



A NEW SYSTEM OF PHILOSOPHY-SCIENCE FROM THE BIOLOGICAL STANDPOINT

Şaban Teoman Duralı



IBN HALDUN
UNIVERSITY

A NEW SYSTEM OF
PHILOSOPHY-SCIENCE
FROM THE
BIOLOGICAL STANDPOINT

ŞABAN TEOMAN DURALI



IBN HALDUN
UNIVERSITY
—◆—
P R E S S



IBN HALDUN
UNIVERSITY
P R E S S

A New System of Philosophy-Science from
the Biological Standpoint

Author: Şaban Teoman DURALI

Editet by: Savaş C. TALİ

ISBN: 978-605-67533-3-6

2nd Revised

Published: İstanbul/2019

Executive Editor: Savaş C. TALİ

Publishing Director: Miraç GÜNDÜZ

Layout: Mevlüt Sami ERTEM

Cover Design: Duran AYDOS

Imprinting and Binding: Step Ajans Matbaa Ltd. Şti.

Göztepe Mah. Bosna Cad. No: 11 Bağcılar / İstanbul

Tel: 0212 446 88 46 - Sertifika No:12266

Ibn Haldun

University Press: Ulubatlı Hasan Cd. No: 2 34494

Başakşehir / İstanbul

Tel: 0212 692 0212

Ibn Haldun University Press
is a department of
Ibn Haldun University

Duralı, Şaban Teoman.

A new system of philosophy-science from the biological standpoint / Şaban Teoman Duralı, editor Savaş C Tali. – 2. ed. -- İstanbul : Ibn Haldun University Press, 2019.

272 p. ; 24 cm.

Bibliographical references and index

ISBN 978-605-67533-3-6

1. Philosophy of Biology. 2. Philosophy of science. 3. Philosophy and science. 4. Bioculture

QH 331

574.01

All rights reserved. Expect for excerpts cited in a review or similar published discussion of this publication, no part of this work may be any means whatever including electronic without prior permission of the copyright owner.©

Şaban Teoman Duralı

Turkish philosopher, professor, academician.

Şaban Teoman Duralı was born on 7th February, 1947 at Zonguldak. After completing his primary school education in Zonguldak, he continued his middle school education at Ankara and graduated from Ankara TED College. In 1973, Teoman Duralı graduated from Philosophy department at Istanbul University. He continued his academic career as an assistant in Istanbul University through 1975. He completed his doctorates on the Philosophy of Biology and commenced in 1977. After one year, he attended biotechnology seminars in Paris as a scholarship holder of NATO. In 1982, Duralı became Assistant Professor and in the same year, he became Associative Professor. In 1985 he became professor. He gave lectures in International Islamic University Malaysia and University of Vienna as visiting scholar in the 1993 and 1994. He made a research trip to Central Asia Turkic Republics by the support of Istanbul University Research Fund. Between 1992 and 1999, he continued giving lectures as visiting scholar between Malaysia. He also founded Philosophy Department in Kırklareli University and between 2009 and 2015 he was dean of Science and Literature Faculty at same university. At present, he is President of Philosophy Department in İbni Haldun University. His research topics are Logic, History of Ancient Philosophy, History of Early Modern European Philosophy, History of Turk-Islam Thought, Epistemology, Comparative History of Religions, History of Islam, Anthropology, Cell Physiology, Human Physiology, Anatomy, Evolution and Genetics.

CONTENTS

Introduction to the Second Edition	7
Acknowledgement	21
Proem	23

Part One

Aristotle's Thoughts Concerning the Problem of the Living Beings and Their Evolution

I - Intellectual Circumstances wherein the Aristotelian Thought Unfolded...	29
II - The Emergence of Philosophy-Science	41
III - The Bounds of Change	44
IV – Conclusion	58

Part Two

The Philosophy of Biology

I - Attempts at Defining the Philosophy of Biology.....	61
II - Theoretical Biology	65
III- History of Biology in General.....	87
IV-Bioethics.....	97

Part Three

Biological Foundations of A Priori Cognitive Faculties The Philosophy of Biology

I - Synopsis.....	107
II- Can the Hypothesis of A Priori Knowledge ever become a Scientific Theory?	108
III- The Biological Origin of A Priori Cognitive Faculties and their Implications	110
IV- Conclusion.....	121

