, the people, the voice of the muezzin, the seller, the neighbor, and the friend... all of these things, all the people who surround the refugee... all of these are temporary.

As soon as the refugee realizes that he is in a temporary place, an intimate relationship with the place, in which he lives will be shaken, he resides psychologically in his place of origin, a place where he doesn't live in, it's far away. His ego fissions into two parts, lives in two places: both are real, exist, but the first one is a place that involves all daily relationships, and the other is a place in the memory, the consciousness, and the dream. His ego is here and there together. The temporary tent that an institution gave to the refugee keeps him in a temporary waiting moment, waiting for no long time, the tent is a transient moment, when the refuge is transient, the homeland isn't occupied by strangers, while the house awaits the return of departing people, but when strangers occupy your house, and refuse your return, and you live in a house with four walls like all the houses on the Earth, in this case, the refuge has no limited time, the waiting here mixes with despair at one time and hope at another time, the tent keeps a hope, while the house kills the hope, but the strength of the hope prevents you from acknowledging the

reality, and that is why the refugee retains the place there in his behavior, consciousness, feeling and memory, it's the original home.

When you look at the temporary residence ticket, you read the country of origin, so the refugee then is in the non-original, unreal, and a pseudo place. It's pseudo; because you don't hold its nationality, you don't have the rights of its citizens, special laws apply to you, and specific institutions take care of you. It's a very tragic waiting experience, your existence as a refugee is tragic, the place is transient, there is a moment of waiting, it isn't known when this waiting will end, and what the time of moving to the place of origin which lives in the refugee heart. In the temporary residence ticket, the place of residence no longer has any meaning. The refugee can't fill out a form contains the item (place of permanent residence); because the permanent residence is in the place over there. the temporary place causes to the temporary time, as you can't be in a temporary place, and a permanent time, and just as the refugee fissions into two existences in the same place: the psychological residence in the permanent place over there, and the real residence in the temporary place here, his time is also divided into two times: A time lived in the unreal future, and a time lived in the present. The present time is an alienated moment from the future, but the real presence of time is in the future and not in the temporary present time. The real time is in the past and the future, the past time, when he was in the permanent place, is the one who determines the refugee's relationship with time, making it the time of the future.

Everyone lives the successive moments of time, the past, the present, and the future, but the refugee alone removes the present time from the circle of his consciousness of the real time, where the original time is like the original place, it exists there. the relationship with the really lived time is a relationship with a very transient time, so he ends his relationship with the transient time in a way makes this time doesn't have any value or importance, as the ego tends towards what is permanent, and for this reason, the temporary lived time for the refugee is a stage that isn't counted from his time; because everything that surrounds him is temporary, and this temporary relationship with time shows two things:

The first is the feeling of freedom towards things, and institutions. The second is the depth of hope in the soul. Material things - money and the house - have no value, and the state doesn't represent him. This is what gives the refugee the courage to exist, and hope makes him always tight to the future.

This is what distinguishes a refugee from an immigrant to another country, while prepar-

ing to return to his homeland. The immigrant, who travels in order to collect money in a strange country also lives for a moment of temporary time, but it's a time that pushes him to stinginess and cowardice. He collects money for the future, and the fear of his existence in a foreign country pushes him to behave in a manner that satisfies the society and the state. He is in a stage that he knows in advance that it establishes his permanent existence in a country that he is free to return to whenever he wants, or when he finishes collecting the money necessary for his existence in the original country. Hence, we understand the difference in the behavior of the intentionally immigrant in the foreign country, and his behavior in the country of origin. In the temporary diaspora, his ego appears submissive, peaceful, satisfied, and accepting of any work that he may not do in his original homeland, and when he returns, his original ego which has been alienated in the diaspora for money returns to him.

While the refugee is necessarily mutineer, and his mutiny reaches the highest level, when he decides to return by force to his homeland, he becomes revolutionist to overcome his alienation.

## Humorous Existence

I put the humorous against the tragic, and I make the humorous existence contradictory to tragic existence, but I don't consider everything that is humorous to be contradicted of everything that is tragic. Here, the issue isn't the opposite, as if we say, for example: if alienated existence is a form of tragic existence, then humorous existence isn't unalienated existence, or if alienation of the body is tragic existence, then liberation of the body isn't a humorous existence, and so on... The humorous is contrary as a state of existence devoid of meaning, or the ego being folded into almost absolute inactivity, such that existence is captured by a superficial existence within an ego devoid of agency, and consciousness, and human existence, as well as, the humorous doesn't necessarily cause laughter, but rather it causes sadness over the triviality of human existence. In a previous chapter, I had spoken about the opportunist, for example, or about the worshipers of idols, especially the idol of money...and these are the two types of humorous existence that are most prevalent, and obvious.

The ego that doesn't ask about its existence, or search for its role in the world, and pupate, - unconsciously - in its vulgar daily existence, and is subject to its selfishness, is a humorous existence, or say that the general existence of the ego is a pattern of humorous existence, or that The absence of dignity, which is a sense of the value of the ego, is a humorous existence, so, it can be said that the most important characteristic of a humorous existence is spiritual poverty, and indulging in the vulgar from things, and its devoid of tendency towards freedom, and thus the humorous ego is isolated, despite living in co-relationships.

## An Isolated Ego

The isolated ego is considered a humorous existence, when isolation isn't a conscious choice, but when the ego is unconsciously submissive to purely individual concerns.

Isolation as a conscious choice is a philosophical-moral attitude towards the life, often associated with meditation, and expresses protest against the lived world.

while the isolated ego: lives relations between people, but lacks positive participation in human existence, and in order to avoid a misunderstanding that may lead the reader to consider the human being devoid of culture as a voluntary achievement, is concerned with isolation, we say, the worker that belongs to a political party or a union, and makes his existence an effective, for goals that exceed his reconciliation of selfishness, isn't an isolated existence, but an active, and cultural that moves him from his self- pupated to the spread of his ego through the fruits of his activity, and struggle.

Whereas, the intellectual who employs his culture for his own individual selfish interests, and doesn't turn his culture into an effective, activity element for the sake of others, is an isolated Cultured.

The worker in our previous example necessarily experiences states of anxiety, suffering, great worries, a sense of responsibility, sacrifice...while the Cultured in our previous case lives absolute isolation from others. We call such an Cultured in his self-isolation: ((Bat Cultured)).

### 1. Bat Cultured

Bat Cultured - as a pupates in his selfishness. He builds a false relationship, first with truth, and second with freedom; He turns his culture into a servant of his selfishness; because he is an employee of his ego, and become the greatest advocate of darkness, a lover of Nighted, and no one is surprised by Bat Cultured's adoration of Nighted, It's the only climate, in which he flies very well, so you see him as the enemy of light, knowledge, right, truth, and man.

This blind mouse, which has become addicted to living in the darkness, fears light and

freedom. so that, they are the first target to be shot at, or the first prey he sinks his teeth into is freedom. He is the absolute enemy of free will and the crude and open defender of tyranny; because he can't survive, and living except in a world of tyranny, stagnant society, and political corruption, even that he trembles, if heard the call of freedom getting louder, but if the persecuted shout: freedom...freedom, we will find him explaining to them the necessity, and reasonableness of tyranny and coercion. If a free thinker draws a picture of the human dream of salvation, he gets up as defend the stagnant reality, presenting himself realistically in the face of the dreamers.

Bat Cultured - prisoner of darkness - isn't ego, but he is an insatiable animal instinct, and an instinct that seeks a vulgar life, so that, he is hostile to every "ego", that has risen to the level of total worry, he transcends himself toward the sun, and far away from cheap vulgarity. he is created from water of the hate that has musty-smelling, hates knowledge, and science, so why not, if both are light?

Bat Cultured is a trivial soul, who praises destruction, and the saboteurs. He is hostile to the language of truth, and the more he praises destruction, the more zero he becomes. Whenever he extends his tongue to praise falsehood, flies stick to his tongue, and you don't know what words or flies come out of his mouth. If Bat Cultured is a master of false praise, the same applies to insults. He is a coward, afraid of frank criticism of mutinous souls; because he is afraid of changing the world. He is immersed in mud, falsehood, verdure growing in manure, and seeks to spread all of this.

Bat Cultured is the enemy of the truth par excellence, that is why commitment to the homeland, his concerns, struggle, and rejection fall on his mind like stones of clay on his head, so why not, his interests are shorter than a mouse's fur.

Bat Cultured is secluded himself, into his vulgar instincts, devoid of heart, infused with hatred for love. Once he hears a beautiful promise of future life, he threatens the promise, and his creator. This slave, who enjoys his slavery, brandishes his knife of submission, thinking that he is terrorizing those who yearn for freedom. He doesn't know that it's an illusion crumbling from any brilliant light that radiates from a creative pen, a poet's poem, philosopher's idea, and an artist's painting.

The more he realizes as pure instinct his trivial status in people's souls, become more hatred, lies, and vulgarity. Yes, he is lying because he is essentially the enemy of the other. Having lost his heart, mind, and conscience, became one of the things. Something of his nature is treachery, betrayal, deception, and snitches; he opposes the courage of the

creative ego with shameless cowardice, and the fire of the Mutineer burning with water and mud. This man who runs after need hates the home country, and Cultured of home country, he is a pen for rent. He is mercenary, who shouts all around who pays more, he screams and will find someone to pay, but he is defenseless from the weapons that keep him within the circle of loving and social relationships; because he is nothing but a humorous existence, deserving of pity, and a sarcastic smile.

The existence of Bat Cultured isn't the only form of the isolated humorous Cultured, rather, there is another type, let's call him the aggressor.

## 2. Aggressor Cultured

He is Cultured defeated from inside; because of his average intelligence, that doesn't allow him to gain prestige on the one hand, and seeks it by attacking the creator through false criticism.

Basically, criticism is knowledge or effort seeks to provide knowledge, this is the case of criticism of reality, in the hope of a better reality, criticism of knowledge in order to test prior knowledge, in the hope of higher knowledge, and criticism of behavior to herald higher behavior, and criticism of ethics in defence of higher morals...and so on.

There is no uncritical phenomenon, and the thinker who sees himself outside criticism is necessarily a tyrannical thinker, and captive in a pathological state. As the practice of criticism is a manifestation of the presence of freedom; because criticism revealed the richness of the text, and the exercise of the right to difference based on a new view of the world, or starting with the method, whose owner believes that it's the safest way to reach the truth.

We still read with pleasure Abū Ḥāmid Al-Ghazali's critique of philosophers, and his "the *Tahāfut al-Falāsifa*" ("Incoherence of the Philosophers"), because it was a critique that started from the defense of religious demarcations against the rationality of philosophy, and Al-Ghazali's critique of philosophy and philosophers is still a pain for a large audience of Islamic theologians.

No less pleasant and important is Ibn Rushd's critique of al-Ghazali in his "The Incoherence of Incoherence", as it's a defense of philosophy against its theological enemies such as Abū Ḥāmid Al-Ghazali.

In both cases, we are facing a criticism that is a defense of a position. Al-Ghazali's criticism of the philosophers is a demonstration of ((the incoherence of the philosophers)) in defense of religion, and Ibn Rushd's criticism of Al-Ghazali in defense of philosophy, and a demonstration of ((the incoherence of theology)).

Marx's book "German Ideology" is still a reference for all forms of criticism based on a new view of the relationship of thought to reality, and for anyone who wanted to reveal the way of the ideologues whom Marx criticized in that they turn everything upside down.

In all previous cases, criticism was an enrichment of human knowledge, but the criticism practiced by the aggressor Cultured with average intelligence is an attack on creative statures, a desire that such a climb on flowering trees will allow him to find, as I said, a status, or prestige in the other.

He is Cultured, who reviles without we are knowing why, and he is writing in an isolated newspaper with a name that you can hardly see even if you use a microscope.

We have to understand the joy that average minds feel when they see their names at the tail of what they write, revilement others. This assault, or humorous pen is a manifestation of pathological fission, the aggressor critic has a sense of not belonging to the public, who have anything to do writing, but at the same time he realizes that he can't reach to the level of the creative private, they - those humorous people - live an unauthentic anxiety, and they fancy that they are overcoming such anxiety through assault, or aggressive criticism not only on the text of the creator, but also on the creator personally, and they drown in ((the world of nonsense)), and their aggression must be understood as an individual protest against their situation, and their ego, so that they remain on their own doorstep not exceeding their hatred not against others, but against themselves.

I wouldn't have begun to present this kind of humorous existence except because I believe that many ignore the effect of self-deception that extends to deceive the other.

