AFKĀR *Journal of Islamic & Religious Studies*
Volume 7, Issue 2, December 2023, PP: 34-58
E-ISSN 2616-8588; P-ISSN 2616-9223
www.afkar.com.pk

Ṭaha ʿAbd al-Raḥmān's Trusteeship Theory

Prof. Dr. Sobhi Rayan
Islamic Studies Department, Al-Qasemi Academy, P.O.B 124, Baqa El-Garbiah 3010000

ABSTRACT

This study deals with the Sufi Trusteeship Theory, which seeks to introduce a model of human cognition based on the relationship between God Almighty and Human, which was present in the Unseen World and is considered the cognitive and existential origin of Human, who knew his God and himself before his existence in the Seen World, as knowledge preceded existence in the Seen World, but existence precedes knowledge in the Unseen World (al-Ghaib). The Trusteeship Theory is based on three Unseen origins, which Ṭaha ʿAbd al-Raḥmān calls "the Divine Charters," which are the origin of the relationship between God Almighty, and Human. The first charter, namely, the Charter of Witness, focuses on Human's knowledge of his God and of himself, which is the origin of human knowledge. The second charter / convention, the Charter of Trusteeship, is Human's acceptance of his choice of the Trust (Ahumana). The Charter of Transmission is the relationship between God and His transmitters / messengers. Knowledge of the Unseen accompanied the creation of Human, which placed wujūb (necessity) and wujūd (existence) in a state of dichotomy, and it constitutes the human knowledge connected to the attributes of the absolute Divine Self (God), which represents what must exist and which is based on the totality of ethical values and moral ideals that are connected to God's attributes. Thus, God is the creator (khaliq) and the ethicizer (mukhalliq), who distinguishes human from other creatures by his ethics and makes him known as an ethical creature, which implies that the quiddity of human lies in his ethical attributes and not in his mental or rational attributes.

Keywords: *attribute, charter, divine, knowledge, theory, transmission, trusteeship, witness.*
*Corresponding author's email: sobhi.rayan@gmail.com

Ṭaha ʿAbd al-Raḥmān is a contemporary Moroccan philosopher, born in the town al-Jadida in 1944. He studied philosophy at Mohammad V University in Rabat and completed his higher studies at the Sorbonne University in Paris. He classified more than 20 works authors in different subjects in linguistics, philosophy, logic, mind, existence and modernity, violence, controversy, and dialogue. Although his works are on different subjects, they all relate to the philosophy of ethics**.**

Ṭaha ʿAbd al-Raḥmān is considered an innovative and creative philosopher in the field of Islamic philosophy. He is also considered one of the most prominent philosophers of the world of Islam since the beginnings of the colonial era in Africa and Asia (Hallaq, 2020, 9)

He introduces a moral project in an effort to build a morally constructive human being so that morality is the identity of today's human being. He also believes that the establishment of modern ethics can solve the world's problems from which the world suffers such as conflicts, inter-State wars, and environmental dangers that threaten human life, and pave the way for a global peace that is based on the values of pluralism, dialogue, and respect.

The Trusteeship Theory (iʾtimāniyya) is based on the concept of Koranic trust that defines Human's relationship with God. The human being is trusted on the things that he owns but he is not their owner, as the human himself is owned by God, and that means that the trust opposes the notion or concept of property and possession. Ṭaha ʿAbd al-Raḥmān views Human's quest to own things as contrary to the requirement of the Trust Charter that was accepted by Human by choice in the world of the Unseen (ghaib). Besides, possession is the cause of conflict and fighting between human beings. Human's disposal of the attribute of possession hid considering all that he possesses a 'trust" a way to reduce violence, wars, and prevalence of world peace. Therefore, some researchers are of the view that ʿAbd al-Raḥmān's project is courageously seeking to formulate a new concept of human. The production of the new concept of human depends on ethnicization and a new way of life that prevents the love of domination and mastery or simply thinking about them, and this requires new forms of teaching, cultivation, and education (Hallaq 2020, p. 352).

Education is based on self-purification and heart cleansing which are popular educational mechanisms among Sufi scientists such as al-Muasibi and al-Ghazali and Ibn al-ʿArabi and others. However, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān's treatment of the soul is

characterized by his use of modern scientific concepts and the employment of contemporary cognitive production in psychological sciences.

The Trusteeship Theory connects the Seen World (al-ʿālam al-marʾī) and the Unseen World (*ʿalam* alghaib). The relationship between them is a connection, not a disconnection or separation, and that means that Human being lives in two different worlds at the same time because Human exists and is created and when he is disconnected from the concrete substance, he exists in his soul, and when he is dressed with the material or substance he is created. *Religion* is an existential perception that takes place by following the revelations of the "perfections" of the Unseen World to the Seen World (al-Tahiri 2021, p. 133).

Human's relationship with the Unseen is due to the Divine Charters that Human witnessed in the Unseen World- Witness, Trusteeship, and Transmission, which represent the existential and cognitive origin of Human, and define Human's relationship with his God and his trusteeship role in the Seen World and the ethical-moral values that establish the human relationships. The First Charter, Charter of Witness focuses on acquainting Human with his God and acquainting Human with himself, which is the origin of human knowledge. The Second Carter is the Trust Charters or Conventions, which focuses on Human's acceptance of his Choice of the Trusty (amāna). The Transmission Charter is between God and Almighty and Messengers, and it is an expansion of reliable knowledge in the Unseen World and achievement in the Seen World.

These Divine Charters define Human's identity as an ethical-moral creature. Human has known the moral attributes in the Witness Charter, which emerge from the Divine Attributes, which God trusted in the original Fiṭra with which all human beings are born. This makes them a human commonality and not a particular thing for a specific nation. Besides, this moral commonality constitutes the origin of the relationship between human and his brother and his relationship with other existing assets.

It should be emphasized that the set of "trusteeship" envisages the construction of an Islamic moral theory capable of resolving modern moral dilemmas based on the nature of the human identity that ʿAbd al-Raḥmān considers religious moral (Ourya, 2021, p. 253), While some see that Abdul Rahhuman's insistence on making his Islamic religious background an inevitable start in discussing various current issues, including ethical problems, makes it difficult if not impossible to reach a universal commonality in ethics. He has been repeating in most of his books, frankly and

without equivocation, that he is not ready to discuss any topic of interest to human outside of his Islamic affiliation. (Mellouk, 2018, 116).