Part Four

Philosophy-Science from the Biotic Standpoint

I- Synopsis.....	125
II- The Process of Humanization.....	127
III- The Top Stage of Humanization: The Emergence of Philosophy-Science	136
Peroration	155

ADDITIONAL ARTICLES

Addition I. Spanish Synopsis of the Article	185
Addition I. English Version of the Article.....	188
Addition II. Spanish Synopsis of the Article	218
Addition II. English Version of the Article.....	223
I. Initium Sapientiae Timor Domini	228
II. Amor Feminae	229
III. Ecce Homo	236
IV. Homo Sapiens Sapiens	242
Bibliography	257
Index	269

Two things fill the mind with ever new and increasing admiration and awe, the oftener and more steadily they are reflected on: the starry heavens above me, and the moral law within me.

Immanuel Kant

(Critique of Practical Reason, 1788)

to
my Mother and my Wife
“Heaven lieth underneath the feet of Mothers”
Prophet Muhammad

INTRODUCTION TO THE SECOND EDITION

WHAT IS THE NAME OF OUR PRESENT DAY CIVILIZATION?

The Fear To Denominate The Contemporaneous Civilization!

In addition to the philosophy of biology, a scheme for a new philosophy- science system based upon life sciences, the third principal thesis I deal with in this book is about the present-day global civilization, I call 'English-Jewish'.

Herewith I investigate, first of all, what 'culture' and 'civilization' respectively mean, again, within the framework of the philosophy of science and most particularly one of its resulting problems, 'evolution.' Then, I follow culture's historical trail; and try to pinpoint how 'civilization' has grown out of some cultures.

Historically the most remarkable civilizations have taken place on the huge Eurasian landmass. Eurasian civilizations I arrange in two principal groups: Oriental set of civilizations -three 'stars': Ancient Chinese; Indian and pre-Islamic Iranian- and Occidental set of civilizations -eight 'stars': Ancient Mesopotamian; Anatolian; Egypto-Mediterranean -Egyptian, Phoenician, Hebrew and Cretan-Mycenean-; Antique Tegean, Mediaeval Christian, Islamic, Modern secular West European and finally Contemporaneous globAbdel-Fattah, Nabil With the demise of Western Roman Empire in 476 the Antique Aegean civilization -to which Romans belonged as well-ends and the Mediaeval Christian starts to exist. The Modern secular West European civilization, which arises around in the 1500s, is not the successor to the Mediaeval Christian one. Just to the contrary, it comes up to oppose the Mediaeval Christian civilization.

In fact, religion had, throughout history, been the essence of all cultures and civilizations. The first not to depend on religion is the Modern West European. Instead it is basically a philosophical civilization. Philosophy's foundation stone is rationality. In turn, rationality has become the corner-stone of this new civilization.

Rationality is the pure act of thinking. Within rationality, feelings are deliberately kept out of the process, in rationality the pure intellectual process is called ratiocination. During the process a clear-cut view can be gained about how the last-appearing thought proceeds from the former one. Thereby an overt demarcation line can be drawn between a correct conclusion and an erroneous one. Where we have a clear perception about the rules that define and govern correct thinking, we speak of a clear perception about the rules that define and govern correct thinking, we speak of formalized reasoning or, in short, formalization. Philosophy-science and especially Galilean-Cartesian-Newtonian, briefly, 'classical' mechanics is the culmination of formalization.

The founding fathers of Modern West European civilization took mechanics' analytical formalized frame out of context and tried to spread its explanatory power out to all holes and corners of nature and society. Moreover they maintained that every reasonable civilized person should think along the rules of ratiocination -that is, formalistic logic. The result is known as rationalism.

God came to be replaced by 'rationality' -and not 'reason', which already exists in the monotheistic religion. Rationalism took over the centre stage that had been evacuated by the Faith. This so-called 'liberation' from 'religion'¹ is labeled as Liberalism.

Religion is a moral affair, whereas rationalism is operative. Morality restrains. It is restrictive. Contrariwise, thanks to operation you can attain any possible purpose. Thus while morality inhibits, operability liberates you from restrictions and opens a wide range of prospects.