#### Morals Of Instinct

We consider that the most dangerous types of humorous existence are instinctive morals. We mean with instinctive morals the behavior by order of instincts that establish a divorce between the ego and the other.

I don't mean the natural biological instincts of the body, which are common to all human beings and animals, but that aspect of man that turns into a driving force for behavior that doesn't exceed individual needs, or the needs that have become instinctive motive, the ego in such a situation turns into needs only, it's Confused in a cage or a limited world of the pleasure created by satisfying the needs.

The aspect that I described as the driving force of behavior is the same as the individual need that doesn't exceed the ego in its banal existence, where the true, and correct relationship exists between the ego and things only, even if the ego to show its prestige,

doesn't show it except through the things it possesses, and thus the existence of the ego turns into an endless process to obtain things, and the ego takes the character of the tool, where the instinctive ethics turns into the poor ego to the highest level of human poverty.

These morals of instinct are present either in the tendency towards enrichment or in the stage of access to enrichment, or in the permanent activity of increasing enrichment, so that it can be said that the instinctive ethics are the distinctive morals of the wealthy class or the categories that are removed towards the wealth, and the auditor in the behavior of the wealthy class will find that it's a confined behavior in achieving pleasure in the world of vulgar things in daily life without any sublime value element.

As sexual insatiable outside love, reluctance to politics for fear of the effects of political behavior, fun of food out of the desire for the food, poverty of culture, and concentration on surface from hearing, and sight, the absence of the concept of home country in a complete, formal appearance, the shape of the house, furniture, dress, car...etc, desiring a prestige, fear of God for fear of wealth, and late repentance for forgiveness.

The common people know the behavior of those who call them the new grace, those who have moved suddenly-in exceptional economic, and social conditions-from the world of poverty to the world of wealth, through trade, theft, looting, or the exploitation of the law ... etc. They are the ideal model of the humorous moving existence with the morals of instinct, they are looking for everything that will forget their past, and to people forget their previous situation, and this is a phenomenon that has grown in all countries in the third world in the stage of the so - called openness, and the character of the dustman in the movie (Pay attention, gentlemen). The optimum image of this style, dustman that have been transformed through rubbish, and waste trafficking to rich, he kidnaps the prestige of the university professor, sprinkles the money on the dancer, and all the Nightclub knows him, that he free from any conscience, doesn't hesitate to commit any deficiency...he is tortured by his past, so every present is used to erase the past, starting from moving from the popular neighborhood to the wealthy neighborhood, and ending with changing the wife through unreasonable extravagance.

An entire society may reach the humorous existence characterized by instinctive morals, with the exception of some cultural elites, such as writers, poets, artists, philosophers, and mystics...these are transitional cases that may be shortened according to the new victory period.

Western society is in the stage of transition to capitalism, or the American society, from

whose nature was the morality of killing, and searching for wealth, which still lives-mostly-the stage of instinctive morals, and society in the Arabian Peninsula where the stage of transition from Bedouin to Civil Civilization is still present after the emergence of oil, In other words: Societies that are transmitted from a world of valuable, historically rooted in a new world of values, in which instinctive morals prevail, and the verse that breaks a socio-economic assortment that means the world of its values is destroyed, and the new collection will take a long time to draw a new valuable world.

The closest example to what we said is what happened in the Soviet Union after the Gorbochovik Perestroika, and the dissolution of the Soviet Union, Where the most powerful mafia gangs, and Crime appeared in a short time, as corruption, and looting, prostitution spread, and prostitutes were exported to the world, simply put, the defeat of socialism, and the values that prevailed for seven decades has cleared the place for the morals of instinct to turn society into hell.

If we talk about the individual ego, the distinctions in life between individuals are great in this regard.

I talked about the informer as trivial (ego), which morals of instinct leads him to harm the other. The traitor is another example that clearly indicates this type of humorous existence, he is the one who helps the enemy to harm in all forms the home country. Nothing leads the individual to treason except to satisfy his needs, and his desire for wealth that is interconnected with his instinctive morals. Rather, his low moral structure is the basis that explains his treacherous behavior.

Instinctive morals often appear in war, where killing, looting, theft, and rape are patterns of behavior associated with wars in general, and the evidence for this is more than can be counted, so there is no need to overburden the text with them.

We conclude by saying: that humorous existence is a humorous culture that may be the culture of a nation, a group, a class, or an individual. There is no difference here between the culture of the rabble, or what is called in science the proletariat, and the culture of the rich, Both of them remain attached to their instinctive morals, and the same applies to the behavior of tyrants or invaders.

## Ego In A world Without playing

The question of the ego without playing brings us to the consciousness of the current civiltion.

Technical, and electronic civilization throws us into the hell of practical life, and the principle of benefit has become the only principle that guides humans.

Our life is a relentless pursuit of fulfilling needs that have been invented. What little goals move us, our day passes without a feeling of pleasure, we return exhausted to take refuge in a house like an iron cage, that one among the dozens of cages contained in a huge building, even the greeting among its inhabitants is dead.

The intimate house is like a factory, everything in it runs on electric power, in the living room there is television, video, satellite, and telephone, even the curtains run on electricity, and finally the computer came...

In the narrow corridor: an automatic washing machine, and you pass it to the kitchen: a gas appliance, an electric oven, an automatic dishwasher, a broasted appliance, a refrigerator, machines... The whole house has machines...here you are inside an area that doesn't exceed seventy square meters or a little more... each what is in it works automatically, so you don't know whether you are in a house, in a workshop, or factory!

Here, I'm lying in this world full of robotic monsters. The smoke rises like a winter clouds, in the morning, I go out at a specific hour, the bus comes at a specific hour, work in the workplace at a specific hour, leaving at a specific hour. Time is controlling you. The "remote" controls the device that occupies your home.

Here, I have been laid in this world full of robotic monsters, without the joy of playing. Only the animals that I no longer see except on TV, enjoy the pleasure of playing freely. I'm fixed in my place in front of the view of lions, that having fun and playing, pretending to quarrel, biting, running, and I see it smiling.

Thus, lions play by swooping on its prey with its sharp canines, tear it, and the blood dripping from its mouths. and I'm either sitting on a chair behind the table, on a chair in a car, bus, or lying on a sofa.

The river we used to visit on holiday has dried, and all I have left is café, in which to whisper with a few afraid to speak. Children in cities that inspire fear are prisoners of a playroom, reserved for those who pay to play. Pay your child to play, to swim, and to enter Disney World.

Originally, children who are fond of play, playing with water, fire and dirt, children who have no purpose in life - a period of it - except for play are deprived of it.

My child grew up amid the tyranny of the city, school, and street. As people are sitting in front of TV, or rushing to a stadium to watch a match - for example, a game of football. The game of football is an organized institution, playing according to its rules determined by experts. The game that we don't play, but we watch it, a game has become an ideological par excellence. Here we are partying for the national team, or the city team, a game for winning and losing that gives in the soul a feeling of victory or defeat.

All sports have become a specialty, this one specializes in discus throwing, the second in running, the third in ping-pong, the fourth in tennis, the fifth in jumping, and the sixth in...etc.

A specialist in sport has become like a specialist in medicine, engineering, or any other specialty.

Sport has become a specialty; and is no longer a game.

Playing, or sport is no longer an expression of freedom. It has become a goal for a medal that studs the chest of the players, who represent their home countries.

Consider with me the Olympic Games, after the Olympic Games in the ancient Greek era.

The games were taking place in Olympia, which dates back to the eighth century BC (the first list of winners was announced in 776 BC). These games were a national holiday, and an endowment for the free people. A sacred truce is declared at the time of these games, the expenses were on the participants. All games are held, and the winners are crowned with laurel and olive wreaths. Then these matches end with a general table, to which all participants are invited. These games were a semi-religious ritual, and the athletes were mere amateurs.

In 1980 the Olympics were held in Moscow, Soviet Union. At the last moment, America and most European countries announced that they wouldn't participate in this Olympics for political reasons. Even sport became political. Countries prepare their professional players. The already advanced and politically powerful countries win gold, silver, and bronze medals.

A number of players are suspended from play for taking steroids.

Pretty, soft women are transformed into muscular beings, she is champion in jumping, that in discus, and another in javelin.

The important thing: the state equips the athlete, while all forms of sport are missing in society as games that the people don't play. Once again, sport is a specialty, so it isn't free play.

The specialized athlete transformed from a human being with athletic talent originally into a goods, yes, he is.

You read in the news: that the "x" club has bought the skilled player so-and-so for a sum of one million dollars.

The club bought a player of a different nationality, from another nation. He is playing in the new club to bring him victory in the next match with the "x" team. Buying player. The commodity is a player without emotions, he is a good machine, and when this commodity fails to achieve what the club aspires to, it breaks the contract with him.

One of the most laughable things is this European coach who leads an Arab team to receive a reward for his victory.

Again, if European coach's team lost, that coach is dismissed as responsible for the loss. Who is playing these days? It seems to me that only creative people are among the human beings who still play.

The artist-painter, sculptor, takes a stand on the world by playing with color, stone, wood, and paper.

Art is the play of the artist; it's the experience of liberation from the world of things, the violence and hardship of civilization.

In fact, that art is a profound experience as old as man. From the first caveman who drew monsters and hunting experiments on the cave walls, to Picasso.

What does the artist aim for? It's free play. As freedom isn't required by the artist except by playing.

Whether the artist reproaches his unconsciousness, his patriotism, the beauty of nature, or any formation, he is originally playing game.

This means that the function of art in dispute isn't related to the origin of art, it is a later stage of artistic creativity.

We mustn't forget that the painting or sculpture is the creation of a particular individual, and if the era allows us to highlight features of painting at one stage, it's the artist who imposed such a classification on us first, through his attitude towards the world aesthetically.

It's natural for the artist in the Middle Ages to be preoccupied with drawing Jesus Christ while he is in his mother's lap, when he is on the cross, or while he is lying...It's natural that culture controls the artist's imagination, but the artist remains the unique, the person who plays with color, stone and paper, as well as poetry play with language. He paints in language what the artist paints with his brush and color. He plays with words, and presents us with a new formation of images and shapes. He remains in the field of creating the beautiful, whatever the ideas behind him. The poetic image is the one that shakes the conscience, and its effect increases if it's a dreamer of an idea close to the mind of the recipient.

This game played by the poet created many souls with pleasure, that was passed down from generation to another.

The poet, this player is slowly losing his Prestige in our spiritual world.

Some clerks turn it into a ridiculous game by using vulgar and metered slang words, introducing it to a hurried musician and a meow-like voice. Music isn't in a better condition than poetry, so that I can hardly doubt its existence. Playing with melodies and strings has become a cacophony that the ear can't bear.

Our world now lives without playing, except for playing with fire that kills souls.

A world without playing is a world full of violence. This is what many of us don't realize, a world without playing is a humorous world.



## Chapter Five: Awareness of Consciousness



Ego's travel on the pathway of consciousness is its road to consciousness of the world. So, the road of the ego to consciousness of the world is long and painful; because the road of consciousness is the same as that of the permanent outflow of truth. Yes, as soon as you grasp a truth, it escapes from our hands. Even since we started to think while standing close to the truth that like a clever and malicious bird, it lands close to us, and as soon as we prepare to catch it, it flees in front of us to land in another place, and so on to infinity.

However, the majority of human beings are tempted by rest and naps in light of a truth, about which they are reassured, freeing them from the tension of constant adventure, what is more, they erect solid walls from it; for hide inside it, defend it against anyone who tries to disturb their peaceful state of affairs.

In fact, that most human beings inherit consciousness as well as their physical characteristics, and the absolute majority of humans are recipients of consciousness, not creators of it, so that you can see that the differences between them are almost negligible, as between the age of the Pharaohs, or the Assyrians, and our current era; I mean the differences in terms of consciousness; namely, Consciousness of the world and the universe. Therefore, the ego finds itself in front of a formed consciousness that is taught to it by the family, school, and society...etc. Few of them escape the captivity of this consciousness, i.e.

Scientists, Philosophers, Thinkers, Poets and artists. But their ability to spread their consciousness isn't measured by the ability of the family, the institution, priesthood, and the consciousness that is formed in general. Compared to those who believe in the idea of religious creation (Adam and Eve), how many believe Darwin's Origin of Man? How many people who share Bertrand Russell's atheism? How many people who participate in Abu Ala Maari's ideas? How many people who participate in Friedrich Nietzsche mutiny?

