The Quranic Construct of Dignity and Modern Systems: An Ideological Study

[1]Umer Farooq, [2]Zia Ur Rehman, [3]Noreen Tahir, [4]Hafiz Jamil Khalil, [5]Tabindah Khalid, [6]Hafiz Muhammad Saleem, [7]Afshan Mubeen, [8]Dr. Malik Kamran

[1]Lecturer, Department of Islamic Studies, the University of Lahore, Lahore, Pakistan. yousafumer329@gmail.com
[2]Lecturer, Department of Islamic Studies, the University of Lahore, Lahore, Pakistan. ziadogerkasur450@gmail.com
[3]PhD. Scholar, Department of Islamic Studies, University of Engineering and Technology, Lahore. noreentahir1980@gmail.com
[4]Lecturer, Department of Islamic Studies, the University of Lahore, Lahore, Pakistan. Jamilkhalilajmi@gmail.com
[5]PhD. Scholar, Department of Islamic Studies, University of Engineering and Technology, Lahore. tabindah.Khalid@yahoo.com
[6]PhD. Scholar, Department of Islamic Studies, University of Engineering and Technology, Lahore. saleemnizami92@gmail.com
[7]PhD. Scholar, Department of Islamic Studies, Superior University, Lahore. mubeeng4588@gmail.com
[8]Associate Professor, Department of Islamic Studies, The University of Lahore , Lahore. malik.kamran@ais.uol.edu.pk

HOW TO CITE:
Umer Farooq, Zia Ur Rehman, Noreen Tahir, Hafiz jamil Khalil, Tabindah Khalid, Hafiz Muhammad Saleem, Afshan Mubeen, Malik Kamran (2026). The Quranic Construct of Dignity and Modern Systems: An Ideological Study. International Journal of Special Education, 41(17s), 245-252

COPYRIGHT STATEMENT:
Copyright: © 2026 Authors. Open access publication underthe terms and conditions of the Creative CommonsAttribution (CC BY) license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

ABSTRACT:
This research is the Quranic interpretation" Azallah upon the believers." It is based on a re-examination and renewal of the intellectual and spiritual dimensions of the Quran, which have been examined in the context of contemporary intellectual currents, especially liberalism, secularism, and humanism. The aforementioned Quranic synthesis, which plays a key role in the formation of Islamic identity, interfaith relations, and collective attitudes, has been associated with a specific historical and cultural context in the traditional exegetical heritage. However, in the multicultural, pluralistic, and globalized atmosphere of the present era, the exploration of new dimensions of this interpretation has become an indispensable scholarly requirement. The study under review examines how classical exegetes defined this Quranic concept within the political, social, and cultural contexts of their time, and to what extent these interpretations are consistent with or inconsistent with the Quran's universal moral message. The research also critically examines the duality that is established between "believers" and "unbelievers," and considers the possibility that this division cannot be reinterpreted in terms of moral attitudes, value commitments, and social responsibility rather than simply a distinction of belief. Furthermore, this paper analyzes the possibilities of interaction, compatibility and conflict of this Quranic concept with modern intellectual systems. The individualism of liberalism, the separation of religion and state of secularism, and the universal human dignity of human thought are discussed in a comparative manner with Islamic ethics. The research presents the position that if this Quranic synthesis is understood in its true moral and principled context, it is not only not in conflict with contemporary intellectual currents but can provide a balanced, ethical and mutually reinforcing framework for the principles of coexistence. interdisciplinary research approach that includes classical exegesis, modern Islamic thought, and contemporary philosophical debates, this study attempts to build an intellectual bridge between tradition and modernity. Ultimately, this research presents a renewed and dynamic understanding of this Quranic interpretation that transcends externalistic or dialectical interpretations and has a comprehensive and contemporary meaning consistent with Islamic principles such as mercy, justice, and human dignity.

Keywords: Quranic interpretation, Islamic identity, tradition and modernity, moral message, contemporary intellectual currents.