1 Which the Humanist Enlightenment philosophers branded as 'ignorance.'

Consequently, once, society steers clear of religion (secularism), morality in the long run -i.e. through public education- will be kept at bay -political and economic Liberalism-: “Laissez-faire, laissez-aller”.

Modern secular West European civilization with secularism-liberalism as its central ideology was constructed after a paradigm derived from the Fifteenth to Seventeenth-centuries -humanist-enlightened- French culture by certain philosophers² who leaned on *Descartes*' method-inducing rationalist philosophy. The said civilization was the outcome of socio-politico-economic circumstances peculiar to European history -first and foremost the schism between clergy and lay; then, the ever-increasing divisions among the lay: Socio-economic class structure.³ This class structure was particularly prominent in two West European countries; the perpetual rivals, England and France. So, liberal winds, in differing degrees, were already blowing in England since *Magna Carta* (1215). As an ideology, however, coming over the English channel, it reached England in the mid-Eighteenth century. It received its final touches at the hands of British philosophers like Anthony, David *Hume* and Adam *Smith* who concomitantly put down the ideological bases of Capitalism as well.

I said, Modern West European was a philosophically based civilization. To be precise, it stood on ideology. So what is, then, ideology? It is a close-circuit philosophy construction. Every independent thought-producing -and the product is called judgement- circuit in a ratiocination is an inference. In an inference there is/are (a) starting term/s. Through the middle term/s you reach a conclusion. The 'end- point', that is, the conclusion of an inference, according to philosophy's principal methodology 'dialectics', will, eventually, assume the role of a 'starting-point' -or premise- of a freshly initiating inference. This process goes on and on. Therefore in philosophy-science no conclusion -in the form of judgement or

2 Montesquieu, Rousseau, Voltaire, Diderot, Helvetius.

3 The nobility, land aristocracy, serfdom, bourgeoisie, proletariat.

knowledge- can be considered as final and definite. Conclusions are there to be transferred into premises. The conclusion reached, when submitted to an unremitting, harsh test, becomes the premise of the next initiating inference and serves thereupon as the thesis. The 'criticizing' of the 'thesis' is an 'antithesis'. The 'encounter' of the 'thesis' with the 'antithesis' yields the 'synthesis' -i.e. conclusion. If the synthesis (i.e. conclusion) is withdrawn from any further logico-empirical justification-exam, it turns into a 'dogma'. Dogma do not remain exclusively within the frame of philosophy. They are socio-politically involved.

The logically knit network of dogma forms a doctrine; and an ideology is made up of doctrines stemming from the same author -i.e. philosopher- and striving towards a common socio-politico-economic denominator. No way to question the dogma constituting the doctrine/s of the ideology. Each of them represent an aspect of the ultimate, undisputable truth. In religion there is always a certain space to move around -i.e. interpretation- within the various faiths which form the creed. After all the faiths are believed to be God-given. Since they are transhuman, they can and even must be brought down to the level of human reasoning. Otherwise they are left beyond human understanding. Most particularly the Monotheist religion possesses self-confidence. Especially Judaism and more vehemently Islam reject transhuman mediators in worldly human shape between God and man. Therefore no human can be considered infallible. This is not the case with ideologies. They are, in fact, reason- produced, man-made items that do not find their justification and legacy in sanctity. So, they are open to all sorts of interferences coming from others. In order to enforce with a touch of miracle, encircled with some sort of a halo. To strengthen the imposition of ideology's socio-political and economic hegemony -i.e. regime- very often violent means have been on the agenda.

Now, after all these deliberations, it gets clear that ideology and freedom are not compatible. The degree of limitations of liberties alter

from ideology to ideology. At the bottom line the most at-liberty-appearing ideology, as liberalism itself, is a far cry from being liberal.

The first two rings of the chain of ideologies are Liberalism and Capitalism. The coming into being of both ideologies coincided. As told above. Liberalism's stuff was prepared by the Seventeenth-century free-thinking French philosophers. It was then taken over to Britain, where it got worked out into a fully fledged ideology, particularly by David Hume and Adam Smith. Coincidentally both -and to some extent Thomas Hobbes- laid Capitalism's foundation stone as well. Indeed, Capitalism was going to become the backbone of the newly arising in: Anglo-Judaic world civilization. This new civilization that appeared from the 1790s onward could be accepted as the direct successor to Modern secular West European civilization. Just like the latter, the former took materialism-mechanicism, derived from classical mechanics, as its background world view. It only differed from Modern West European that it was not overtly secular any more.