The Divine Charters (al-Mawatheeq al-ububiyyah)

The three charters – the Charter of Witness, the Charter of Trusteeship, and the Charter of Transmission – are characterized by a cognitive gradient, starting with Human's knowledge of his God and himself, followed by Human's knowledge of his Trust and responsibility as God's successor on Earth, and then by knowledge that guarantees the continuity of human life on Earth. The cognitive gradient runs parallel to the gradient of creation, which took place in different stages.

Here, the role of knowledge of the Unseen emerges as a foundation of the human knowledge. It also indicates the relationship between knowledge of the Unseen and the empirical knowledge that the human being produces in the Seen World. Empirical knowledge cannot be separated from its Unseen components, but it must be based on knowledge of the Unseen. Divine charters are characterized by the following attributes: (ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, 2021, p. 74)

> The Divine Charters are products of the truth. This means that the process of self-ethicization, namely, the adoption of ethics, starts promptly with the creation of Human and his exit to the Seen world. Ethicization is not connected to a specific age; it starts with the first interaction with one's parents. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān links the process of human creation and moral education as two fundamental truths. The relationship between them is one of association and accompaniment in terms of origins and beginnings, and since God created Human in his best image, the role of the charters becomes one of the ethicization of Human in his best image, too, and since human can neither create nor ethicize himself, God is the creator and ethicizer.

The Divine Charters were taken from Human being in proportion to his preparations, to qualify him for the transactional /operational condition, which is a process of development toward the better, and there is no advancement of Human's ethicization unless he continues to seek improvement, progressing towards the good actions that are required by the charters. These are required of him, in progressive ascending stages, starting with the Charter of Witness, which concerns the first ethicizing preparation, which makes him know his God and himself; followed by the Charter of Trusteeship, which makes him know his responsibility and role in the cultivation of the Earth. Thus, in the Entrustment Ethics Theory, human first recognizes his God,

then his responsibilities; the former is a means to understand the latter, and when human knows his responsibilities, he understands himself (Zatari, 2022, 4); and finally, by the Charter of Transmission, which makes him know the nature of his work in life. Gradual development, an attribute that accompanies moral education, runs parallel to the stages of human growth and development.

The Divine Charters are related to the ethicization of the whole of humanity. These charters have a comprehensive human dimension that defines the human relationship of Human with his brother Human, and they are not exclusive to one nation; rather, the effects of their ethical treatment are comprehensive and should include all nations. They should also include the relationship of Human with other creatures, objects, and resources in the world. This means that these charters are universal and organize the relationships between human beings and other beings on ethical and moral grounds. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān asserts that morality should not be understood as a system of orders, but as a mode of existence in which one's actions are compatible with one's personality (Viersen, 2021, p. 176).

The Divine Charters require that Human should recognize, according to his ability, the perfections of the Divine Self before he recognizes the data that are reflected in its orders and prohibitions. Here, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān attributes the religious orders and prohibitions that appeared in the Heavenly Messages to the origin (*asl*), namely, the attributes of the Heavenly Self. Recognition of these attributes precedes the knowledge of comhumands and prohibitions, because Human judges the status of these attributes according to the degree of his knowledge of these perefctions. Human knew his God first and then himself, which means that Human's knowledge of God led him to the knowledge of his human self.

ʿAbd al-Raḥmān connects judgement with the values associated with it, which implies that there are multiple meanings and values for one judgement. However, this does not mean that there is a contrast between judgements, because every judgement that is based on a charter bears several meanings or values. The fact that a judgment involves humany concepts does not mean that there are differences or contrasts between judgements, but loyalty to the Charter. The ethicization of a specific value is not one single rank, but different ranks, and ethicization is involved with people's different minds and their

preparation. Differences in rank do not mean differences in value; the purpose behind them is to "upgrade" ethics.

ʿAbd al-Raḥmān distinguishes between the means of dealing with the Divine Charters and the Transactional charters. Reflecting is the means of work for the Divine Charters, while thinking is the means of work for the Transactional Charters. This obliges the ethical human to transcend and see beyond the rank of thinking to the the rank of reflection, which obliges the sight of the ethical person to transcend the rank of thinking to the rank of reflection. Both thinking and reflecting are types of thought, but they constitute two varying degrees of the chartered-ethicized (*al-mutakhaliq al-mithaqi*). Chartered reflection exceeds transactional thinking because it connects ethicization with human selves through causes and effects, and through ethicization with the Divine Self. Hence, religious charters involve ethical / moral transactions that were confirmed in the world of reflection, unlike social transactions, which are imaginary moral transactions that were confirmed in the world of thinking.

The importance of *trusteeship criticism* lies in the fact that it produces a set of moral purposes that are represented in the acknowledgement of the human Self in itself, and consequently, in its validity, and social and political goals that are represented in the acknowledgement of the human Self in relation to other selves and in the achievement of the principles of social justice (Eido, 2021, p. 129).

Considering the Divine Charters as certain facts, based on mental evidence, makes attachment to them a duty, since they are considered the source from which the Transactional Charters are derived, and separating them or failing to recognize their source restricts Human in his thoughts and ethics regarding the phenomena of the Seen World, while connecting the two ehumancipates Human from the restrictions of the phenomena into a multiplicity of meanings and values, and opens for the ethicized (*al-mutakhaliq*) infinite horizons for intellectual and moral elevation and improvement.

The Charter of Witness (mīthāq al-ishhād)

The Charter of Witness offers Human's testimony of God's Oneness, which is made in the presence of both sides. The witness is the individual human being, and

the witnessed / one testified about is God Himself, as illustrated in the following Suras from the Holy Koran:

And [mention] when your Lord took from the children of Adam – from their loins – their descendants and made them testify of themselves, [saying to them], "Am I not your Lord?" They said, "Yes, we have testedified." [This] – least you should say on the Day of Resurrection, "Indeed, we were of this unaware (**Al-A'raf [7] : 172**) *(Saheeh International Translation).*

ʿAbd al-Raḥmān believes that the Charter of Witness took place in the Unseen World after the creation of Human. It was a charter between God and Human, whose significance stems from the participation of humanity in it at an individual level. It was not made with humanity as a collective or as "Human," but with individual humans on an individual basis, namely, one by one, so that no one would represent the other, no one could deputize another, and no one can act as a substitute for another. The required testimony here is individual only (ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, 2021, p. 86). The importance of this individual testimony lies in its attachment to individual consequences, such as responsibility, accountability, and calculation. Each person must be individually responsible and accountable for his deeds.