Part 1: Ideological Differences Between Modern Thought Currents and the Islamic Code of Walā' and Barā'

The first point of this discussion highlights the fundamental contradiction between the concept of the individual and the concept of the ummah, because in Islamic thought, the existence of the ummah is not simply a geographical or ethnic unit, but a religious relationship that is formed on the basis of faith and transcends all superficial distinctions. ,In the Islamic conception the nation is not a discrete human gathering governed by common interests, but rather a complex relationship based on faith in God and His Messenger, and transcends the boundaries of ethnicity, geography, and language. (Qaradawi, 1982) The concept of the Islamic Ummah is based on a transcendental religious relationship, while modern liberal thought places the individual at the center and relegates collective identity to a secondary position. Charles Taylor describes this individualism in these words:

The liberal tradition begins with the individual, while religious traditions often begin with a community constituted by shared beliefs and obligations. (Taylor, 1989)

Whereas in the Islamic concept the Ummah is an organic entity with collective duties and mutual responsibility, liberal ,philosophy places the individual at the center of all priorities .resulting in an unbridgeable gulf between these two perspectives The issue of individual freedom and collective responsibility is also an offshoot of this contradiction, for in Islamic thought individual freedom is subject to moral limits and the objectives of the Sharia, while in liberal thought it is seen as beyond any external constraints. Freedom in Islam is not a release from all imprisonment, but it is a moral responsibility that is governed by the interests of the community and the purposes of the law. (Amara, 1998) This position of Muhammad Amara introduces the Islamic concept of freedom as a code and responsibility that subordinates individual interests to collective good, while John Stuart Mill's view is the exact opposite.The individual is not accountable to society for his actions insofar as these concern the interests of no person but himself. (Mill, 1859)

A fundamental conflict is evident here, where in the Islamic system the scope of individual action is limited by the concept of collective responsibility and afterlife reckoning, while in liberal thought individual autonomy is considered absolute, which is a real challenge to the spirit of the code of allegiance and disassociation. The clash between religious identity and global citizenship is another important axis, in which Islamic identity is identified with its religious and cultural background, while the modern concept of global citizenship believes in a universal moral community by destroying all characteristics.Islamic divinity is based on belief and cultural affiliation, while modern international citizenship is based on transcending religious and cultural characteristics. (Al-Alwani, 1994) This analysis by Taha

Jaber Al-Alwani indicates that Islamic identity is a ,comprehensive unit that encompasses both faith and civilization while the concept of globalization dissolves all these characteristics and propagates a colorless humanity.

Cosmopolitanism regards all human beings as members of a single moral community. (Appiah, 2006)

Appiah's statement illustrates the ideological background of ,global citizenship that renders religious distinctions meaningless and this is where the code of humiliation over believers and ,honor over disbelievers faces a serious ideological challenge .because this code mandates a separate and distinct faith identity

The standards of loyalty, affiliation, and cultural affiliation also have a profound difference along the same lines, where in Islamic thought loyalty is not simply related to political or national affiliations but to faith and culture. Loyalty in Islam is a marital and cultural relationship that determines the nature of the relationship between an individual and his nation, and is not limited to national or political ties. (Al-Buti, 1991)

Al-Buti's position links the concept of filial piety to a religious and cultural dimension, which transcends any national or political affiliation, and is the spiritual core of the code of filial piety and renunciation.

National identity depends on shared memories, common myths, and collective loyalties. (Smith, 1991)

Smith's definition links national identity to shared memories and collective loyalties, which is a worldly and relative identity, and thus highlights a fundamental contrast in the standards of loyalty between Islamic and modern concepts. The comparison of the concepts of right and wrong is the logical conclusion of this discussion, because in Islamic thought, right is a fixed and unchanging reality that is authentically revealed, while in modern thought, reality is considered to be something relative and socially constructed.

,Al-Haqq in Islamic vision is a proven fact based on revelation but modern thought is inclined to relativity and considering truth as a variable matter. (Qutb, 1983)

So This quote from Muhammad Qutb presents the Islamic concept of truth as an absolute reality based on revelation, which is not subject to change under any circumstances, and therefore the concept of the code of allegiance and disassociation is an eternal and unchanging principle.