My concern isn't in the clarification of public consciousness, for this is something that has become known, and doesn't require effort in the first place, and I won't go into deep philosophical discussions of consciousness, but I'll justify the roads of consciousness of the ego who thinks in general. In my opinion, ordinary people, resigned to their inheritance, are comfortable in their ignorance, blessed, and have absolute truths that we're hardly able to move from their minds; To the extent that you find a young man in the prime of life, and he has a long time before him to know and be enriched with knowledge, he argues with you in the form of a person with complete knowledge from

his religious or colloquial consciousness. So, you can't convince millions of people that ghosts don't appear; because it not exists. I'm addressing these people in the hope that they'll turn into a conscious subject. There're problems related to living life, not to metaphysics, which consciousness tries to possess in theory, and seeks to spread them in the hope that it'll turn into a human act, an active will. Let's enter the roads of the consciousness of the ego, and while I say ways in the forms of denial; because I can't disclose all its pathways without denying that we make other pathways.

Thinking According to Principle Of Beginning and The End.

Firstly, I mean by the "principle": a rule of thinking that turned to a prior idea, characterized as an a priori. This the rule is a foundation, that doesn't require an exam, thinking according to the "principle" of the beginning and the end is a thinking of process, and shifting, and events that are take place over time in genera. Now, let's start asking: how does it occur to our minds to think in accordance with this interconnected binary: Beginning- end? How does the next judgment of a beginning and an end shifts to true, absolute, and global one? and will such judgement always be true?

Undoubtedly, a look into those partial events in this living or socio-historical world indicates to a beginning and an end, and this judgement "for every beginning and end" is a product of induction.

Normal and abnormal consciousness live, or read about beginnings and ends, for a man is born from a sperm, and lives for a certain number of years, then dies; thus, every individual man has their own beginning and end, and there are some intermediate concepts between birth and death: childhood, youth, adulthood, and death, and yet life itself refutes this process, for there could be a child passing away, a young man dies martyred...But within life, the events of birth and death, beginning and end, day and night are natural ones: sunrise is the beginning of the day, and sunset is the end of one. Sunrise, as well as sunset, is a beginning— night's beginning, and end. An elderly man tells you about a river that was running here, but the waterway had become a dried route. An elderly man nods, saying, "things are how I'd witnessed it, for every beginning has an end".

The historians of civilizations such as Ibn Khaldoun, and Toinby talk you about the beginning of civilization, its prosperity, then its end or death. Historical process denotes patterns for that shift: birth...prosperity... death... evanescence; and so, the historian commented that each civilization has its beginning and end.

Karl Marx, the father of the material dialectical process of history, conceived a blissful

ending to the development of mankind in Communism as a new return to the beginning - the communalism.

Furthermore, Religion is also a conception, a beginning of Man and an end of the earthly world in whether heaven or hell. The European contemporary intellect conceptualizes ends: country's end, history's end, cultured people's end, and Man's death; each of those ends has beginning. Slavery is the beginning of the country; capitalism is the beginning of the recency and the nation... and Eric Hobsbawm writes *The Age of Extremes*. Factually, there are beginnings and endings that are in isolation from the difference in determining the beginning or the end, but the claim that there is an existence of a beginning or an end, is limited consciousness, which does not conform to claim that there is an existence of a beginning or an end, with using the definite article "the". There is a beginning for life. Yes, biology can detect the beginning of existence and time of organism, but who can possibly detect the end?

I can conceptualize the end of the now existing life in the theoretical absence of its conditions: such as the earth draws nearer to the sun, the falling of a big star on it, or a nuclear war breaking out, destroying every living thing. Even if such things have occurred, life might have returned thousands of years later. Who can determine the end of the world? Thus, we can say that, if our concepts of the beginning and the end are correct based on our perspective of partial events, such concepts are still incapable of being comprehensive. For instance, the end of a certain civilization doesn't lead to the end of the entire civilization in general.

However, the language, which is a phenomenon associated with thinking, involves contradicted concepts to the beginning and the end such as Eternity, Endless, Timeless or immortal.

This means that, the mind has always been capable of imagining what has no beginning, end, or both.

Eternity, where there is no beginning, is a concept that philosophy has used to confirm that the world was eternal, and endless to confirm that it had no end of the existence, and for this it can be said that the universe in general is immortal, and has no beginning and no end.

In some religions, immortal is restricted only to God.

Abi Al-Baqa in his book "*Al Kulliyat*", defined Endless as "The Time, Perpetuity, Ancient, and Eternity". Therefore, what has no end, has no beginning, and Eternity is what has no beginning in its first, such as the ancient. These concepts have continued

to be used in the field of theology, and then metaphysical philosophy. The error of the mind is that it transforms colloquial knowledge into two universal knowledge tools. The theoretical philosophical consciousness, as it transcends the colloquial consciousness, liberates us from these two concepts' captivity.

So, if we go from the concept of the absolute beginning, and inquire what existed before the beginning? We will be in a stalemate from which there is no way out, especially if we assume the concept of nothingness before the beginning to interpret the existence or the cosmos. Nothingness is the non-presence of a thing's image. We can conceptualize nothingness as an absolute nothingness, it's all about imagining nothingness of this or that thing, this phenomenon after it was there, imagining the end of certain existence, or metamorphosing of something to another. According to science: nothing is created from nothingness; and matter doesn't perish, i.e., matter has no beginning or end. It's only transforming; living matters turn into oil, and oil to gas, stones turn to cement... but Metamorphosis is a concept that ensures the transforming existence, not nothingness. Time itself is a concept refutes the beginning and the end.

Undoubtedly, I can imagine the end of life on Earth, and the end of the sun. Astrophysics discusses stars' death, but that doesn't lead me to talking about the absolute nothingness, absolute end of the cosmos or its absolute beginning.

Let's leave this the philosophical aspect a side, and asking once more: can we think away from the two concepts of beginning and end. Concepts aren't priori as innate ideas, but it becomes priori, when the mind approves of it, i.e., it becomes formed, and knowledge tools "I know the world based on the concepts I have for it", so chronologically the ego is enriched with new concepts, while others are obsolescence over time and then vanished as they are not fitting anymore in acquaintance of the world.

Here, I'm thinking of the fate, which means thinking of the end, when I'm doing that for goals and ways to achieve them, I'll be directly thinking of the end; also, when achieving certain goal, I'll say I reached the end.

Here, I'm, giving the beginning and end a subjective, voluntary meaning. Now, let me say: beginning and end not only have a cognitive function, but they have also a psychological one which is more important than we are assume, in isolation of what is positive or negative in this function.

Someone who rejects the living world, who usually proceeds from that this reality has an end, repeating to himself that there is an end for each beginning. The ego is using those two concepts striking a psychological balance. Because if the ego had no such those two

concepts, it would have an absolute desperate, I swear that by the end hope is often what helps people to sustain life.

It might be said: relying on the beginning and end concepts may lead to false certainty and determinism, which may result in inertia of will.

That's true, but the function here -As a psychological- provide ego with necessary faith for life, as will do with act, which may be delayed by waiting for the end. Any ways, beginning and end provide the ego with hope and optimism. The ego who doesn't know the time of end, lives the waiting, or waits for the principle of beginning and end to act what they are supposed to do. Sometimes, this principle provides the man with the meaning of the life.

For instance, Ego's relationship with the dictator, he wishes for his demise, Ego either be active to put an end to this dictator's life, or just wait nature for put the end life to him, in both cases, the beginning and end are providing ego with hope. Believing in the beginning and end out of the humanistic efficacy, and a will toward changing world cause a dangerous inertia and inefficacy that may produce historical stagnation where generations die, without the ego witnessing the happy end.

I swear, one of the dangerous forms of cognitive thinking according to the beginning and end principle, regardless its psychological aspect importance is ego's appetite to historical analogies, i.e., conceptualizing the beginnings and endings, which is present in relation to the knowledge of past beginnings and endings, two tendencies will be there: the first one truly believes in this analogy, and the other relies on its ideological use to justify a deficit.

Taking Zionist occupation of Palestine, and occupation of the region by the Franks, it's easy for the conscious to start saying: there won't be difference between the end of Zionist or Crusade occupation of Palestine and the region. This leads us to the perception that history repeats itself, as well as those unconcerned with occupation give a temporizing speech justifying their unethical and unpatriotic attitude toward the Palestinian cause.

In such a case, it's cognitively safer for the conscious to be real without syllogism of the possible current end, which needs to act, as well as will to past end. In this state, conscious should be liberated from the principle of the beginning and end, from fatalism consequently, then actually works a change.

Following discussing the contradictions of the principle of the beginning and end, I will turn to the main problem, the European conscious of ends and its effect on our conscious of it, I will ask the following question: are the ends according to the European universal? Are they, our ends?

globalization ideologists talk about the end of Nation-State, which is called the cosmic village.

Since 18th Century, the European live under patronage of the nation-country, the history of Europe is the history of expansion, dominance, and colonialism, because of capitalist, then imperialist this nation -state.

Nowadays, they are talking about globalization, what will convey unto thee what it's? they propose it as a new phase of the recent universal production, based on financing the production and distribution of the commodity with no regard to national borders. The Nation-State loses its economic function in trade for an international economy, that means the end of the state's economy, or they perceive to globalization as a culture state exceeds the Nation-State's culture. The concept of cultural identity, as if the world has become one cultural field by virtue of the development of the media and the information exchange, i.e., the end of the nation's culture; or they reckon that world has become governed by multinational companies that have no national, It become a supranational force, that means the end of the state function.

Or they may declare the contiguity of globalization over the ideologies and utopias, leading to the end of ideology.

In sum, globalization is a bundle of ends.

Do you think these endings real ones? Let's stop at the Nation-State end.

I wonder who made the decision for the first and second war against Iraq? isn't it the United State and other European countries.

What's the nationality of more than three-hundred thousand American soldiers, are they Singaporeans? Who is doing Japan-America economic talks? Is it South Africa and Mauritania?

Who spent and still spending from the national economy to control the community resources? Where are the multinational companies fixed assets? Aren't they home?

Assuming that the state is coming to an end in Europe and America, how can we talk about the state's end while it's not yet a state, how can we call the end of the country while we are in the beginning?

Centuries ago, Arabs have been striving for the Nation-State without achieving neither the State in its regional concept nor the State in its national concept. Do we put an end to this endeavor in the name of the end of the country?

Whoever calls for the end of the State before the State's establishment as a call for a child to put an end to his childhood.

## Danger Of Absolute Relativism

We consider the obsession of truth an original for every ego, regardless of the level of his consciousness of the world, and whatever the impact of the truth on the ego, negatively or positively, Rather, who hides the truth out of fear, and shows the false or lies, builds an inner relationship with the truth, every ego wants to be truly known, and seeks to know the truth of the emotions of the other, with whom he is bound by a relationship of friendship, love, work, kinship... etc. so that it can be said that it's impossible to live without having real knowledge, or believing that our knowledge is true, and it's said, but it's common that human beings live most of their lives in falsehood, or that they behave contrary to what they contain truth.

This is true, but they all know their contradiction with their true consciousness. Ignorance is another matter.

I'm not talking here about truth in science, which often has no presence in the political, moral, and cultural practical life of the ego, for it's social, political, moral, ideological, emotional...etc. basically, say that aesthetic, moral, ideological, and political judgments are relative; because we can't reach absolute judgments about society, beauty, morality, politics, and ideology. These judgments are socially-nationally conditioned culturally in a particular world, for it's natural that African aesthetic, moral judgments differ from European ones. As political judgments for colonial state different from those of a colonial state.

But I have to point out that the contrary of relativism is absolute, not objective.

The danger of absolute relativism is that it contradicts objectivity first and foremost. Absolute relativism is to say that all our judgments are relative, therefore all judgments have an equal chance of truth, and before I introduce the danger of absolute relativism, I point out that absolute relativism isn't an expression of freedom as it's thought. We don't believe that defending freedom means starting from absolute relativism. Of course, we can't be free to say that the angles of a triangle are equal to two or three

rights, but it's an example that doesn't make sense; because there is no difference that the angles of a triangle are equal to two rights. This definition of a triangle belongs to the science in which the field of difference is narrowed.

But suppose one said that Stalin was the biggest advocate of freedom, and another asserted that he was the greatest dictator of the twentieth century and an aversion to freedom, saying that both rulings express the freedom of attitude towards Stalin. Judgments about who a dictator in this sense are relative, but if so, freedom here has eliminated the concept of dictator, and we no longer have any criterion by which to measure the degree of dictatorial ruler, and to distinguish on its basis a dictator from a democrat.

Can we disagree on the dictator's matters based on the idea of freedom? How can our judgment be general and objective against a dictator? There must be a criterion for judging a ruler in relation to human beings on the basis of which we determine whether this or that ruler belongs to the class of dictators.