This means that the Charter of Witness is not a question about God's existence, but a certain fact beyond evidence, clues, or proof, which means that it obviates the need to raise the question of divine existence, whose intense treatment had persisted in the general philosophy of thought as an unanswered metaphysical question. The great existential questions that have puzzled minds throughout history are answered, not through reason, but through revealed divine religion or the experience of religious faith; without this experience, the way to answer them would remain forever shut in the abstract mind. According to the Trusteeship Theory, however, this question becomes irrational, because the question of God in this charter is not at all a question of existence, but a question about specific descriptions that represent His existence, namely, those of unity (tawḥīd), represented mainly in divinity and Oneness (ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, 2021, p. 88).

The Charter of Witness is considered the origin of human knowledge, which Human received directly from its first source without means of proof, namely, through certain knowledge that constitutes the certain foundation on which human knowledge is based. The relationship between divine and the human is a relationship of witnessing and, in its reality, a relationship of knowledge. The *witness* knows and

tells what he knows, and the *witnessed* is known and tells about him what he knows about him. This is an excellent cognitive knowledge, whose excellence stems from two sources. The first is that the gained knowledge, in its way, is direct knowledge; namely, it is gained from a close source. The second is that it is sure knowledge, namely, gained out of certainty. This means that the ethicization that is required by the Charter of Witness is initially based on gaining this witness knowledge through the charter (ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, 2021, p.90).

ʿAbd al-Raḥmān draws a connection between the Charter of Witness and ethics, as ethics are based on the knowledge that God taught to Human through the Charter of Witness, and these ethics acquire their entitlement by their foundation in certain knowledge. Ethics are related to knowledge, which means they consist of ethical certainties that arise from the Charter of Witness, which should constitute the foundation of a human moral architecture and the source of human ethicization, and they are universal, for all human beings and not just for a single nation.

ʿAbd al-Raḥmān maintains that the Charter of Witness is part of Fitra; it is one of the Divine Charters that Human witnessed in the Unseen World, which means that knowledge was acquired before Human came into existence in the Seen World. Although this knowledge precedes human existence in the Seen World, its occurrence took place after its existence in the Unseen World.

The principle of *Fiṭra* determines that Human's capability of witnessing (*Tash-heed* / *Saying al-Shahada*) comes from his having been created originally in an image that preserves his previous connection with the Unseen World, in such a way that his soul possesses a specific faculty that is similar to memory but is anterior to the memory he possesses in the Seen World. This spiritual faculty that preserves memories from the Unseen World, this unseen or original memory – was given in Islam the name *Fiṭra* (ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, 2012, p. 52). Fitra is the innate ability of humans to comprehend their archetypal state as one connected with an unseen world, a fact that is anthropologically attested in societies the world over, including in the so-called secular West. There are not many ways to explain why the majority of people , even in the present, and despite oppressive secular dis-course, remain, as they have been for millennia, bound to spiritualism and belief in one form of transcendence or another (Hallaq, 2020. 286).

ʿAbd al-Raḥmān distinguishes between innate memory, which preserves the Divine Charters in the Unseen World and psychological memory, which preserves the things of the Seen World. God Almighty called Human to acknowledge His imperativeness in Unseen charters that are preserved in his spiritual memory, and Seen charters that are preserved in his psychological memory (ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, 2012, p. 384).

Thus, *Fiṭra* is connected to the Unseen (*al-Ghaib*) in its existence and its cognitive attainment, while the Soul is connected to the Seen World in its existence and knowledge. Here lies the need for a connection (*wasl*) between the Unseen and the Seen Worlds and the establishment of the psychological upon the innate.

ʿAbd al-Raḥmān clarifies the concept of Innateness, saying that " it is a group of ideal meanings that are deposited in Human's soul, which reach him at a level that exceeds the capability of reality, and makes him wish to see them come true in his deeds in order to benefit from them. In other words, Innateness is a group of practical values that has a spiritual origin in return of the Instinct that are *behavioral facts* that have material / physical origin. (ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, 2005, p. 230), the spiritual and the material: they must be bound together, in our consciousness and in our actions, into one harmonious entity. (Asad 1982, p. 20)

ʿAbd al-Raḥmān attempts to connect the spiritual and material by freeing himself from physical constraints to gain access to spiritual origins and establishing physical life upon them, in the sense of adhering to the values that exist in Innateness, which are reflected in what Seen human behavior must be. The essence of *Fiṭra* is a set of values that a human being acquires at his or her creation, which determines the ethics of how he or she should behave. *Fiṭra* is, thus, the best witness that Human can summon in his aspiration to commit to ethical values (ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, 2009, p. 127).

Objectivity of the Knowledge of Witness

ʿAbd al-Raḥmān uses the Comparison and Contrast methods between the iʾtimāniyya theory and the secular theories in the West, and it is a prominent method in his various writings, with the aim of clarifying his theory of iʾtimāniyya, because he sees in secularism a thought that is contrary to iʾtimāniyya and tries to prove that the faith on which iʾtimāniyya is based does not contradict the mind, but is based on the highest degrees rationality.

ʿAbd al-Raḥmān establishes the knowledge of the Charter of Witness as the origin from which human knowledge branches off. Moreover, it is the fountain and

certain origin of knowledge. Adam's sons knew their God before their witness, but they would not have known Him if He had not introduced Himself to them; therefore, their knowledge of Him was a result of his introducing Himself to them. Consequently, "knowledge" is the first thing that Adam's sons knew, and there was no better knowledge for their existence and nothing that came more rapidly to their minds than knowledge of the perfection of His traits. Thus, he had favored them before their witnessing by providing them with what He wanted them to know of their human capabilities and of the divine perfections (ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, 2021, p. 9).

The beginning of knowledge was God's knowledge. Human knew his God first, and then himself. In other words, God Almighty made Human know his Divine Self as well as himself, and the achievement of all this knowledge was followed by Human's witnessing it. This witnessing occurred in the presence of its cognitive realization.

This knowledge is direct or near knowledge, for which there is neither a king nor anyone else to mediate, and the witness to this is his direct speech to them. Moreover, it is compelling, because the use of the word "yes," which indicates belief, is introduced as a reaction to a question that is accompanied by negation, and belief that responds to a previous negative is more indicative of definitiveness than belief that is not preceded by a negative. Furthermore, this question, which is preceded by a negative and indicates reporting, is more indicative of certainty than an interrogative that is not preceded by a negative (ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, 2021, p. 91)

ʿAbd al-Raḥmān clarifies the difference between *witnessing knowledge* and *inferential knowledge* (argumentative reasoning). The former does not rely on evidential proof to establish its degree of certainty, because its acquisition is clear and direct from God, and this clarity makes it absolute and definitive and without any doubt. The witnessing knowledge they realized is humanifested knowledge, especially knowledge that preceded their knowledge of themselves, versus inferential knowledge, which was adopted by the interpreters (ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, 2021, p. 91).