The Catholic version of the entire-humanity-embracing Christianity got split into pieces. Each piece assumed the shape of a national religion. Like Judaism one of the single portions of Protestantism, that is Anglicanism evolved as legitimizer of national interests and aspirations. So the way got opened for the two inevitable pillars of Capitalism, namely, colonialism and imperialism, and globalization is a continuation of imperialism. This process is unique in history. We do not find an example or a model in the past. It started in Britain with the English sitting at the helm of the enterprise and the Jews financing the unheard novel undertaking with money and know-how. The firsthand laboratory where this original and ambitious hypothesis had been submitted to test was New England that would later become the United States of America. Continental Europe became the springboard whence Capitalism and in its wake Anglo-Judaic civilization started its unstoppable world conquering campaign. In Continental Europe

France, the leading culture and heartland of Modern West European civilization, had become Anglo-Judaic civilization's primary world view export target. Hence the French Revolution, first in Judaic civilization's primary world view export target. Hence the French Revolution, first in its kind in history. Surely enough, the French, particularly the Parisians rose up against despotism and corruption. That was the rebellion side of the coin. What about the revolution? This, in turn, is more complex in its composition than revolt or rebellion. It needs first and foremost financial backing in order to get organized and by that to seize the political power. The French Revolution received the necessary financial support from over the channel. Mainly the Knight Templars⁴ transformed version, Freemasons were ready to run for help.

Modern West European civilization's central ideology Liberalism bore a political character. It emphasized a politicized social order in the form of State -'civitas' in Latin; thence 'civilisation' in French. The State's political order was advocated to be laic republicanism. Laicism is the contrary of theocracy, that is, the State ruled by a so-called God-sanctioned class. This class is known to be clerical. The political power yielded by the clerics is theocracy. Secularism is the education of the upcoming generations far from religious concerns and fervour. So, while laicism is a political order, secularism is a social, to be more precise, educational organization. Liberalism encompasses both laicism and secularism. Its republicanism differs from what we understand today under that term. The enlightened republicanist French of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth centuries translated, like the Romans, the Greek word 'democracy' into 'republic' -'res publica' in Latin, meaning 'public affairs.' Thus a monarchy could very well be republican, that is, democratic. The English and their north European followers, the Dutch, Swedes and Danes, did not conceive 'republic' in the Latin-French sense. They, naturally, switched over to the term

4 Who vowed revenge against French monarchy after they were massacred by the order of Philip (IV) the Fair in 1307.

‘democracy’ and nurtured a special distaste for ‘republic.’⁵ They regarded it as the form of a State’s regime, while ‘democracy’ came to mean the content of the socio-political order. America’s philosophical founding fathers took over ‘republic’ and ‘democracy’ exactly in their English (Anglosaxon) meanings. Hence the United States was to become a ‘democratic republic’ and not a ‘monarchic’ one.

‘Democracy’, nevertheless, is a tricky affair. It was applied in the true sense of the term only once in history, namely, by the Athenians and their allies. So we should not see democracy as something Greek. Although Greek as well, the Spartans were applied democracy in its full sense. It was every male citizen’s duty -not right, but duty- to participate in all political and judicial affairs. In normal circumstances he was not entitled to delegate his political and judicial duties to someone else. Representative democracy emerged long afterwards, during Rome’s republican era. When I, personally, cannot directly take part in the political and judicial decisionmaking process, no way to speak about democracy any more. In short, to delegate democratic duties and rights to someone else is undemocratic in itself. ‘Democracy’ as it is used and applied in our days within the frame of the Capitalist Anglo-Judaic civilization is, therefore, a far cry from the sense content of this term. Well, is it applicable under the existing socio-political and demographic circumstances? Simply, no. Then, why so much fuss about it? It is an efficient weapon thanks to which the Anglo-Judaic civilization can pursue its imperialist goals. Yesterday it used its gunboats. Today it puts into practice smokescreen-concepts like democracy, liberty and human rights. Through these concepts and the like it seeks to dupe people all over from A to Z. Concepts and ideas have become the most lethal weapons of our time. Not to forget that the global Anglo-Judaic one is, after all, a philosophically based civilization. Where concepts and ideas do not suffice, tanks, planes, battleships and all sorts of bombs are still there ready at hand to be put into practice.