This criterion is human freedom in speech, practice, belief, scientific expression of belonging and possession of the right...Then it can be said that every ruler who suppresses this one mentioned by any means of repression is necessarily a dictator. May be an objector believes that there is a difference in the attitude of human beings towards the dictator in terms of acceptance or rejection. Yes, but this is very different from sentencing a ruler. Someone might love Stalin; because of he defeated Nazism, or he established an industrial base for the Soviet Union in a short period of time, or he established a powerful empire that stood up to US imperialism. Well, that's all understandable! But all this doesn't prevent it from saying that Stalin is a dictator by the criterion of freedom, and an objector who says: You originally made the relative criterion itself a criterion for judging a dictator, which is freedom, that is also relative. Are we in front of a word game? No, We aren't talking here about freedom in the metaphysical sense of the word, but, in its political specify; because the dictator is originally politician, he is part of the political authority, therefore judging him is linked to freedom in the political sense, which is the freedom of individuals-Citizens in what I have previously offered.

However, there is a connection between freedom and relativism, that based on the right to difference, and this last is the right of freedom to disagree, that is, we are faced with different judgments, therefore it's relative in terms of their issuance from this or that party, and if the right to differ in one of its aspects is an expression of the right to freedom, it doesn't always come from this right, but from the difference in interest, and power, the danger of relativism is most evident in moral and political judgments, this is due to

the absence of common standards of moral, and political judgment, but, are we really missing these standards in these two fields? There is no doubt that every society has a set of moral standards that allow us to determine moral judgment and immoral behavior on the basis of it. These standards differ in the degree of human consensus on it.

Let's consider the following moral criterion; every behavior that harms the other is evil, based on such a standard that has a human being approve, we can make the following judgments, for example:

Attacking on the right of the other is evil, and this applies to bribery, rape, occupation, killing other for ideological reasons. Such Judgments aren't subject to great difference, they are almost absolute, and most people are unanimous on it.

If we look at these Judgments from a relative point of view based on the fact that all Judgments are relative, then the moral standard: that harming other is a fleeting evil, thus the morality of the Judgments generated by it disappears, then the occupier can say that occupation is good, as well as rape, theft...and so on, but it's rare to find someone saying this. So here the issue seems very simple, and the limits of disagreement are narrow about these Judgments, and when I say narrow, it means that they exist, the briber may say that he doesn't consider this behavior to be immoral; because it was done for reasons of destitution, poverty and the need to support the family, therefore, necessity knows no law, but he admitted that he had committed the prohibitions, thus, he justified the behavior, didn't give a positive value judgment on bribery, or say that it's a moral behavior.

But standards are often lost under conditions of comprehensive debasement, and become need for who seek to justify their interests in the presence of absolute relativism. This is because interest is the first enemy of all standards, as it's established as a lonely standard for behavior and judgments.

As an example, someone says: "Corruption is a historical necessity", there is no rational and moral being who can make such a judgment, but who issued it, is rational, and immoral one. Corruption, as a phenomenon practiced by authority and rulers, need a being who claims reason, and seeks to achieve his narrow interests by defending authority. Thus, simply interest becomes the basis of absolute relativism, and corruption as evil turns into corruption as necessity.

Just as an unhandy, who thinks only in his pocket, turns the national struggle against the occupier into terrorism, then the struggle is equal to terrorism based on the relativity of standards and freedom of speech.

Here, I'm not talking about the phenomenon of its non-existence, there is a political analyst woman appeared on TV, say, who condemns the Lebanese national resistance in the south. Yes, a people fighting the occupier have become, in the language of the intelligent analyst woman, who one practice terrorism.

Thus, the criterion of patriotism is lost, and the differences between the concepts of patriotism, human dignity, freedom, and the concepts of national betrayal, subservience, and tyranny disappear. Then someone comes and say: Why do you condemn her, because things are relative first, what you see as a struggle, she saw as terrorism, moreover, this is identical with freedom of opinion, then the defender of freedom and democracy is equal to the one who defends tyranny and coercion.

Then there will be no difference between a tyrannical and a democratic state in terms of absolute relativity.

Yes, interests challenge facts, unless interests coincide with facts.

Our rejection of absolute relativism doesn't mean our rejection of relativism in a world thought, ethics and politics, absolute relativism doesn't set limits to relativity, while relativity is limited, socially and morally conditioned. Honor as a concept, for example, is present in all cultures, a word that exists in most languages, but specifying honor morally and behaviorally is different in cultures and societies. In this specifying, honor appears in behavior that deserves respect, but what behavior deserves respect? Generosity that deserves respect in one society may be astonishingly extravagance in another society, and sexual practice outside marriage is adultery that deserves to be vilified, while it is a normal behavior in the West between a boyfriend and a girlfriend, the origin and belonging to the Hashemite Hasani or Hussein root allows the person belonging to it to be called Sharif or Syed. The origin in other countries may not make sense. Then, the moral structure of each society determines the meanings of moral concepts, and makes it relative in terms of their specifying.

Relativism seems more present in reading the text - Authority. The text - authority is the text whose presence in the consciousness of people has become great. The sacred text, the text of the thinker, of the philosopher, of the writer. A great text is one that allows for multiple readings, and may be different. Here, the text creates a relativity of reading. Since we can never decide which reading is true, some saw in Baruch Spinoza's texts what referred to a materialistic philosophy, and other saw the spirit of idealism as characterizing this text.

Hegel was read by both Leftist and a right-wing. And Ernst Fischer wrote about the real

Marx as opposed to the false Marx.

No doubt that reading here is governed by the reader, and the historical condition for reading. But the relativity of reading here is limited by the ability and capabilities text. Nobody can say that Marx's book "Das Kapital", prove his belief in God; because the text doesn't include such a possibility. One might say that the germ of tyranny is present in Marx's texts, on the contrary, another believes that his texts focus on freedom. Thus, we have and still lived the experience of disagreement about Marx.

Let's read what the author of the Soviet Philosophical Dictionary wrote about Jean Hyppolite: "Jean Hyppolite is a French existential philosopher, director of the École des Écoles Normale Supérieure, and devoted his main works to Hegel, and he argues that Hegelian philosophy is as important to our time as Aristotle's philosophy to the Middle Ages. He considers that the main philosophical directions are a continuation of Hegelian doctrine, and from his point of view Hegel's "life" should become the basis for knowledge of human existence. In this way, he turns Hegel into existentialist.

According his false concept, Hyppolite claims that Marx is Hegelian, and tries to find idealistic elements in Marxism".

Let's stand at the last sentences: "According his false concept, Hyppolite claims that Marx is Hegelian".

Both authors reject to regard Hegel as an existentialist, or Marx as Hegelian.

So, we are faced with two readings of Hyppolite, the first is Hegel, and the other is Marx. Hegel is an existentialist, Marx is a Hegelian, while according to the dictionary authors' reading: Hegel isn't an existentialist and Marx isn't Hegelian.

There is no meaning in asking which of the two readings is truer and more correct. Here the reading is relative, but nobody said that Hegel isn't a dialectician, or that Marx is an idealist, interpretation - as a basis - of the relativity of judgments about the text isn't caused only by the text, but also by the reader, for this we always witness the war of texts, Hegelian Marx from the point of view of Hyppolite is Marx who spent his life in a constant struggle with Hegel to destroy his fortresses, and takes away from him what belongs, and unique to him, or if you want say to save what can be saved after the defeat of that the absolute philosophical doctrine of Henri Lefebvre in His book "Marx and Sociology". Hyppolite reads Hegel and Marx existentially, while Lefebvre reads Hegel and Marx Marxism, and so on...

It remains to be said that it's the stormy presence of the concept of utility that turned relativity into absolute relativism. Utility as a philosophy of life is widespread in the

souls without anyone reading perhaps any text in utilitarianism. The morality spread by capitalism, especially American capitalism, and its way of life almost affect all Human cultures with different borders.

Hence, turning utility into a standard for behavior and beliefs means killing and exiling the other, when we measure everything in relation to individual utility, it means the destruction of objective truth, and then relativity turns into absolute relativism.

Dangers face moral and political life in the name of absolute relativism. Isn't absolute relativism, if it's controlled by the ego, is a declaration of the death of the other?

Isn't absolute relativism an absolute truth?

## Science And Its Contradictions

If someone says that we live in the time of science, the scientific revolution, and what it generated from the cybernetics and techno-electronic revolution, then his saying is correct. Science has touched all aspects of our lives, So, we live its effects wherever we turn our faces, and the speed of scientific discoveries is also paralleled by that in the world of technology, you won't find a person who doesn't praise the boisterous progress of science; because you rarely find a nation now that the results of science haven't touched its life. In fact, that the development of medicine, biology, engineering, physics in all its branches, and various chemistry...etc., contributed to an increase in life expectancy, and reduce the time and effort. This is a common utterance and a very slang saying; Nobody has the credit for saying it, I'm not talking about the importance of science, but I like to start with the common simple.

In asking the following question: Can natural science save us? We enter into the first complications of science. In 1963, Amin Ahmed Al-Sharif translated the book of the American sociologist George A. Lundberg "Can Science Save Us?" I swear that, the question that Lundberg asked Forty or more years ago, It's still present and important! When he mentions science here, means nothing but the natural and mathematical sciences. Worse now, these sciences have occupied the center stage in international universities, almost complete control over the options of the new generation, you even see a move away from learning the humanities, or sarcastic look of it, and those who chose to specialize in it.

I call this case: the domination of the ideology of science - science in the natural, mathematical sense of the word - science in the ideology of science has turned into a mentor at the individual and social level, liberated from poverty, disease, and illiteracy, it's a path to happiness.

Science is the path to happiness; it gives happiness a new content in our current world, happiness linked to technology, which has transformed life into industrial workshops

for production. The question has been absent about the human capacity to enjoy the production itself; for these goods – fetish, with which the markets are filled, millions of people who desire to own it pass in front of it, but to no avail.

Here, we're in front of a new metaphysics in the ideology of science, a new origin, and a new meaning of existence; the ideology of science, of the ideas of human existence. The ego that glorifies science has become a one-dimensional ego, as long as science has turned into a saving, individual and social basis. Thus, the great illusions that lean on science have grown. Progress is only possible with science, we'll overcome poverty with science, that shortens the way to wealth - existence, science - this metaphysics that is now consuming the spirits of human beings and nations. Existence - a science, it's a new meaning of blind power, which is sweeps the world without any sense of its savages. There is no doubt that our life is impossible without science, but it's poor in science alone; because the ideology of science turns its face on the ethical-value, aesthetic, and social aspect of life, captivate it in a cage of a lifestyle, whose walls are high-level, charming, luscious technology, that prevents the thinking of the universal human existence.

A long time ago, philosopher presented the ethical side of science, that with the beginning of the connection between science and technology, but it seems that he has been defeated. The ideology of science doesn't even think about the human and moral effects of science, and isolates it from the universal human existence, from its misuse that has claimed, and still the lives of millions of people.

The discovery of the fragmentation of the atom killed two cities, and it has produced and still to horror among millions who are frightened for life. Science - the basis of happiness - Science has become the basis of fear.

What danger is greater than that science will turn into a destructive force in the hands of an expansionist imperial power that doesn't care about man and nature? Bacterial, chemical, neutron, hydrogen and atomic weapons ... etc. some have been used and some are awaiting use.

The power of Science has become a fighting; meaning that war is no longer a formula for solving problems between countries and nations. While you possess the power of knowledge; war is the means for domination and control. You fight because you possess the destructive power of electronic technology. It's only a small press of a button until one of the neighborhoods of Baghdad has disappeared.

Thus, the link between war and science arose, and science was liberated from any human moral aspect; It just became a power.

The cost of producing a single warplane loaded with tons of smart bombs, and guided missiles is enough to free tens of thousands of people out of poverty, but it's necessary to get tens of millions of dollars into the banks of financial tyrants.

The objector might ask: what is the guilt of science in that? Yes, it's not absolutely at guilt for this, but we're talking about the ideology of science, and not science as a basis for blind savage force, the ideology of science that turns it into a force devoid of any moral sacredness, of thinking about human existence.

The most dangerous thing in the ideology of science, especially in its spread over a wide area of societies that don't participate in scientific-technical production, is that this ideology - that is, the ideology of science - is spread without science turning into a basis for scientific consciousness of the world.

Here, we're in front of humans who be helped science, enjoy its results, and its goods, but they live without scientific consciousness. As they coexist with knowledge of the laws of physics, chemistry and life sciences on the one hand, and the mythical, metaphysical view of the world on the other.