ʿAbd al-Raḥmān links human knowledge to the knowledge of divine qualities, as Human knew God's qualities in the Unseen World before he knew himself. In other words, these divine qualities are cognitive evidence of human qualities and the traits of Human, and Human must know these divine qualities in order to know himself. Knowledge of these pefections is Human's way of acquiring knowledge of himself and is a form of proof deriving from other things, because human beings (*Bani Adam*

/ Adam's Sons) know their own qualities by the qualities of their God (ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, 2021, p. 92). This knowledge contradicts the statement that Taha Abd al-Rahhuman is a prisoner of the theological school to which he belongs, which says that the common characteristics between the Creator and the creature are like verbal commonalities and not moral ones (al-Hamedi, 2022, p. 101).

Research on divine qualities depends on the use of tools that differ from those used in research methods involving inferential reasoning knowledge, because this knowledge is not a natural form of objectivity that is based on external qualities of things but a standard, normative form of objectivity that is based on high ideals and values (ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, 2021, p. 92). Values are considered essential qualities that are characterized by consistency and stability, and their loss means loss of the object, which is not the case with external qualities that are subject to change.

These values from the Unseen World are not accessible by inference or reasoning, "because inference is construction, and the human notary has not yet built anything, but it is the knowledge of his humanifestation, and it is known that 'humanifestation' in general is appearance or emergence, and appearance that is related to 'humanifestation' is acceptance of the apparent to the other" (ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, 2021, p. 93). The clear appearance of divine knowledge took place at the beginning of the creations of humans, who were not yet ready for the structures of inference. Therefore, inference should be considered a result of previous cognitive knowledge, which is divine knowledge.

> The British philosopher Hume raised a philosophical dilemma in his discussion of values, which amounted to the idea that "In every system of morality, which I have hitherto met with, I have always remark'd, that the author proceeds for some time in the ordinary way of reasoning, and establishes the being of a God, or makes observations concerning human affairs; when of a sudden I am surpriz'd to find, that instead of the usual copulations of propositions, is, and is not, I meet with no proposition that is not connected with an ought, or an ought not. This change is imperceptible; but is, however, of the last consequence. For as this ought, or ought not, expresses some new relation or affirmation,'tis necessary that it shou'd be observ'd and explain'd; and at the same time that a reason should be given, for what seems altogether inconceivable, how this new relation can be a

> deduction from others, which are entirely different from it … [I] am persuaded, that a small attention [to this point] wou'd subvert all the vulgar systems of morality, and let us see, that the distinction of vice and virtue is not founded merely on the relations of objects, nor is perceiv'd by reason." (T. 3.1.1.27, SBN 469-70)
>
> The passage is summed up in the slogan 'No-Ought-From-Is'
> You can't derive an ought from an is, moral conclusions from non-moral premises.
>
> 2*) The best explanation of 1*) is:
>
> a) that in a logically valid argument you can't get anything (non-vacuous) out that you haven't put in; and
>
> b) that since moral judgments are covert commands or disguised exclamations, moral words are fundamentally different from non-moral words (they aren't 'descriptive' or fact-stating). (Pigden, 2011)

ʿAbd al-Raḥmān responds to this allegation and tries to remove the logical contradiction it produces.

First, What is meant by the separation of necessity (*wujūb*) from existence (*wujūd*)is the elimination of the existential foundation that bequeaths to realistic values the attribute of objectivity or realism, or the attribution of subjectivity. The term *subjectivity* bears more than one meaning. First, the *human subjectivity* that carries values requires *value subjectivity*. Each person has his or her values, and in this case, it is true to say that there is neither objectivity nor necessity in these values. The second meaning of *subjectivity* is the Divine Self, and when we add the values to this Self (*Dhat*), the values become realistic or objective by necessity, because the Divine Self is not only the source of objective existence or objectivity by necessity, but it creates the whole of existence as it should be.

This result requires a basic trusteeship, which says that existence, seen from the perspective of the Divine Self, by necessity is doubled in the existing, no matter who or what that might be (ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, 2021, p. 95). This means that the dialectic of

existence and necessity (*wujūd* and *wujūb*) is a question that concerns philosophy that works within the borders of the world and places Human at its center. If existence (*wujūd*) represents Being and necessity (*wujūb*) represents what must exist, the derivation of necessity (*wujūb*) from existence (*wujūd*) becomes logically impossible, because a new element cannot appear in the outcome if it does not exist in the premises.

However, this is not a question for the Trusteeship Theory, which goes beyond the limited Seen World to the infinite Unseen World and starts from the Divine Self, where there is no separation between existence (*wujūd*) and necessity (*wujūb*), and in its presence, the existing (*mawjud*) and necessity (*wujūb*) are integrated, because there is no separation between the Seen World and the Unseen World – both worlds exist at the same time.

Second, Although human and divine qualities are apparently shared, they are never suitable. There is no proportion between them at all, including the lagging of necessity (*wujūb*) behind existence (*wujūd*). God's existence is not the same as ours; it has more room than ours, and its necessity (*wujūb*) is not like ours. The claim that there is a gap between existence (*wujūd*) and necessity (*wujūb*) in the right of the Divine Self is a result of likening God to what we know about ourselves, which is not valid because it is not appropriate to compare two parties that are infinitely distant.

In spite of the shared qualities between God Almighty and Human, the difference between them is as great as the difference between the finite and the infinite / absolute. This difference also applies to the question of existence and necessity, as the relationship between them is rendered necessary by the absolute attributes of God, which require it to derive necessity (*wujūb*) from existence (*wujūd*), due to the synchronous dichotomy of creation and ethics, but this derivation is prohibited by the limitations of human qualities, which are unable to create.

The fact that the slave (human being) is merciful, patient and thankful does mean that he has to be similarly able to hear, to see, to know, and to be capable, lively and active, but I say that the Divine property is not for anyone except God Almighty and is known only to God. (al Ghazali, 1968, p. 36). It is impossible for anyone to know the true knowledge that surrounds the essence of the qualities of God except God Almighty (al-Ghazali, 1968, p. 41). According to some scholars, the ultimate knowledge of God Almighty is the acknowledgment of the inability to know Him (al-Ghazali, 1968, p. 20).

Third, Divine qualities are considered maximal perfections, and perfection originally should rise in its quality from the rank of reality to the rank of the ideal. It is known that an ideal is a standard by which other instances are measured, or a model for imitation, and everything that is used for estimation or imitation is likely to depend on values. Therefore, divine qualities, besides their being descriptions of the Divine Self, have the status of "standards" by which things are measured, or serve as models that can be adopted as far as possible as ethical examplars.