5 Among the factors of this ‘distaste’ we find the customary English antipathy towards the French.

All major Eurasian civilizations have forged specific terms in order to denote that which does not conform with their cultural peculiarities and standards. In the Antique Asgean civilization it was the “Barbarikos”, in the Mediaeval Christian “Paganus”, in the Islamic “Kafir”, and the ancient Iranian civilization denominated the outsider, stranger as “Turam”. Whoever steps beyond the permissible social, political and most importantly economic limits of the Anglo-Judaic civilization is right away a “Terrorist”. This term, of course, has changed its meaning. In the Nineteenth century Terrorism was the name of a breakaway-ideology -from Anarchism. In the 1980s it began to assume within Anglo-Judaic civilization’s denotative context the meaning of “Barbarism” -“Terrorism”.

The main clear-cut distinction between Modern secular West European and Contemporaneous globalized Anglo-Judaic civilizations was brought about by the principal ideologies on which each of them depended. Of course, we already come across Capitalism’s ‘seeds’ in the extending and more and more liberalized trade connections between the Islamic world and late Mediaeval Christian countries of south and north-west Europe in the mid-1200s. Especially the above-mentioned trend liberalized trade connections between the Islamic world and late Mediaeval Christian countries of south and north-west Europe in the mid-1200s. Especially the above- mentioned trend became more manifest from the 1300s onward in Italy, France, the Netherlands, England, Denmark, Sweden and North Germany (Hansa-league). As an ideology in its own right it came into being only in the mid-Eighteenth century.

Those who masterminded Capitalism did not put aside their obligation to lay out the scheme of an alternative as well. To plan for all possible options that lay ahead is the epicentre of English and Jewish genius. Just as Theodor Herzl designed the anti- Zionist movement parallel to the Zionist one in 1897, so did the British philosophers draw up Socialism as an alternative to Capitalism in the mid-Nineteenth century. With that you do not wield full control

only over your own fabrication, but also on that which seems to be the opposite to it. In devising Socialism, Capitalism's masterminds tried to imply, "o people!, if you are not content with Capitalism, do not go far afield to look for an alternative; here is a legitimate one for you and that is Socialism". Both stand on a common denominator: Materialist-mechanicist world view.

Only Stalin was an unexpected road accident. He, I mean his political and economic legacy, was overcome some forty years later.

A direct challenge to the Contemporaneous English-Jewish global civilization and its two so-called rival ideologies, Capitalism and Socialism had come from two other European ideologies, namely Fachism and National socialism. The latter derives from a world view called romanticism which had been set up in order to oppose materialism-mechanicism. Just as we can trace materialism-mechanicism's origine back to Descartes and Lamettrie, likewise we follow romanticism's way up to the Italian philosopher Giambattista Vico. Out of it arose in the late Nineteenth and early Twentieth centuries a new socio-political and economic system, Fachism, mainly in the hands of another Italian philosopher Vilfredo Pareto. It was materialized as a political and economic order by Benito Mussolini. Although half-witted leftists have branded every tyranny and military dictatorship as Fachism, this is not the case. It is not to be identified with National socialism either. For Fachism national identity is to a great extent culturally based, whereas National socialism particularly derives it from an ethnic or racial source. Unlike National socialism, Fachism possesses a clear economic vision (Fachist corporatism) which is antiliberal and against finance Capitalism, so much so that it approaches sometimes the Marxist version of socialist conception. Again unlike National socialism, which sees Christianity as Judaism's offshoot and therefore rejects it vehemently, Fachism bears a distinct religious, particularly a

Catholic, colour. Fachism is not anti-semitic⁶ in nature. Although initially National socialism took the basic ideological ingredients -most importantly the political governing form- from Fachism, it, eventually, succumbed to capitalist English-Jewish/Anglo-Judaic civilization's fundamental values and schemes against which, in fact, it, initially, vowed to fight. This you may call the irony of fate. Before everything else it was immensely influenced by the Spencerian interpretation of Charles Darwin's evolutionary vision. This vision, essentially, is already a byproduct of Capitalism's way of regarding the world and society. Constant material competition and the relentless triumph of the ones who get the upper hand in the process of struggle. In this context I always claim that those who had to stand trial at Nuremberg in 1945 - 46 were not only a bunch of criminals but the whole group of those intellectual godfathers of the said civilization.