The dominance of one dimension of science - science is technology, and man is technical, deprived man of thinking about creating a scientific consciousness of the world. This is why you find that the people most learned about basic sciences are the ones who most adhere to illusions. What makes science separate from scientific consciousness, especially in underdeveloped countries? The reason is that science is taught here as information without any connection to questions about existence, society and thought. Science in one of its aspects is an Interpretation of phenomena, and the Interpretation isn't possible without knowing the relative relationships, and the causal relationships are objective, therefore science allows us to form a consciousness that going off from the objectivity of causal relationships, and its philosophical generalization.

My problem now isn't to stop at the epistemology of science, which is restricted to philosophers, or Scientists Philosophers, nor to proffer the positions of logical positivism and other from science. What interests me is the ego as a whole, the man who is helped by thinking to occupy a place in his world, becomes free with it.

Scientific consciousness provides the ego with an understanding of its world, the arrangement of its life, and removes the separation between the thinking elite and ordinary humans, or between a minority that has become aware of a large part of the objective relations of the world, and between a majority who still live in capturing of illusions that arose hundreds, or even thousands of years ago.

Swindler wouldn't have found a presence in the human world, if the man hadn't been immersed in an unscientific consciousness.

Swindlers of all kinds are present in all cultures, and millions of people believe them. Swindler who reads the future of this and that, the one who claims to be connected to the spirit world, who expels the genie from the soul of patient.

This Swindler corresponds to the consciousness of his nature. A book about the Zodiac and the events that afflict their owners in the next days, the fire spreads like wildfire. He appears on TV screen "Astronomer so-and-so", and you see, and hear hundreds of callers searching for their fate that has been predetermined.

No doubt that it's absurd to refute the conviction of believers in miracles, in the name of science; because these believers have knowledge of science, but they don't have a scientific consciousness of the world, and they originally wouldn't have believed in superstition if they didn't acknowledge the limitations of both science and reason to understand phenomena that appear to them through hearing or Swindler, It's beyond the capacity of science and reason.

Then, the problem, isn't to highlight the contradiction of human illusions with science, as some believe; for this is a useless process. The problem is to spread the scientific and mental view of the world.

This can only be done in a historical-social condition that allows the dissemination of scientific consciousness, especially in school, university and the media, and in a condition of freedom that allows the dissemination of knowledge without any material obstacles.

If we see the phenomenon of the Swindler or superstitious awareness in the societies of European modernity, then it's first in a narrow way, then Western rationality has become a feature of the lifestyle. It's the implicit philosophy even when those who stretch their tongue to rationality.

Now one of the effects of the spread of ideology of science in the whole world is the decline interest in the humanities, especially in third world countries, and the decline interest in literary texts, especially poetry, except for the novel that still retains its importance to the reader.

The problem is that the value of these sciences in the public consciousness is much lower than the value of the natural and mathematical sciences, for a simple reason; that is, the effects of the first on life aren't directly visible, first, and the profession that the humanities qualifies you for doesn't generate profit, and

doesn't make you among the rich, while if you were a doctor, an engineer, or a specialist in informatics, accounting, the path to wealth is open to you.

You won't hang a nameplate about yourself anywhere if you are a specialist in history, philosophy, archeology, sociology...etc. The doctor repeats the biography of the swindler, above the door of his clinic is a letter of temptation "Dr. X" is a specialist in internal diseases, a graduate of universities - so universities in plural - France and Britain. Member of the Royal or American Medical Association, Ultrasound, a former doctor in - and plural - London hospitals", is an advertising rhetoric not unlike any rhetoric of washing powder on TV, of perfume, or of fashion.

Wealth because of the profession gives its practitioner a dual form: knowledge and criticism "wealth." In such a world the patient is no longer a human being but a commodity, goods, a thing. But it's a commodity to be paid, goods to be bought, and something to be blackmailed.

A humanities teacher is inferior in value than a natural and mathematical sciences teacher, The number of high school divisions in the scientific branch is the largest, while the literary branch almost disappears, and if it exists, it's the branch of the least intelligent students, even the scientific student gets a higher value than the literary student.

In the universities themselves, it took a line of interest in the natural and mathematical sciences, to the extent that most private universities don't open branches for the humanities, and some universities in the Arab world have closed the departments of philosophy and history; because the number of those wishing to join them doesn't allow the opening of the two departments; for it's very few.

In fact, the decline interest in the humanities causes severe poverty of awareness. Because it's the science that poses human problems and lifestyle, and qualifies its owner to ask questions, for it establishes critical awareness. While the owner of the basic sciences teaches, and memorizes information without questioning at all, the human sciences learn to question, and the natural sciences teach us how to store information in memory. thus, we understand why most of those, who obtain scientific education only live in the duality of science and superstition, while most of the owners of human sciences enjoy a free mind, and scientific consciousness.

## The Death of Man

Did man really die as some western philosophers obituaried it? In what sense do we understand the death of man?

The man remains abstract with the word 'the' as long as this 'the' hide inside of him the specific man.

When the West proclaims the death of man, it makes to deep down itself the Western man is the man. So, the word of man with article 'the' contains an implied ruling: The man is Western man.

Roger Garaudy who admired Islam, wrote as critic of Structuralism "Philosophy Of The Death Of Man", he meditated the history of the European thought that Knocked man off his perch.

In his astronomical discovery, Nicolaus Copernicus announced that the Man and his planet is just an infinitesimal, worthless point, in a boundless sea of galaxies and Spheres. Once again, Darwin made man lose his ground, that is, the man who became an advanced, biological being compared to other organisms before him.

Also, Freud who revealed the unconscious and the Id, deprived man of being responsible for his actions.

Finally, structuralism announced the priority of the category of relation over the category of Entity, and the whole is prior to the part.

Copernicus, Darwin, Freud and Strauss declare The Death Of Man. Garaudy, in turn, stands against The Death Of Man, even though he is a French Marxist. So, there they declare the death of man as well as defend him. When the European man declares death or defends life, can't give up his centralization. The Man there is dead or alive.

This centralization didn't arise arbitrary, the power of the West grew this feeling that became subconscious.

"There's only us and the Greeks...", Paul Valéry said, Indians, Chinese, and Arabs, are assets but the Africans don't exist. In such consciousness the Western-the man died

metaphorically, the Arab and the Indian are literally died.

The difference between a real dead, and the metaphorical one is in the type of history. The West as a historical actor writes from history, but anyone other than Western is on the sidelines of history. Excuse me, it's not, but it's the West who writes it on the sideline. It's, I mean- the other, like Western notes that are written on the sideline, and it's the West who decides the size of this sidelines.

The relationship between the colonizer and those who are colonized hasn't disappeared, not at the level of reality, if it took a new form, nor at the level of consciousness. Even if this relation is disappeared in the reality, the consciousness is so stubborn, as Master-slave consciousness for example, which is remain present even though the slave is freed. Therefore, the western is metaphorically dead, while the other is dead literally according to the West.

Aristotle's definition of Man as "sapiens, talking, civil, and social animal" was accepted; because these qualities are universal. It makes humans equal, However, in modern and contemporary history, the sideline has been deprived of these universal qualities, the sideline according to the angle of the West's view of the division of human beings.

Man, who fought colonialism, engaged in war of liberation, and sought of freedom, doesn't exist in Western consciousness, when Western is conscious his crisis, or he declares that the structure precedes the particular- individual, declares without batting an eye the death of man. Did man live for brief moments out of structure? If the man since the emergence of society, was an element of structure, then he is actually dead for thousands of years ago. The proclamation of the death of man is nothing but a discovery that displaced the illusion overpowered the man for ages.

But it's not like that anyway.

Let's now leave the discussion of Western self- consciousness, and put the problem on its universal dimension.

Perhaps the death of metaphorically man had a universal meaning. Nowadays the organizing of social, economic, and political life has taken unprecedented formulas in human history. The man lives in a world of institutions, decisions, directives, advertisements, and laws which he - that is, this man - knows about the actors who established it, or who maintain it.

The bureaucracy took over man's life, he couldn't break it. This bureaucracy has become a matter of pride in the name of the institutional rational organization of life. Until man's life looked like a train the railway, and it couldn't deviate, and if it happens, the

disaster is inevitable.

In a situation like this, “the ego” has the right to wonder; what freedom does it have left in front of this strange structure, which it was told that it works for organize his life? This is the substance of metaphorical death of the ego, which makes “the ego” marginal in its relationship with this structure.

instead, man seeks to move beyond this structure: Strike, riot, discourse, freedom of opinion, all kinds of protest, but most importantly the spiritual creativity, and receiving it that strikes some balance between the ego who is subject to the system, and who seeking freedom.

Indeed, the western democracy with all its pros and cons strikes this kind of balance. It also cancelled major social outbursts expressed in social revolutions to date. it seems that humanity is moving on this path despite the enormous difficulties that the majority of them faces in achieving a democratic system.

But the death of metaphorical man that the west is talking about, and the like, isn't a universal condition that humanity live.

When we think of man in general; we mean getting out of his framework as Western or Arab.

If the western man is protesting against well-being, democracy, and the technical authority for more welfare, and freedom, the African is facing a very different world. Thousands die in civil-ethnic wars. Thousands die of poverty and illness. Millions aspire to a life free from fear for their lives.

Palestinian who lives in the camp and subject to racial occupation waiting around for something that may never come. He puts his freedom forward as a human project which is based on freedom from usurping occupying entity as well as human dignity, and he is ready to pay with blood for that.

When Western is declaring the death of metaphorical man, he doesn't consider the three-quarters of humanity that are struggling against real death.

Whenever, in this vast non-European world, man contemplate his world, and fighting various grievances: political, economic and cultural. He announces the birth of man once again.

However, the birth of man means nothing but that he is turned into a real actor in the face of forces alien to him, one of them is the dead man metaphorically in the West, which declares the death of man a reality in the other world.

In this regard, comparison between two worlds seems useful: the first is thinking of how to get more well-being, freedom, and control, while the other thinks about how to transcend poverty, slavery and control.

On the day of election, the Western-European sits at home, he is free in his choice to go for vote or not. therefore, he is exercising his freedom twice: once when he freely chooses his candidate, and again when he didn't vote.

Arabic in general, Chinese and African aspire to live this experience.

He is the man, when he aspires to achieve his dreams. The western man has the right to talk about the death of metaphorical man, while in the same time Arabic and African have the right to announce the birth of man.

Here, the difference lies in the dream, the daydream. Dreaming with eyes open. That's how it's for a man who makes his way to freedom. So, death is the death of a dream, that throws us into a world of monotony, dullness, and vulgar daily life.

In a world where the man still resides in the womb of dreams, echoing the ton of death of man, mechanically echoing in a mind, who can no longer think outside the dominance of European thought.

There is a huge difference between the one resists his death, and who declare it. The dream of millions of countries that suffered from dominance, tyranny, poverty, and unrealized dreams putting forward the birth of man who seeking for freedom, and confirm his existence as it should be.

There is a huge difference between who dreams of dignity, and the other who forget this word, or he only remembers it just on occasion. As well as, between who own a plane ticket to go hundreds of miles to riot against globalization in front of the Group of Eight, isn't like who doesn't have the money for his daily bread, and he searches among live-stock manure for cereals.

## About The Utopian Consciousness

Utopia is one of the mutinous conscious weapons against the world. It's , i.e. utopia, the world as just should it be far from the mechanisms of achieve this world. So, the utopian is a person, or ego rejects the living world, since this world isn't corresponding with the optimal conception of the world that the human beings deserves to live. Also, we can say that utopian is the contrast of the evils that exist in existence, such as the political, class, and moral evils...utopian is a person who got fed up with this world, he had no choice but to draw the desired world in his imagination. Simply he searches for promised paradise on the earth.

Nowhere - that the word Utopia mean - is an imagined place into the place where we live.

Utopian Consciousness had been reduced to symbols that proposed utopias, an example in western, is Plato's Republic, More's Utopia, Tommaso Campanella's City of the Sun, and Francis Bacon's New Atlantis, and the ideal city (Utopia) by Alfaraby in the east. But utopia isn't only present in the formulation of complete utopias, as the formulations of symbols we talked about. It's present in every Consciousness that rejects reality, dreams of the absence of evil, and defends the great values of humanity. It's present in the common consciousness of the ordinary man, in his daydreams to overcome his sufferings. If our current era has witnessed the defeat of utopian projects, it has left it to the contemplations of people, who don't write a letter about their utopia, but dream of it, or it appears in their deep groans.