Considering divine qualities as criteria and examplars by which things and deeds are weighed requires an educational dimension and makes the knowledge of divine qualities a basis for education and a source of values and ideals that should pertain to human behavior, and the moral elevation of the human should be connected to the degree of his rise towards values, that is, the greater his morals, the greater his humanity. . From the sufi point of view, self-knowledge and self-purification are necessary preconditions to a more perfect knowledge of God (McDonough, 2010, p. 19). However, expansion of knowledge occurs in the knowledge of his names and his qualities, which is a knowledge open to ethics, where they vary in rank (al-Ghazali, 1968, p. 42).

The Epistemological Trait of Belief

Secularism claims that belief runs counter to reason, and to the extent that reason is described as having the ability to enlighten, faith is described as the loss of this ability; there is no place for faith in knowledge, and its only place is in the conscience. The believer, according to this secular vision, is a person who does not think, but feels, and there is no rule that defines this feeling nor any objective criterion that controls it (ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, 2021, p. 99).

This claim is based on the fact that belief, unlike thought, is not subject to logical rules and cannot be proved with the tools of scientific reasoning and inference. It is a matter of conscience, which cannot be defined by employing the objective criteria of logic; its existence is evidenced by sensing it. Feeling cannot be defined or limited and is not subject to the control of subjective rules.

ʿAbd al-Raḥmān responds to the earlier claim that belief is not a lack of mind / reason, but an increase of mind / reason. The "mind of belief" is under the guidance (*tasdeed*) of moral values, with the aim of guiding or correcting, and with the support (*ta'yeed*) of spiritual meaning in order to "establish." However, the "mind of disbelief"

is not accompanied by such guidance (*tasdeed*) and support (*ta'yeed*) (ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, 2021, p. 100).

ʿAbd al-Raḥmān distinguishes here among three levels of the mind. There is the Mind of Abstract Reason , the Mind of Guided Reason, and the Mind of Supported Reason. The Mind of Abstract Reason (*al-ʿaql al-mujarrad*) is characterized by identification, objectivity, neutrality, and discipline. It is the mind that is used in the study of sciences and phenomena, while the Mind of Guided Reason (*al-ʿaql al-musaddad*) is controlled by the rules of moral values, which function as an authority that corrects and guides its actions. These are followed by the Mind of Supported Reason, which stems from the cognitive source of knowledge of the qualities of the Divine Self, which is the knowledge that Human acquired directly from the Divine Self in the Unseen World. In this way, the knowledge of belief increases more than the other types of knowledge because it possesses the guidance (*tasdeed*) and support (*ta'yeed*) of the moral / ethical values that are added to the abstract mind. The Mind of Supported Reason (*al-ʿaql al-muʾayyad*) It is a practical mind, and the sum of the three minds combined (Amer, 2021,133) and constitutes the principle of perfection in the soul of Human, because it combines virtues from the two other minds through their perfection by Sufi practice (Saifuddin & Tulung, 2021). This means that the mind of belief is a moral / ethical mind, in addition to its inclusion of the abstract mind, which implies that the knowledge of belief is an increase of mind, rather than a decrease.

The division of the ranks of knowledge was known among previous scholars. Al-Ghazali ranked human souls by their different kinds and varying degrees of human perception, in the following way (lowest to highest): sensitive spirits, imaginary spirits, mental spirits, intellectual spirits, and divine spirits (al-Ghazali, 1996, p. 285). These are considered cognitive rankings based on complementarity**.** In another place, al-Ghazali spoke about these perceptions in terms of varying phases, such as *sense* and *mind,* plus the phase of *beyond the mind*, which is a light in which the Unseen appears (al-Ghazali, 1993, p. 54). It is the mental phase that parallels the supportive mind in the Trusteeship Theory. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān does not stop at distinguishing among degrees of mind, but delves into the bases of the apparent structures of the mind, in order to gain access to the mind's hidden origins, which philosophers describe as metaphysical, and which are actually types of knowledge or information that cannot be proved or disproved by the abstract mind.

In addition, modern cognitive science, which is based on observation and experience, asserts that belief is an explicit matter of knowledge, and that religious ideas, whether they be meanings or beliefs, suit best the cognitive structure that human acquired through his creation, since the mind contains within it enormous amounts of information and mechanisms that are implicit or not felt.

ʿAbd al-Raḥmān conjures Justin Barrett[1] to reinforce his opinion regarding the institutional beliefs of human knowledge, which is that witness is one of the fundamental factors in the formation of belief, because we believe in what those whom we trust have told us, and we continue to trust them until evidence appears that proves the contrary; also, we continue to believe what most people believe, because we believe those who resemble us most (Barrett, 2011, p. 41).

Though Barrett's and ʿAbd al-Raḥmān's concepts of testimony / witness differ, both consider it to be a form of knowledge. Testimony for Barrett is telling another person at the time of a transaction what one knows, while for ʿAbd al-Raḥmān's

[1] Justin L. Barrett is President of Blueprint 1543 and honorary Professor of Theology and the Sciences at St Andrews University School of Divinity. Prior to founding BP1543, he was at Fuller Theological Seminary, where he led the Thrive Center for Human Development and then the Office for Science, Theology, and Religion (STAR). He came to Fuller from the University of Oxford, where he taught and served as senior researcher for Oxford's Centre for Anthropology and Mind. His book Thriving with Stone Age Minds: Evolutionary Psychology, Christian Faith, and the Quest for Human Flourishing, co-authored with Pamela Ebstyne King, is out now as part of the BioLogos series of books on science and Christianity. Some of his other publications include Psychology of Religion (ed., 2010), Why Would Anyone Believe in God? (2004), Cognitive Science, Religion, and Theology: From Human Minds to Divine Minds (2011), and Born Believers: The Science of Children's Religious Belief (2012).

testimony is acknowledging to a person at the time of *Muwathaqa* what one witnessed of the godly perfections.

Witnessing knowledge becomes the foundation of the knowledge of belief, namely, the point of origin from which the transactional witnessing knowledge branched off. The foundation of this transactional knowledge is based on trusteeship knowledge that is guided and corrected by it, which results in ethical treatment that brings good to all parties (ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, 2021, p. 101).

This means that ʿAbd al-Raḥmān distinguishes between two kinds of knowledge; *religious knowledge* and *scientific knowledge*. In the case of a confidential agreement, the assets of religious knowledge are achieved, and in the case of a transaction, the assets of scientific knowledge are achieved. Achievement takes places in both cases, but in the first case, it takes place before, while in the second, it takes place after. Therefore, the innate in us is not the same as in cognitive science, if it does not take place in an absolute way, but if it does not take place in the case of *Muwathaqa*, as there is no knowledge unless it is achieved, whether it is innate or not innate (ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, 2021, p. 104).