The ultimate aim of the Contemporaneous globalizing English-Jewish civilization is to homogenize all men. First, the socio-cultural entity human (*L humanus*) must be brought down to the biotic level of man (*homo*).⁷ Since the human is a socio-cultural entity, in Rene Descartes' terms, a "*Res cogitans*", he himself cannot become an object of scientific research. If, after all, it is the human who conducts the said research, how could he be submitted to that?! He is, in epistemological terms, unnomologizable -i.e. the explanation of the human reality cannot be achieved through scientific law (*nomology*). Why? Because he/she is a 'psychic' -or 'soulful' or 'mental'- being. Then, what is 'psychic'? Any 'event' that can be explained or described

6 Al though Arabic is also a Semitic tongue, anti-semitism is exclusively being identified with intense hatred of Jewishness and has nothing to do with the Arabs.

7 While '*humanus*' (human being) a religiously tinted designation, '*homo*' (man) is a biotico-evolutionary term.

"When I have fashioned him (in due proportion) and breathed into him of My spirit... (*...nafahtu fih min er-Ruhi*)..." -*Qur'an*, *Al Hijr*(15)/29.

Accordingly, contrary to '*homo*' or '*bashar*' in Arabic, '*humanus*' (Ar '*insan*'⁵) is not the outcome of a biotico-evolutionary process. It is directly a God-conferred attribute -according to faith.

on time - space coordinates is a 'fact'. A psychic entity and thereby the human being is not there to be explained on time - space coordinates. Impossible to point at and repeat a psychic happening. It is a force or better said an agent the result of whose activities we perceive in certain 'facts' which, themselves, are, of course, tangible, sensory, experiential, testable and repeatable.

An event that you are unable to sense -yet you can feel it!-, test and repeat you will not be capable to subjugate. Such an 'event' is not a 'fact', but a 'case'. The soulfoul human is a case. It is impossible to explain him in terms of science. He is rationally an incomprehensible case and therefore indomitable. For the sake of exploitation, 'human' had to be reduced to the level of 'man'. The hitherto 'believing- warring human' -'humanus religiosus-bellicus'- was brought down to the biotic stratum of the 'consuming-straying man' -'homo economicus'.

Capitalism is there to urge the individual to accumulate an ever increasing amount of material, or better, monetary assets through acquisition and then to invest them; and investment's purpose is to take the product onto the market. The span between procurement and sale is called 'profit', Capitalism's kernel. In Capitalism's view there is no other ideal except 'market' and 'profit'. Whatever is 'marketable' and 'profitable' that can be considered 'good' and 'acceptable'. The target object in the market is the 'mouldable biotic man'. He is not asked what he wants or needs. On the contrary he is socio-culturally moulded and shaped along the lines the producer-seller wants him to be -cultural imperialism. The more his whims are inflated (Consumerism) owing to a perplexing web of fabrications,⁸ there will be further gains in the realm of production and sale. No halt to this vicious cycle. A virtual reality is constructed at the expense of the natural one. What Ian Buruma and Avishai Margcilit regard as the sublime urbanizing civilization devised by the Anglo-Judaic one is nothing else but the 'virtual reality'. The ceaselessly

8 Schooling, propaganda -of which Dr Joseph Goebbould be considered as one of the talented executioners-, audiovisual advertisements, written publicity, the media...

squandering man's consumerist whims and the vast scope of reckless enterprises are seen, again, by Buruma and Margalit as liberal Capitalism's benign liberties. Indeed, anything beyond the indicated level is submitted to harsh restrictions. A large array of prohibitions take place beneath the pretext of "how can you allow the destruction of the democratic Capitalist order!?" Every other ideological system, political order or regime sets the same assertion forth.