Yes, Fiedrich Engels, who wanted to make socialism a refuting science, that is, utopian socialism, remained utopian through his promised communism. Likewise, Marx, Linen, Trotsky, and even the entire global left, whether in the East or in the West, had utopia present in his conscious.

The greatest existentialists, such as Sartre were utopians, and dreamed of a kingdom of freedom on earth.

Most human religions consider utopia to be an essential component of it.

A consciousness of this comprehensiveness that the market thugs and their small “intellectuals” want to attack on the pretext that it’s an illusory conscious, and scream: Ideology, utopia are dead, and man has returned to reality, to be busy solving his daily problems. it’s no secret to anyone that declaring the death of utopia is nothing but a declaration of fear of everything that is radical in man consciousness. Such Consciousness wants to say that everything can be fixed, and it isn’t necessary to make radical changes, it’s poor and false realism. as poverty is no longer a class reason, and can be solved by some procedures, like helping unemployed to find jobs in order to eliminate employment, or depends on charities. Then the crime has no social, or cultured reason, it’s enough for the country to be strict in its laws that prevent crime. Simply; the results are cured, while there is an absence of reasons.

The Ideology of the death of utopia is never separated from The Ideology of the death of man, or the death of Ego. The ideology of the death of utopia seeks to throw the ego into a swamp of tar, drowning, or busy swimming in this swamp. The death of ego through the death of utopia only means that ego has lost his existence in the future.

Existence in reality turns the ego into coma in a limited, and a final world, and into an ego imprisoned behind the bars of narrow desires, which don’t go beyond existence in a reality.

while the existence in the future turns the ego a wing, grants it the revolution against life, and the continuation in it; because existence in the future, the existence of coming ego, means existence of hope. At the moment, the ego ceases to exist in hope, it loses the most important justification of its existence; because existence in hope keeps it in an infinite state of action, whether in thinking or practicing.

We aren’t exaggerated, if we said that the ego can’t feel its freedom unless it involves a utopian tendency.

It was said: Every ego has what to think about in the future. Therefore, every ego is necessarily utopian. This is true, but within narrow limits; the poor, for example, hopes to be rich, the sick in healthy, the employer in rise to a higher position...etc.

But I’m not talking about this; because the ego in a state like this remains an existence in reality, its small worries can be achieved; for it’s narrow. As for existence in the future, it’s existence in a universal future. It’s the ego thinking of all others, so utopian doesn’t draw for his ego self-world, but he draws the world in its broadest sense. Therefore, utopian isn’t the one who thinks of his poverty, but rather who thinks about poverty, and

draws general features for a future free of poverty. While the poor person who dreams of getting rich stays a prisoner of swamp.

Hence, existence actually produces a false mutiny in an ego that only thinks within the limits of its narrow desires. while the existence in the future produces the universal existential mutiny, Seeker of the universal possible. Yes, about the universal possible, so utopian isn't looking for impossible, he isn't "ego" drowning in illusion, Rather, he is a vigilant dreamer to the maximum.

Socialists are par excellent utopians, but they aren't under a deluded, they defend the justice in its finest form. After the collapse of the socialist experience in the world, some people announced the end of the world, and that this dream has no future.

Was the socialism a dissonance in a history isn't contain this form of justice? was the fruit of the will against history, and when will became weak, the history came back to its true course, revenge of this will that resisted him.

Indeed, that idea has been defeated in concrete reality. Its concrete defeat led to its inability to reach the awareness of millions of people who saw in it a salvation from the torments of class disparity, the terrible exploitation of labor, and the transformation of wealth into brute force.

Absolutely, the idea was defeated in reality, tyranny and totalitarianism defeated this dream goal, and noble, as it was seemed there was a coherence between the socialism and totalitarian tyranny, and socialism and the enrichment of socialist rulers by authority and corruption.

The dream of socialism has been uprooted from a large number of people in the East and West; because of its two experiences in Eastern Europe and some of Third \_World countries as it was associated by dictatorship and corruption.

As soon as the collapse phenomenon of socialist experiment in the West began, even the criticism started, not the experiment but the idea itself, and this is the tragedy.

## Free Ego

We said free ego, and didn't say ego and freedom. Such concept-free ego not ego and freedom-is something different from playing on words.

Considering free ego, on the one hand, we proceed with the absolute unity of the ego, hence freedom seems to be a stick and necessary characteristic of the ego, we can only imagine the ego as free ego.

On the other hand, if we think about the ego and freedom separately, then freedom will be an external topic that the ego establishes a relation with. However, it isn't at all like this in fact, because there is no independent existence of freedom, it can't be possessed somewhere. But the denial of the free ego suggests this separation between ego and freedom, as ego apparently aims to possess an external thing.

Freedom is an internal conscious that arouses from the ego itself, it isn't a reflection to something external. Therefore, deprivation of freedom is a deprivation of the ego, and its consciousness, a deprivation of the awareness of the ego of its ego.

"Slave neither conscious his freedom nor has the concept of free ego, a slave is the man after all", someone says. Such assumption doesn't mean that the slave isn't an ego at all, he is something in his self-consciousness, and in the master's awareness of him. he isn't more than an object. When the slave reaches a stage of conscious of his enslavement, then he discovers the consciousness of his free ego. Thus, he starts to mutiny. Nothing better than free ego can realize the deprivation of his freedom, and own ego.

It's common for someone to say; "I'm defending freedom", such statement implies merely one thing, I'm defending my own freedom, my free ego, and every free ego that has been robbed of what is a basic component of its existence.

Self-consciousness of ego being free only appears in free conduct. free ego specifies only in the living world, the conduct here is practical and spiritual.

"I want"; this is a form of specify of the free ego in practical conduct. Action as it appears externally. I want; meant then the apparition of freedom in external, the apparition of

the ego in its relationship with the world; i.e. the material and the human world, here the free ego appears in the world of ideas and art. Will means the apparition of freedom, and any obstacle to the will leads to preventing the apparition of freedom. indeed, will repression means merely captivating the free ego. So, prison is a punishment that narrows the scope for apparition of the freedom through the will.

The prison is the ego, which is restricted somewhere, while freedom only appears in the place. In certain faces of some guardians, uprooting the ego from its own liberty in co-relationship, In compulsory conduct imposed by prison laws during time, makes freedom only specify in conduct, and so on.

Freedom stands up as a problem that has troubled philosophers, thinkers, and ordinary people in questioning about those limits of which the ego mustn't exceed; especially human limits that are concerned with the relation of the ego with others. Let's examine the prevailing statement: "your freedom stops where other nose begins". your freedom ends, means that there are some borders you can't override.

Those limits are the other, who has free ego. Merely my personal freedom shouldn't be assault to another individual freedom.

This statement leads us to the crux issue. The problem of moral liberty as an overrun of classic question: am I free or devoid of liberty?

Freedom in a moral sense is to admit others' freedom. But in human reality is the assault on another free person, it's the history of the deprivation of freedom, and of confronting this plundering.

There is no need to recount the history of liberty deprivation from the inception of slave society up till now. As hundreds of thousands of pages have been written about this history, but the outstanding point in all this history is the possession of power, and using it to deprive others of their freedom, the power here involves all the physical and spiritual dimensions, as well as the power of wealth, of authority and that of ideology. Particularly when all these forces unite to practice injustice, tyranny, and dictatorship against the other.

In previous chapters I introduced the human bondage of authority and money, but the slaves of authority and money this time turn into compelling and rustlers of free ego which has no power, to be turned into thing, and a weak, his ego-lost being.

By then, the ego consciousness of its essence loss turns into awareness of its free ego. The contradiction between the plunder force of freedom and defendant power of it doesn't reveal without this consciousness. The self-consciousness of the non-free ego -

though it's not free so that it has no power to say "No" – restores the power of freedom, and the power of the ego which was taken away from it. The contradiction of history appears as a contradiction of external power which deprives the inner free one. When the ego becomes conscious of strong its free existence, then it writes the history of freedom. At that time Hegel's statement turns out to be true that is, "History is nothing but freedom's consciousness of itself.", but this time in the history of free ego. Moreover, the history of ego liberty turns to be the history of freedom of other; because the other becomes free "ego".

The inner ego's feeling of its freedom, and that it possesses a power that nullifies freedom liberty, and prevents its practical and realistic appearance, is the thing which creates mutiny, whether it was raised in the inner ego or was apparent mutiny through word and action. in the first case the ego lives in a state of alienation, while in the other case it sought to be free from alienation. When the force of deprivation of liberty comes out to a point where the free ego is prevented to be shown outside, the society turns into a tragic one, and the ego pupate involves its ego. Then the ego refrains from appearing creatively, and people live in a state of boring, and tragic stagnation. Because the ego that retains the world as it should be, turns to absolute powerless ego in case of full deprivation of liberty. Little by little, the ego melts, leaving the world as it no longer exists, and declares its own death with the demise of dream, and hope.

Thus, the ego lives in a state of absolute exile without choosing to be exiled, since real existence has become exiled, because being in free existence was destroyed through the absolute plunder of the free ego, and for its appearance into existence.

## Conclusion

Finally, we finished tracing the possible specifics of the ego. Our research included fragments of our attitude to the ego as it should be. As well as, our previous presentation indicates the defense of a type of egos without devoting a special chapter to that whose existence we defend. We have up-lift the noble, the mutinous, the tragic, and the ascetic ego, and all these types of ego have a fundamentally moral dimension.

In fact, the moral existence of the ego as we have shown is realized in reality and history. Also, this existence is closely related to two concepts that haven't exhausted analysis: freedom and power.

Why do we associate these two concepts with conjunction "and"? Because our hypothesis is that there is never a separation between freedom and power in the level of ego analysis. Here we aren't talking about two concepts outside the field of the ego. So that our statement regarding the relationship of freedom and power isn't considered a general statement, we render a judgment that says:

The free ego is the necessarily strong ego. The strong ego is necessarily free. It makes no difference if we put the concept of freedom as a subject or in its relation to force. Let's define the concept of the strong ego in the framework of defining power in general. And its multiple specifics: Authority is power; because it has the power of coercion, domination, and control. The referee in such a framework is a theoretically strong man. Authority is power: This is a universal judgment that derives its validity from the exercise of power over others. And it's not about this that we're talking about.

If we analyze the concept of the strong ruler, we will find that he derives his strength from an external force. He is free - in the case of authoritarian rule - to use external force to subjugate others. He is in fact subject to external force, even if he is free to act on it. He is subject to the power of the authority that he thinks he owns it, but in fact, the opposite is true.

Authority and its hierarchy in our previous example make the concept of power relatively to the extent compatibility between two concepts of strength and weakness.

The tyrannical ruler is always afraid. Fear is weakness, and his tools in tyranny are the others weak in front of this weak and frightened person. Therefore, the tyrannical authority is in fact a mass of people who lack freedom and power.

This leads us to say that the strong ego is the one that derives its strength from itself, and is free to use its strength that specifies its freedom.

Also, money by general custom is power; because it allows its owner to exercise power over others. But the owner of money - the rich, is extremely weak; because he is already subject to the authority of money. He often shows his weakness in front of this authority, whether in the way he seeks money through it or in the way in which he keeps the money. Money remains - as well as authority - an external power. This confirms our saying that the strong ego is the one that contains a free inner force. If the strong ego is the one who derives its strength from within itself, then we can't isolate here the ego from strength, and the feeling of freedom.

As for how the ego is strong, this only appears in the field of courage, i.e. the courage to defend the ego against everything that defeats its freedom. Especially, when courage turns from a defense of ego freedom to a defense of freedom.

The strong ego is the one who looks at all the egos as originally free, or must enjoy freedom, i.e. looks at all the egos as being strong. The strong ego is the ego that feels its freedom. when it feels its freedom, it's always ready to defend its ego, as it's free.

Consciousness of freedom is the apparition of the existence of a true ego. Then it will necessarily be that the weak ego is that doesn't feel its freedom, or that who has given up its freedom, or that which doesn't have the courage to defend its freedom. Thus, he doesn't look at the other egos except in the framework of its view of its weak ego.

If the concepts indicating the strong, free ego are courage, bravery, sacrifice, dignity, adventure and the presence of the other as free ego, then the concepts indicating the weak ego are humble, indignity, cowardice, fear, submission, and contentment. The absence of the other in its life, here there is no difference between the concept of the noble ego, and the strong free ego, just as there is no difference between the trivial ego and the weak ego.

Whereas the free strong ego chooses prison in defense of its freedom, the weak ego chooses to be constrained in the present life, where the present life turns into a prison.

While the power, free ego renounces everything that restricts its freedom and power, the weak ego seeks everything that tyrannizes it, and its existence.