The Theory of Trusteeship introduces an interpretation of *Fiṭra* (Innateness), attributing it to the state of *Muwathaqa* (Agreement) in the Unseen World, which goes beyond the borders of the Seen World, while scientific theory fails to explain or prove the existence of *Fiṭra* (Innateness), because of its dependence on a mind restricted by the limits of the Seen World.

The Mind of Supported Reason distinguishes itself from the abstract performative mind in its heavy insistence on communication with existence, namely, insistence on a point of view that looks at Human in an ordinary way, such that he and the world are in harmony. The human being looks at himself as standing in a series of different equal entities, all of which deserve respect, specifically because of the truth of constant equality in creation (Hallaq, 2020, p. 360).

The Charter of Trusteeship (mīthāq al-iʾtimān)

The Charter of Trusteeship refers to Human's acceptance of the divine offer to hold the Trust, simply by choosing to do so.

> *Indeed, we offered the trust to the heavens, the earth, and the mountains, but they refused to bear it and were afraid of it, and human carried it. Indeed, he was unjust and ignorant. (Al-Ahzab:72) (Saheeh International Translation).*

This event includes two main elements: freedom of choice and the bearing of responsibility. The principle of proportionality between responsibility and freedom is so deeply rooted in the human con-science that it cannot be omitted without seeming somewhat unjust (Draz, 2008, 89), there can be no responsibility without freedom of choice (Al-Mutawakel, 2018, 217) Freedom is an essential element that originated with Human's entity; it was received from the Divine Self directly without mediation, and therefore, it entails responsibility, and consequently, accountability.

The word Human mentioned in the Koranic verse refers to the human race as a whole and not to individuals, one by one, as stated in the Charter of Witness. It should be understood in the context of all races and all of the world's creatures. The distinction of Human from other creatures by his traits is clear; it made him take the initiative to choose what was offered to him, but he did not appreciate what was offered to him in the right way, perhaps because of his lack of knowledge and his inability to perform his right, due to lack of his treatment (ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, 2021, p. 119).

God described Human's choice to accept the Trust as ignorance, which is lack of knowledge. Human was unaware of the consequences of such a choice because of his lack of knowledge of the Seen World, which is the world of transaction, in which freedom and responsibility are exercised.

The concept of the Trust was linked to the Charter of Witness as human beings (Banu Adam) acknowledged the Oneness of their God and witnessed it with certainty because they knew His perfections, which guided them to His Oneness. The word of the Lord (which in the Charter of Witness means "God") in the Charter of Trusteeship means "owner." If Human recognized God's Oneness in the Charter of Witness, he should have recognized the status of ownership in the Charter of Trusteeship. This link between the two charters entails the following consequences (ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, 2021, p. 121):

First, the Lord, who addressed all beings in offering the Trust, was humanifested to them by the perfection of ownership, which means he is the owner of everything and the sole owner of his property, and thus, the divine offer that the beings received is the offer of one who owns not only what He offers, but also the beings themselves.

The second consequence is that the ownership by which the Only God singled Himself out, dissociating Himself from others, stripped every claihumant of the right

to claim the Trust in the transaction. Therefore, in this case, Human is not the owner of anything in a real sense.

The third consequence is that the proof of absolute ownership by the Only God required Him to give proof of His absolute ownership of everything else, even if Human appeared to be dealing freely with what fell into in his hands. Deluded, Human thought that everything that he dealt with was his property by virtue of the (earthly) transaction, but it remained the sole property of its owner.

ʿAbd al-Raḥmān finally defines trusteeship by the negation of its opposite, which is ownership, and thus, trusteeship becomes a request for non-acquisition. He does not object to other definitions, as long as they fall within the concept of non-acquisition and semi-possession. For example, he acknowledges the validity of the definition that the Trust is belief, but Human can be misguided by his belief, calling into question someone else's belief, and such misguidance restricts the right to oneself without evidence. This restriction of the right to own is possession, and belief cannot be a Trust until the right to possess has been removed from it (ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, 2021, p. 123).

The human being acquired *Fiṭra* at the stage of the Charter of Witness (Muw*athaqa Ishhādiyya*), when his God introduced His perfections to him to make him know his God. Thus, his knowledge of his God preceded his knowledge of himself. Then came the Charter of Trusteeship, which led him to know himself, whose behavior he had not known. This is human's movement from his perception of God's total property to his perception that he has no property at all under God. Everything that was put into his hands was only a trust rather than a possession. Thus, Human's knowledge of himself was emptied of his knowledge of his God, which is the movement of the description from the origin (*asl*) to the branch (*far'i*), and his self-knowledge became innate, like the knowledge of God's ownership, and hence the Trust became a subordinate moral value inserted into the Innateness of the human being, as it was inserted into God's ownership, which is an original value (ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, 2021, p. 124).

The presentation of the Trust to all creatures rendered them equal in trusteeship rights, and it is incumbent upon the trustee, even if he is a non-human, to preserve these rights in relation to himself, as well as to any other being, since the comprehensive divine agency bestowed this direct trusteeship in a better way. This means that this trusteeship includes all the creatures in the world.

The Human Trusteeship

The human trusteeship is based on commitment to the Divine Law, which shows the human being how trusteeship should be exercised to achieve the urban end of his existence. Therefore, the trusteeship is bound by absolute belief, which takes away the human being's aspirations of possession, because attachments lead to domination, and domination leads to a dispute with the High Owner in his absolute ownership, and this dispute leads to corruption. According to this principle, human beings have to rid themselves of the spirit to desire possessions (rūḥ al-tamalluk) and take over all responsibilities obligated by reasoning (Suleihuman, 2020, 54). The purpose of the Trusteeship Law is to prevent the harm caused by the transformation of authority in the trusteeship relationship between human beings to domination. The trustee can abuse the authority that is given to him and turn it into a possession of his own.

The duties of trusteeship are, therefore, to prevent the violation of people's rights and infringement on their interests. The most important duty is the duty to keep a promise and fulfill the Covenant; other duties are loyalty, chastity, care, welfare, justice, and charity. Violation of these interests is also a betrayal, as trusteeship is against ownership and possession. The violation of these interests is also treason, since trusteeship is against ownership, and thus ownership becomes treason.

6. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān explains the concept of ownership, saying that what is required in trusteeship is the occurrence of a sensory or internal change, and not a physical, external one. because the human being can strip himself of what he has without ever shifting his feelings. His feelings can also be transformed without stripping what he has from himself for a moment. The sign of such an emotional change is an aversion to the accumulation of possessions and to competition for possessions, since an owner is content with what he has and with what satisfies his needs, and anything more than that is no matter, whether it be in his hands or in the hands of another. If he is afflicted with it more than his food, and covering nakedness like an inheritance or something else, then all of it is given to his Lord, so he is happy to take it out and is distressed that it stays with him for less than a blink of an eye (Al-Muḥasibī, 1971, p. 225),

This emotional transformation in the human being has the status of a transformation of faith, as if he were converting from one religion to another. It is a radical upheaval in his own consciousness; he reestablishes his close relations by conventions, because separation between them leads to dominance, just as independence of treatment leads to a dispute with God in His perfections.

These results and their entailments have four elements: (1) the Owner, due to his Oneness, (2) the human being, due to his gender, (3) his trusteeship, due to lack of possession, and (4) knowledge of responsibility, because it is responsibility for the world.

1. The principle of trusteeship can be formulated as follows: The world is guided on the righteous path when Human takes responsibility for himself and for other species of creatures, realizing that this broad responsibility does not give him the right to possess these species, even if he can deal with them as he likes, given the belief that God is the right owner (ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, 2021, p. 136). Because the human species is both burdened and privileged by the duty of trusteeship and stewardship, born of which translate into care of the world. To be steward is to live in a world that is psychoepistemically saturated with humility and gratitude, it is to live in a world that does not know, much less recognize, mastery and love of domination (Hallaq, 2020. 286).

- **The Charter of Transmission (*Mithaq al-Irsal*):**

God sent the prophets to their peoples in order to enlighten them concerning what he sent them, with the aim of taking care of them. God appeared to them in His perfection of education; namely, He is the One, who has no partner in the upbringing of his creation. On the other hand, the prophets pledge to carry the divine message to their peoples and raise them according to it, as we read in the Holy Koran:

And when God took the covenant of the prophets when I came to you of a book and wisdom, then came to you a messenger confirming what is with you that you would believe in him and help him, he said: "Did you affirm and take my insistence on that?" They said: "We affirm." He said, "So bear witness, and I am with you among the witnesses." (Surat Al Imran, 81) *(Saheeh International Translation).*

The Charter of Transmission represents the Prophet's acknowledgement of the prophets and their testimony in the presence of the Divine Self to the upbringing of the Oneness of God and to the fact that He is the Creator, the Owner, and the Educator.

That is why God sent the prophets (God's prayers be upon them) to call upon his creation to believe in *Tawheed*, the Oneness of God, as that was forced into their Innateness (al Ghazali, 1993, p. 105).

This education works upon the Mind of Abstract Reason(Al-Mawardi, 2013, p. 367), which perceives nothing except superficial things. This kind of education can bequeath the capability of abstraction that is based on external existence, while prophetic education focuses on escaping from that which was bestowed on Human's Mind of Abstract Reason into a mind that goes beyond the explicit into the implicit and transcends the existing (*wujūd)* to arrive at the necessary (*wajib*). It is this education that leads to ethicization, which is the acquisition of values and meanings that lie in the interior of things.

The concern of the messengers in this case is to shape their own nations according to this requirement, and actually shape the whole of humanity, which is undertaken each time a messenger is sent to a certain nation. Thus, the goal of this education by transmission is the ethicization of humanity (ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, 2021, p.198).

Al Ghazali states that ethics aims at Human's happiness and perfection and that God's qualities represent the standard or exemplar of this ethicization: "The perfection of the slave and his happinessis in the ethicization of God's morals and adoption of the meaning of his traits and names" (al-Ghazali, 1968, p. 31).

Al-Ghazali criticizes those who maintain that ethics are fixed, because they are actually changeable: "Some jobless leaners have thought that morals are like creation and they are a trait that does not accept change, and creation is two parts: The first part is one that we have nothing to do with, like heaven and planets, and our organs and body parts, which already exist. The second part is a part that is created and was given a power in it that accepts perfection if the condition of education is available, and its education is related to 'choice' (al-Ghazali, 1995, p. 82). The human being is mixed, with the ability to change through his upbringing; his upbringing is a condition of ethical change that can be attributed to his freedom of choice.

Abd al-Rahman is not satisfied with education on thinking based on the abstract mind alone, but he bases education on reflection that depends on the supported mind. He believes that the abstract mind is its field to engage in the phenomenon, while the supported mind goes beyond the phenomenon towards the verse, given that each

phenomenon is related to different verses, and our awareness of these verses contributes to expanding our understanding and knowledge of the phenomenon

Conclusion

The Trusteeship Theory establishes a moral world order that is based on Human's cognitive and existential origin in the Unseen World (*al-Ghaib*) and which is the true and certain origin upon which human knowledge must be built in the Seen world.

Knowledge, which Human has taken directly from God Almighty, is a set of moral values that are related to God's qualities, which are the foundation upon which the ethics of Human must be built in the Seen world, which is the link between existence (*wujūd*) and necessity (*wujūb*), or between Being and What Must Be.

This Unseen origin of Human brings together all human beings and constructs all humans as Human, regardless of the apparent differences among them, and equates humans on the grounds of equal creation. The discourse of trusteeship is not satisfied with the limited brotherhood among those who bear the Trust; it goes beyond the human relationship to the relationship with other creatures as a part of the Trust that was offered to humans and which they hold, because it was offered to the other creatures before it was offered to Human.

ʿAbd al-Raḥmān seeks to establish a new moral world and to re-envision Human as a moral being who aspires to see his supreme values, which are derived from the qualities of God Almighty, fulfilled in the Seen world and in his daily actions. This moral elevation requires that Human should be the keeper of the Trust as a trustee, rather than as an owner. Trusteeship saves Human from the desire for acquisition and ownership, which is the root of competition, disputes, and conflicts among human beings.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 international license.

References & Notes:

ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, Ṭāha, (2021). *al-mafahim al-akhlaqiyya* bayna *al*-i'tihumaniyya wal *'ilhumaniyya, Beirut ,marks nohoudh.*

ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, Ṭāha. (2012). Rūḥ al-Dīn: Min Ḍīq al-ʿAlmāniyya ilā Saʿat al-Iʾtimānīya. 2nd Ed. Casablanca: al-Markaz al-Thaqāfī al-ʿArabī

ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, Ṭāha. (2005). Al-Ḥaqq al-Islamī fī al-Ikhtilāf al-Fikrī , Casablanca and Beirut: al-Markaz al-Thaqāfī al-ʿArabī.