I was told in the summer of 1970 that in occupied France of September 1940 German military authorities distributed official forms to be filled and signed by the head of the family. The form contained three questions: 1) "are you Jewish?"; 2) "Freemason?"; 3) "homosexual?" or "are there persons in your family or among your relatives who comply with one or more of those questions confirmingly?"

In the summer of 1985 I received a grant from the United States government.

In order to enter the United States I asked for an entry visa. In the application form there were three questions to be answered by the applicant: "are you or have you ever been a member of a 1) Communist, 2) Fascist party or 3) extreme religious -in its present day appellation 'fundamentalist'- community, brotherhood or order?"

Thus, seen from the outside, the regimes seem to be different, while to the core no discrepancy between them.

What a muddle! Buruma and Margalit throw Islam, National socialism and Japanese militarism into the one and same bowl! Surely the confusion is not accidental or the result of ignorance. Propaganda has so many facets, one of them is disinformation. How can an honest and a reasonable person cite a teaching that states "to kill an innocent person equals to annihilate whole humanity"⁹ at one

9 *Qur'an, al-Ma'idah (5) 132.* On this Ayat *Abdullah* has to tell us the following: "...To kill or seek to kill an individual because he represents an ideal is to kill all who uphold the ideal..." -footnote no: 737.

stroke with those for which human life does not possess an intrinsic value? If a criminal declares himself Muslim, how much can we blame Islam itself for his murderous act/s? We must look into the heart of the teaching and judge accordingly, and certainly not by picking out single perverses and say that they represent the particular Faith. Anyone could profess anything his heart desires. Clearly Buruma and Margalit's main target is neither National socialism nor Japanese militarism, but Islam itself. The former two are there to soften the stance and give an appearance of objectivity. Islam is not taken here as a religion antagonist with regard to Christianity, nevertheless in the form as a possible or potential rival to the Anglo-Judaic civilization. Thus hereby we come across not a clash of religions, yet that of civilizations. This is, anyhow, the very essence of the current debate, or shall we say, struggle going on worldwide.

The Contemporaneous Globalizing Anglo-Judaic Civilization with its ideological backbone, Capitalism, is inevitably defiling the human constitution and irremediably destroying nature worldwide.

Finally let us reiterate the fact, it should and even could not be overlooked that there is the vital necessity to explore mentally the possibilities of an alternative to the current globalizing civilization. Otherwise we are, indeed, standing on the verge of the end of history.

Acknowledgement (For The Second Edition)

I thank Mr. Yılmaz Aksu and Mr. Miraç Gündüz and also thank Mrs. Şehadet Sena Taş for their inestimable help correcting grammatical and orthographical.

I especially thank Mr. Savaş C. Tali for the time he spent preparing, editing and publishing this book.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I am greatly indebted to many of my friends, colleagues, and teachers among whom special mention has to be made of Professor Dr. Louis BAECK (Faculty of Economics, the Catholic University of Louvain, Belgium), Professor Dr. Ernest WOLF-GAZO (American University in Cairo, Cairo, Egypt), Professor Dr. Teo GRÜNBERG (Department of Philosophy, Middle East University, Ankara), Professor Dr. Yalçın KOÇ (Department of Philosophy, Bosphorus University, Istanbul), Professor Dr. Ahmet Yüksel ÖZEMRE (Istanbul, Turkey), Professor Dr. Wim J. VAN DER STEEN (Department of Biology, the Free University, Amsterdam) and Professor Dr. Nermi UYGUR (Istanbul) for inestimable comments, suggestions and corrections on the draft of the constituent parts of this tractate.

In the meantime my special thanks go to the *International Institute of Islamic Thought and Civilization* (ISTAC) and its Founder-Director Professor Dr. Syed Muhammad Naquib AL-ATTAS (Kuala Lumpur) for providing opportunity to pursue my research activities in Malaysia; with gratitude I must add also that this book would not be comprehensible were it not for Professor Dr. Alparslan AÇIKGENÇ (ISTAC, Kuala Lumpur) and Mrs. Sakinah Sharon Needle's (Kuala Lumpur) meticulous grammatical revisions and corrections. I would also like to express my gratitude to Ass.-Prof. Dr. Stephan HALTMAYER (Department of Philosophy and of Epistemology respectively, University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria) whose dedication and painstaking application made possible the publishing of this book.

Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, 1993.