The strong, the free ego, loves its ego; because it's identical with its strength and freedom, that is, it loves power and freedom, finds no for its ego meaning without it, while the weak ego knows its ego only in all its trivial appearances. That is why love is the original emotion of the free ego, and love specifies the relationship of the ego to the other. Love, with all the beauty, truth, and goodness that fills the ego with pride. Only in this case, love turn into a vocation, and a spiritual energy destined to possess the world in its best form as an expression of the power of the free ego.

When the ego pricks up his ears to vocation, the value of duty and commitment to external rules diminishes in it. Fear, or the behavior resulting from it, doesn't find its way to it. Here, the other has become an existential value resulting from the ego's sense of its existential value.

No doubt that few people can reach this highest degree of love. The historical experience of man has shown that the individual benefit is stronger than the vocation of love. But this matter shouldn't absolve free souls from raising the voice of their vocation in behavior, and in words, may it transform with time into an ideal capable of creating a feeling of union and communication by others.

In each ego a seed, it often dies in the field of life, but can grow in the conditions of the vastness of freedom and the conditions of the expression of the varying inner strength of men.

Humans will never attain to conduct out of love, but a portion of love has become necessary for human beings; because the present life of the ego has become subject to all kinds of legal oppression and torture.

Will is the appearance of the ego in reality, as we said, that it's an act always goes outward and appears in some effect...the effect here is varied, but it's always an effect in reality. For sure, the same idea when it comes from the conscious ego, is an effect in the consciousness that appears.

The emergence of Will allows, in fact, an idea, a relationship with the world, and existence, so, in its relationship with the world, it sees its impact in society, things, people, and in its relationship with existence, since the emergence of its free existence. The world is external, and the effect of Will is external in it, while that existence is internal, and the effect of Will is awareness of the ego's position in existence.

Every voluntary action is the fruit of a vocation, not that of an external necessity. Rather, an act due to an external necessity isn't a voluntary act. The act of Will is similar to artistic creativity - literary, aesthetic in general. It's a free dance to the music of the inner ego. Working to provide the means of life isn't a voluntary act; Because it's devoid a vocation of the ego. Every act devoid of a vocation isn't a free act.

I want, that is, I manifest, and my perpetual multi-appearance, is the highest expression of my inner strength. Otherwise, the ego becomes a thing, and not a subject. Each ego devoid of inner strength that seeks to manifest is something. The will as an inner force can never remain imprisoned. The will isn't a latent force, it's always a visible force. when this force turns to the outside world, treats with it as nothing but "Hylomorphism or Hyle". It's, i.e. the force is The demiurge - Designer, Who gave Hyle its images.

The will doesn't ask itself: am I capable or not. It's a meaningless question; Because it doesn't set a distance between power- capacity, and its appearance. The will doesn't create its actions, but overflows from its action.

The will is an unhesitating force, it doesn't think; because it's thinking itself, and the relationship of the will with reality is one of mutual negation, there is a free struggle between the will and reality. And reality isn't the wrestling ring, no, it's the other side in the conflict. That is why history is the one of a permanent conspiracy against the will, a conspiracy to domesticate power by an external force majeure. An external force seeks to silence the vocation of power, so that the ego becomes governed by an external force, or imprisoned behind the walls of the making of history. Or say that history is the industry of forces to conquer the will. Political, social, cultural, and technical authority.

And because the relationship between the ego and reality is a relationship of mutual negation, as we have said, the relationship between possibility and reality in history, emerged to put an end to the will power as vocation, to open the way for the fruitful act of the will, or to establish a kind of reconciliation between the will and Reason.

Let's reflect on these relationships that were created, and start with the last relationship. Will and Reason.

From my point of view that distinction between Will and Reason is a very arbitrary. The will, as the consciousness of ego to its power directed to action, is Reason itself. It's impossible here to imagine two limits, one for the will and the other to Reason. Because the will is always conscious apart from any value judgment that some might make of this consciousness.

Thinking itself is a will; because it's a force that travels freely around the world, and what is Reason if it's not thinking itself! Since the will is consciousness, there is no need here to distinguish between a conscious will and an unconscious one. There is no unconscious will at all.

Every movement that the body makes, for example, by virtue of its own laws, or habit, is an involuntary movement. We don't say that it's an unconscious will. Because the will is a thinking, i.e. Reason, it tends to action, conscious of its own strength, the limits of its strength, and ability. Nobody thinks on his own that through the will, he can move a mountain from one place to another. But the action destined to move a mountain or remove it becomes a possible act after the will is armed with the technology necessary for that. The will in this sense is conscious of its power, and its interconnected capabilities with reality itself.

The will is a permanent force that establishes a conscious relationship with the world. In this conscious relationship, the will recognizes the possible and the impossible.

But if the issue remained in this context, there would be no dispute about the relationship of the will to the possible. However, the forces of suppression of the will are trying very hard to define the will from the outside with what is possible, and what is impossible, in order to restrain the will from venturing into the action that is directed to negating the world by changing it.

In politics as an authority, as a system, all efforts of repression, especially ideological ones, are made to prevent the will from expressing itself in practice, in the name that it - that is, this Will - must know its limits, and this is done out of fear of the will, began from the consciousness of the will power itself. Politics presents itself as the art of achieving the possible.

Occupation and Will are both power. But resistance is power and the will of power. The will of resistance is a conscious, an adventure power to triumph over the occupation power. The power of the occupier, and those who stand in fear of the will to resist, present the possibility as an obstacle to the act of will. They make victory impossible. Hence, we understand the ideological character of the concept of possibility. And the failure of the will to achieve its intended goals isn't related to the inability of the will, but rather to the relations of power between the wills. It's a contradiction to say helpless will.

As long as we say will, this means that we are facing a specific manifestation of the will. The incapable has no will in the first place.

This doesn't mean that the will is absolute power, and absolute ability to act. What determines and limits the act of the will is the reality itself, as we have indicated. Hence, we understand the condemnation of voluntarism launched by some against those who raise the status of the will.

We fall here in a complex web that isn't without solid ideological threads, as the motive

behind condemning voluntarism isn't always an innocent one. Especially when it comes to the relationship between will and history.

If someone says: The will is a power capable of doing what it wants, then we must believe it on the basis that the will can do whatever it wants, when we know that it does what thinks it's capable of doing, and is achievable.

But if we repeat such a statement in order to refute it by giving examples of actions in which the will is incapable of performing it, then, this is a kind of stupid discussion of the issue. The will doesn't announce its ability unless it's conscious of its ability, did we not say that it is always conscious? No Subject can claim that it's capable of carrying a ton of cement on its back; because it's subject conscious of the impossibility of this matter. So, the issue doesn't return to a metaphysical discussion about the will, but rather to the designation of the will as a free agent, and conscious of the limits of its effectiveness, for which external, objective reality is the most important element of its conscious of its ability, and its active power.

Then, criticism of voluntarism on the grounds that its owners don't to value highly the reality, resulting from the difference in the perception of the relationship between the will and reality on this or that party. The clear formulation of the difference is the following: Voluntary ones declare: that the reality as it should to be, it's in this way, and that the will is the one that achieves the reality as it should to be. Those who criticize them declare that the will can't achieve its conception of reality as it should to be from your point of view, oh voluntary ones; because the objective conditions don't allow any will to achieve its conception, but the will is capable of achieving another form of reality. This debate produces three types of will: Radical revolutionary, the reformist, and the conservative.

Revolutionary Will in its utmost is consciousness of power. It's an adventurous power, and we meant here an adventure in the deep sense of the word. Life is an adventure, not ask about the price it has to pay, and it pays without hesitation. It's the will of the noble ego I was talking about.

I swear that, the role of this type of will in history is greater than we imagine, and more important than we think. Rather, it's responsible for the major revolutions in history, especially when history awaits it. Or even if it didn't succeed in what it aspires to. This the will drives the resisting spirit to enter the awaited living world, as I have already said. Can this the will make history as it pleases? Certainly not, it's born from the womb of history, and pulls the new born in the womb of history itself. Its failure and success are

another matter, it's enough its free to embark on the historical adventure, and is conscious of this adventure.

While the reformist Will is limited in its adventure, and its limited in its goals, it's a transforming power, but it doesn't see change except from the perspective of its interests, not from the perspective of its power.

In the face of a radical adventurous will. The revolutionary stands for the conservative will, which is as strong as the revolutionary will. It wants to preserve a reality that is the best of all possible worlds, if not the only one it's satisfied with.

Thus, we get the conflict of wills, the struggle of powers, and we obtain, therefore, the image of history, its process that is inseparable from the human will.

In fact, the danger facing human history lies in the following incident: History may carry in its womb a new-born child, but it doesn't have a will capable of acting in order for this child to be born. As if the will here is midwife, so the newborn dies in the womb of history without seeing the light, and the era of stagnation and waiting for a new pregnancy begins.

Or that there is an adventurous, revolutionary will that breaks into history while carrying pseudocyesis. The blood of the will flows without watering a plant, or without the trees of history flowering. A reader may object, saying: You confuse the individual will with the collective will, so that we hardly discern your understanding of the will?

I'm talking about the will of man in his individuality, and in his collectiveness. There is no doubt that the individual will, and the ego's Will vary in the field of its effectiveness. I mean the will of the ego that radiates over human history through the will of individuals that awakens at crucial moments in history. The narrow field of the will in daily life remains inferior to its effectiveness in collective history. Inferior in terms of its role in life. The great life, the major events, is the unity of human wills in their varying role. This is what allows us to say: It's the role of Lenin and the role of the one who launched the Aurora shells, but there is no point in equating the value of the will of this and that of the other, or separate the two wills.

I go back to history, which, as we mentioned, is a struggle of wills, a struggle of power; because it's bound in view of its intimate relationship with human destiny. Even the individual will in its daily life is linked to the individual criterion. The driving concept in human destiny is salvation. So, salvation is the basis of human tragedy; because it carries of salvific thoughts, salvific behavior, and egos that are seen as saviors, and creators of salvific ideas.

The idea of salvation doesn't appear except in the field of the feeling of torments, and in this field the will turns to the path of salvation, and pays the necessary price for it. Because they are engaged in a conflict of powers, and contradictory and mutually exclusive wills.

All revolutions are salvation ones, starting from the slave revolution in Rome to the October Revolution in St. Petersburg. From the peasant uprising in Germany in the days of Mozer to the Palestinian uprising in Jerusalem.

The driving concept of salvation is freedom that is only conscious of itself thanks to the human will. Then the main contradiction in history becomes the contradiction of freedom and slavery, and the consciousness of the will of its slavery means that it actually exists in order to specifies itself in a free reality, even if its victory leads to a new slavery, this in turn creates its opposite and so on. From here we also understand the idea of the end of history as the final victory of freedom, but the idea of the final victory of freedom is an ideological idea; because it closes the door of history to freedom always seeking to specifies itself, and puts an end to the will of human beings always seeking salvation. Because the conflict of wills is a struggle between a free will that knows no bounds to its freedom, and a will that denies freedom. But the will that denies freedom is a will that wants to seize freedom, and deny it to others. It denies it through the permanent suppression of the will that denies the freedom of the redemptive will. The prison, repression, killing, spreading fear...etc. These well-known, and persistent methods are but a manifestation of the conflict of wills.

This is how we must understand occupation, colonialism, racial discrimination, and tyrannical rule. Aren't all these historical forms a free will against the freedom of others, and the monopoly of freedom at the expense of the freedom of the other?

The whites in South Africa in the days of apartheid are nothing but the class of free-wheels who want the continuation of the slavery of the blacks, and the revolution of the blacks is nothing but a revolution of salvation from slavery to be free, as is the case in Palestine, which is now witnessing the biggest struggle between the freedom of the occupier, which is based only on the continuation of the slavery of the colonial occupiers who lost their land, freedom, and their dignity by brute force.

Thus, a black person, and the Palestinian replace their slavery to the white person, and the Zionist with the freedom of their struggle in order to achieve the freedom of their existence, or their free existence.

Only Tyrant, Despot, Colonizer, Occupier, and Racist fear the freedom of others, and

in these people, the blatant form of denial of the other appears, the denial of the will of the other. Because the will is freedom.

I generalize this idea, and say: The class, ethnic and sectarian conflict is a struggle of wills over and for freedom. Much has been written on this subject.

Yet, Our research in the ego has led us to the following definition of the free ego: It's the ego that is able to appear publicly, and without any fission between the hidden, and the overt ego.

The continuing chasm between the ego can't reveal itself, and ego declare in a way that isn't identical with his hidden ego, means that the ego isn't free to apparition.