ʿAbd al-Raḥmān, Ṭāha. (2006). Rūḥ al-Ḥadātha: Naḥwa al-Taʾsīs li-Ḥadātha Islāmiyya,Casablanca and Beirut: al-Markaz al-Thaqāfī al-ʿArabī.

Abbas H. (2021). In Search of a Universal Human Common Denominator: Religion, Ethics, and Communication in the Thought of Jürgen Habermas and ṬāhāʿAbdal-Raḥmān, Journal of Islamic Ethics, 5, 1, 1-27.

Amer, Sabira, Ibn Abbas, & Abdul Malik. (2021). Classification of sciences between Muhammad Abed al-Jabri and Taha Abd al-Rahhuman. Standard, 25(9), 123-136.

Asad . M (1982). Islam at the crossroads, Dar al-Andalus, Glbraltar.

Barrett. J (2011). Cognitive Science, Religion and Theology, Templeton, West Conshohocken.

Ben Hammed, M. W. (2021). (Dis) Enchanting modernity: Sufism and its temporality in the thought of Mohammed Abed al-Jabri and Taha Abdurrahhuman. *The Journal of North African Studies*, *26*(3), 552-571.

Brahimi, M. A. (2020). The Trusteeship Paradigm in the Social Sciences: Moral Agency as an Islamic Ethical Turn. In M. Hashas & M. al-Khatib (Eds.), *Islamic Ethics and the Trusteeship Paradigm: Taha Abderrahhumane's Philosophy in Comparative Perspectives:* (pp. 218–231). Brill.

Draz, M. A. (2008). The Moral World of the Qur'an. (Tr. Danielle Robinson and Rebecca Masterton. London: I. B. Tauris.

Ebrahim M. (2014). "On Reading Shāṭibī in Rabat and Tunis." In Adis Duderija (ed). Maqasid Al Shariʿa and Contemporary Reformist Muslim Thought: An Examination. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Eido, I. (2020). Confession in the Public Sphere: Trusteeship Critique of Foucault's "Confession and Power", In M. Hashas & M. al-Khatib (Eds.), *Islamic Ethics and the Trusteeship Paradigm: Taha Abderrahhumane's Philosophy in Comparative Perspectives:* (pp. 104–130). Brill.

Al-Ghabri. A (2016). Religion and the synthesis of politics from the perspective of Taha Abdel Rahhuman. The islamic college university journal, 2(41)

al Ghazali (1993). Iḥyāʾ ʿulūm al-dīn, Beirut, dar al Fikr.

al Ghazali (1968). *al-Maqsad al-asnā* fi sharh asmā'Allāh *al*-husna, Beirut, *Maktabat al-Jundi.*

al Ghazali (1995). Mizan al-'amal, Beirut, Dar al Hilal.

al Ghazali, (1998). Al-Iqtisād fī al-iʿtiqad, Beirut, *Dār al-Kutub al-*ʿilmīya.

al Ghazali,(1996). *Mishkât Al-Anwar. In* Majmu't *rasael al-imam al Ghazali, Beirut, Dar al Fikr.*
al Ghazali (1993). al-Munqidh min al-dalal,Beirut, dar al Hilal.

Hallaq Wael B. (2020). Reforming Modernity, Ethics and the New Human in the Philosophy of Abdurrahhuman, translated by Amro Othhuman, Columbia University Press.

al-Hamedi, M. (2022). Reason and Religion in Contemporary Arab Thought. *Al-Daleel*, *4*(15).
Hume, David . A Treatise of Human Nature, 3.1.1.27, SBN 469-70

Kepplinger, E. (2020). Taha Abderrahhumane and Abū Isḥāq al-Shāṭibī: Comparative Reflections on Legal Thought and Ethics. In M. Hashas & M. al-Khatib (Eds.), *Islamic Ethics and the Trusteeship Paradigm: Taha Abderrahhumane's Philosophy in Comparative Perspectives:* (pp. 62–77). Brill.

Al-Mawardi (2013). Adab al-Deen Wa al-Dunia, Jeddah, Dar Al-Minhaj.
McDonough, S. (2010). *Muslim ethics and modernity: a comparative study of the ethical thought of Sayyid Ahmad Khan and Mawlana Mawdudi*. Wilfrid Laurier Univ. Press.
Mellouk, A. (2018). Towards a Common Universal Ethic: Putnam, Habermas, and Taha Abdurrahhuman. *Tabayyun*, *6*(24), 97-120.
Al-Muḥasibī (1971). Al-Aql Wa-Fahm Al-Quran. Edited by Husayn Quwwatli. Bayrut: Dar Al-Fikr Lil-Tibaah Wa-al-Tawzi.
Al-Mutawakel, & Youssef. (2018). The Philosophy of Religion according to Taha Abd al-Rahhuman, and the Credit Criticism of Western Modernity. Shehab, 3 (8), 201-226.

Oury, M. (2020), The Trusteeship a Theory for solving Scientific Ethical Dilemma. In M. Hashas & M. al-Khatib (Eds.), *Islamic Ethics and the Trusteeship Paradigm: Taha Abderrahhumane's Philosophy in Comparative Perspectives:* (pp. 232–255). Brill.

Pigden, Charles. "Hume on is and ought." Philosophy Now 83 (2011): 18-20.

Saifuddin, Ahmad Farid, and Boma Panji Astha Tulung. (2021), "Al-'Aql wa'Alaqatuhu bi al-Din inda Thoha Abdurrahhuman." *Tasfiyah: Jurnal Pemikiran Islam* 5.1: 137-164.

Suleihuman, F. (2020). The Philosophy of Taha Abderrahhuman: A Critical Study. *Die Welt des Islams*, *61*(1), 39-71.

Al-Tahri, A. (2020), Religious political practice, In M. Hashas & M. al-Khatib (Eds.), Islamic Ethics and the Trusteeship Paradigm: Taha Abderrahhumane's Philosophy in Comparative Perspectives :(pp. 131–149). Brill.

Viersen, H. (2020), The Modern Mysticism of Taha Abderrahhumane. In M. Hashas & M. al-Khatib (Eds.), *Islamic Ethics and the Trusteeship Paradigm: Taha Abderrahhumane's Philosophy in Comparative Perspectives* (pp. 170–194). Brill.

El-Yousfi, A. (2020). The Anthropology of Islam in Light of the Trusteeship Paradigm. In M. Hashas & M. al-Khatib (Eds.), *Islamic Ethics and the Trusteeship Paradigm: Taha Abderrahhumane's Philosophy in Comparative Perspectives.* (pp. 197–217). Brill.

Zatari, F. (2022). Entrustment Ethics and Secularism: Taha Abdurrahhuman's Perspective. *darulfunun ilahiyat*, *33*(1).