The free ego is the real apparition, and not just apparition. It's difficult for any ego to distinguish between true and false apparition of the other ego. Only the ego knows itself. When the whole ego reaches the stage of removing its fission between that it keeps to itself and what it declares, it's freed from fear, lying, hypocrisy, death, weakness, and these are all cases that negate freedom.

If we have talked about the oppression of the transcendental system that transforms the ego into an apparent and a hidden one, the ego, by liberating it from fission, turns the ego into an ego without a cave.

The ego becomes free in its relation to it, and the moment the ego becomes free in relation to the transcendent system, this in turn becomes a non-transcendent world. The relationship becomes one of love and not one of duty and obligation.

I swear that, the ego's liberation from its alienation in fission or fissions makes freedom a real existence of the ego, for the ego - then - transforms politics into free action, morals into free action, and expression of omnipresence into free action. The humorous field of existence narrows in response to the tragic expansion of existence, and the ego is liberated from captivity.



# Fragments



### Philosopher

Philosopher isn't a star; because a star is seen only in the dark. he isn't an orator; because the orator needs hands to clap. he isn't a preacher; because the preacher lies. he isn't a teacher; because the teacher like to have students. he isn't a messenger; because the messenger needs an oracle from heaven. he isn't a knight; because the knight unsheathes his sword. he isn't an

authority; because the authority suppresses. he isn't a pen for rent; because the rented pen writes to take.

Philosopher is a son, who appears in the daylight. And he hid at night, and when he appears, he asks what you've been doing? He answers: I was fulfilling myself with the truth. Philosopher is ego, that thinks and lands on fire. The more he burns, the more he can fly, he loves the fire; because he doesn't like to see the world become ashes.

He doesn't fear hell, and doesn't covet heaven, he is mystical has no temple to worship. His main concern is to weave the feathers of the wings and give them to people lying on the soil, cave dwellers, blindfolded, and happy with their handcuffs. The philosopher isn't memorizing the thought rules. he constantly creates those rules and doesn't stop at a limit.

Not anyone who knows the rules of play is good at playing.

The winds don't ask the earth about the time to blow, the hurricanes don't ask permission from trees when it comes mad, and the rain doesn't beg the sky when it falls. As well the philosopher is winds, hurricanes, and rain.

Philosopher doesn't come down to the valley to address people. Rather, he remains at the top, and invites people to ascend to him. Because most of them hate ascend, they hate him.

He isn't realist; because his main enemy is reality, he aspires to the possible, but he is the infinite possible. Because he can't stand in one place. The philosopher doesn't spend his life seeking the light; because his head is the lantern that ignites it with a spark from his heart. Therefore, his light doesn't fade; because it's from him.

Philosopher is a pen, who doesn't ask permission from the inkwell so that it not to turn her face away from him, he hates to inkwell to beg for him; because if it happened his face will blush in shame and get silent. The philosopher is a pen, who rapes the inkwell

to make ecstasy.

He doesn't deny the accusation against him that he thinks about others, who don't think. When he knows that people make decisions with their own minds, he will happily hold them to his chest.

The language is the horse of the philosopher. Because this is so, he likes wide plains.

The

language is the ship of the philosopher, which is why he likes sailing.

The language is the philosopher's wing; and that is why he likes flying. Every language isn't horse, ship or wings is the language of the dead.

The philosopher is a phoenix.

### Mutineer

The Mutineer is a twinkled spirit, who knew that the entire world is a cramped prison. He refused the prison in the vulgar, and he made the impossible idea. His nourishment is the wine of 'no'. The mutinous is abstinent necessarily, mystical in his own way. He finds the difficult easiest, and he lives the constant anxiety. His body isn't outwardly, he writes with the body and the pen. The Mutiny of the body means that the fear of death has disappeared, "life is a

moment of glory and victory," many have said it, there is no one like the Mutineer who knows the joy of refusing; the authority always looking for him, seducing him with the water of

blessings, the bliss of blessings, so that he falls, when he is down from the honourable place of 'no', will be forgotten.

Guevara tried the mutiny; he tried to sit behind the table. When he releases that he will die on his chair alive, he left it quickly in order to stay in the memory. The mutinous is Obscene par excellence; because obscenity is pleasure towards nothingness. Mutineer doesn't achieve

victory, if he does, and rests; he vanishes. He is an eagle swooped on the bat in himself first. Who didn't kill the bat that stands in himself, he won't mutinous.

Philosopher is Mutineer; when he declares his absolute alienation from reality, the poet is Mutineer, when he explodes the language to build beauty springs. Mutineer is dynamite from a spirit that doesn't know where to explode. He is extremely interested, but he indifferent about himself.

Who is mutinous on his poorness, he won't seek richness or affluence, and mutineer on authority; he doesn't want authority.

## Poet6

Poet sees what eyes can't see. He hacks the invisibility, and put it in the hands of souls who like to disclose. He is an unfamiliar language in a bizarre world. The language remains dead until the poet revives it, He dresses it in a beauty suit, releases words from darkness and mold, and transforms it into a bell ringing announcing the prayer time rejoicing in beauty.

Poet gives us meaning when exceeds the lack of existence - Autumn of existence to existence spring. Every exceeds means an expression of freedom. Poet is the tongue of the possible existence, or staying in existence as it should be.

Poet is like the philosopher who looks out the balcony of existence to hack the existence secret. To expose the secret. The poet has no work except sneaking around the closed rooms to announce what is inside them, the scandals that the residents are afraid of spreading it. This is the poet, mutineer with privilege, carrying human worries without care for the night watchmen, he says to get angry.

This is the idea of the poet; dancing in an astounding aesthetic Outfit.

Poetry isn't praise, slander, lament, or flirtation. Poetry is revelation, intuition that doesn't care about logic.

Poet is inspirer the philosopher.

### Dictator

He kept crawl on his abdomen for a long time, many stomped him in their way, and they didn't see him, he hides all his pain, grudges, and fear. When he is sure that he is capable to put handcuffs on erect legs, he put it up and erect. He is the dictator, the hate, that assumed the likeness of a perfect man, he took refuge in the palace as a mouse living his life afraid of the trap. A bat looking for a vein, he sucks all the veins till he is sure that all the veins are veins of the dead. The pen rushes to him to hold her in his bosom, don't blame him, but feel pity for the hands that applauded to get close to him, throats that glorify his name for fear, the natural talents that wrote for him the poems out of greed, and the dancers around his chair as monkeys sadly.

Dictator is the most skilled who paving toward death and destruction.

### Trivial Egos

He is mistaking, who respects humans; because they are in human form. Contempt for trivial man is piety.

Trivial man who never tried to climb; so, prefers to accommodation beneath. All who are addicted to accommodation beneath are the lowest men.

Trivial man is a worm in a cocoon, so don't ask the cocoon what is its color, form, and material; It's enough that it hides a worm that is afraid of flying. Merchant is a worm in a money cocoon, and the small handworker is a warm pupate in the muscles that seek sustenance.

Painter hate the house that he paints; the construction worker grudged the wall. The trivial ego is a submissive slave for something outside its ego. It's something that sleeps in answers it has nothing to do with making it; don't wake him up.

Everyone who fears scandal is trivial (Ego), and a keeper of secrets that can't be revealed, keep his secret and his tongue is a mean for lying. He pleads for the satisfaction of others.

"When your head is nailed to the ceiling so how your feet will march, when your hands are chained to your neck so how you will know the joy of hugging, and when you sleep in certainty, when you confront". Said to the trivial man.

When your eyes are without tears; how do you love, when you are satisfied, how do you dream, and when you see beauty as useful; how do you feel the excitement of your existence?

Trivial man: a nailed head to the ceiling, hands chained to the neck, a constant sleeper in certainty, eyes without tears, and fake satisfaction. The trivial man is a world without beauty.

Despise, Oh noble ego, men who live their life in a masquerade. Don't despise a slave; who doesn't know he is a slave. Feel pity for him, otherwise, the ones who know they are slaves and are satisfied with it; turn your face away from them.

The trivial man doesn't like ego, but he hates the other. Informer human hunter, a jailer of souls that he is afraid of souls, and the executioner enjoying the sound of the whip, they are all things.

The Arab Prophet Mohammed Bin Abdullah (Peace be upon him) said: ((The resurrection day won't come until the appearance of the people who are beneath the people and no one knows them, and perish of notable people and their nobles)). Oh, Aba Al-Qasim the resurrection day has come and no one knows.

## On Values

### Piteousness:

Piteousness is the worst emotion, rather, it isn't an emotion. It's euphemistic sadist, taking pleasure in contempt for other. A refusal to be in the position of other who to be pitied. The person who pities other cannot grieve. Sadness is the real emotion so ever.

### Love:

Many love God; because they fear him. Don't believe them. The one who loves something doesn't fear it.

If you were driven by duty, this means that you are a normal person, subject to obligation from outside of you. Because it's, you are able escape it. Duty is something that forces you to obey without your desire, and it needs an authority to control it. Observe law is duty; because it imposes punishment on those who work against it. The duty is to make freedom a legal right. However, love is the vocation that the person hears. When you are in love, you won't fear anything. Don't ask why.

Love is the ultimate good...faith is the right. "None of you has faith until he loves for his brother what he loves for himself", The greatest value in Islam. It's the most important Islamic ritual; because it's the only ritual that feels you with your humanity.

In love, your sadness, dance, and words are true. Love is true with ego.

When you laugh intentionally, this means that you take a step back from the edge of the swamp. When you dance because it's requested of you, it means that you have entered the swamp completely. If you use the swamp as a stage to talk, know that you have become a swamp.

In love, you become free in space, playing with the breeze and the wind. When love enters your heart, haters will be meaningful. Because love frees your heart from envy, and love is standard your position, it becomes the light that enables you to see the world. When you see the world with the light of love, then you hate the darkness side in others, and freed from the darkness side in your own ego?

### Falseness:

Don't see your face in the mirror. Hence, the mirror is lying to you, and you, in turn, will lie to yourself. Don't see your face in the mirrors of others, they were also lying to you. Close your eyes, and contemplate yourself to learn honesty, self-reflection is the only thing that shows your true face.

The woman, who lives in a palace of marble with man who flaunts his pocket, will continue her life by lying to the palace and pocket. The woman will continue searching for a warm home, and an understanding man.

The strange paradox to get used to the lies of others through your praise until you believe their lies. Lying is assaulting other and your ego.

### Death:

Always remember that life is to dance to the melodies of death. It's out of stupidity to be one of the onlookers; because if you do so, you will live in a fantasy.

They forgot death because they believe that they are escaping it. There is no way; you will crash into the wall.

In remembering death, life becomes beautiful; because you know the end.

In remembering death, tragedy becomes a cause for laughing, and a comedy.

If you haven't tasted the honey of tragedy, that's your problem. If you lived tragedy, you would be free from the fear.

How foolish it's to die rich! Obscenity is the revenge of nothingness. Death is the real nothingness. Anything else isn't nothingness.

### Wolf Nature:

If you're a wolf, you should stay a wolf, Because, if you return a lamb, they will gloat at you. When you realize that you will return a lamb, kill yourself immediately.

If you accept to be a lamb, after frightening others with your fangs, you will only be a lamb dressed as a wolf. Thus, if you raise your sword to kill other wolves, you won't succeed until you kill the wolf inside you.

The world is a jungle. This is right. The most beautiful jungles are the wolf jungles, where democracy and freedom are bred. That is the right meaning of freedom: the

equal distribution of power.

If a wolf uses the logic of power against you, it's vain to reply using the logic of power. It's true that "Be tough as a wolf, lest wolves eat you."

No... No... you won't be safe from wolves by closing your home; because one day you will go out.

It isn't Reason that who doesn't have fangs; Reason has no function but predation.

Illusions:

((No man ever steps in the same river twice)) Heraclitus said. But he is mistaken and delusional.

How many people – For thousand years- swimming in the same river water. If you didn't believe then contemplate consciousness.

Then Heraclitus forgot that what flows in the river water is water.

\* \* \*

The people love the winds that go as the ships wishes; Because they don't know that the most beautiful wind is that goes against the wish of the ships, and the most beautiful ships are that goes against the wish of the wind.

It's an illusion to think that there is a struggle between two rights, the right doesn't contradict itself, the opposite of right is falsehood.

the trivial ego isn't the one who doesn't know the difference between the right and the falsehood. Rather, it's the one who knows the right and abuses it. Or that who is afraid to walk in the way of achieving the right.

The beginning illusion is like the end illusion, which means fake knowledge.

The money owner thinks that the money is a tool for him, what if he meditates a little, and know that he is a tool for the money?

The end