Truth is not discovered but made; it is constructed within particular social and historical contexts. (Rorty, 1989)

This philosophical position of Rorty considers reality to be something relative and context-dependent, which is completely at odds with the Islamic concept of truth, and hence no understanding seems possible between the Islamic code of humiliation over believers and dignity over disbelievers and modern intellectual currents, but rather it involves a perpetual ideological conflict that leaves no room for compromise in its .fundamental principles

Part II : Intellectual objections to the rule of Azzallah on the believers in the infidelsin the context of liberalism

The basic philosophy of liberalism gives absolute status to human freedom and places the autonomy of the individual above all moral and social limits, while the Islamic code of loyalty and disavowal requires that the believer's loyalty and love should be centered on obedience to Allah and His Messenger and his aversion to disbelief and polytheism should be clear and unambiguous. When these two points of view are put against each other, a fundamental conflict emerges that is not limited to a mere superficial difference but goes to the roots of thought and vision, because in liberalism, man is the sovereign ruler of his desires and interests, while in Islam, man's true freedom is hidden in his servitude and responsibilities. Thus, this first contradiction of absolute freedom and religious commitment is evidence that while liberal thought makes the individual independent of any higher law, Islamic thought considers faith as the first condition for all kinds of freedom, and thus any attempt to adapt the aforementioned code to a liberal system would be tantamount to distorting its original spirit.

,Individual freedom is an absolute value in liberal philosophy while Islam links it with the responsibility of man before God and society. (Al-Awa, 2006)

This position of Muhammad Salim Al-Awa illustrates the fundamental difference between Islamic and liberal concepts, in that Islam views freedom as a responsibility rather than an absolute value, which is associated with accountability to Allah and social obligations, while in liberal philosophy this aspect of responsibility is missing and the individual is considered the master of his own will, on whom no external constraints are imposed. Thus, when a believer determines his loyalties according to the code of humiliation over believers and honor over disbelievers, he clashes with the concept of freedom that considers the individual to be the absolute ruler of his body and mind, and thus, from the perspective of liberal philosophy, this code appears to be an unnecessary constraint against human freedom.

Over himself, over his own body and mind, the individual is sovereign. (Mill, 1859)

This famous statement of Mill shows the extreme of liberal freedom where the individual is declared the sovereign ruler of his own existence and no religious or moral law has the right to interfere with this autonomy, and this is the point where the code of allegiance and disavowal is seen as an unreasonable constraint in the liberal system, because this code subjects the sphere of action of the individual against his will to a higher ideological order and thus is completely contrary to the spirit of liberal freedom. When the modern concept of pluralism or pluralism collides with Islamic distinctive identity, a new and complex problem arises, because liberal pluralism demands that all cultures and beliefs can live under the same political and social system without any discrimination, while the code of humiliation over believers and dignity over infidels gives believers a separate and distinct identity that sets them apart from others. This issue is not limited to theoretical debates but also affects the struggle of Muslims to maintain their identity in practical life, because in modern pluralistic societies, it is demanded that each group abandon its special identity and integrate into common social values, which is contrary to the Islamic code of loyalty and renunciation. Contemporary cultural pluralism calls for the removal of theological differences, while Islam preserves the distinctiveness of the nation and its distinctiveness. Tariq Al-Bishri highlights the fundamental contradiction here that modern pluralism seeks to erase the gaps between identities, while Islam emphasizes maintaining the unique and religious identity of its ,ummah, and this is where the code of fidelity and non-violence on the one hand, commands Muslims to preserve their unique identity, while on the other hand, the modern pluralist system seeks to dissolve this identity and merge it into a colorless .humanity, resulting in an insoluble conflict

Pluralism assumes that diverse ways of life can coexist within a common political framework. (Gray, 2000)

Gray argues that pluralism provides an opportunity for different ways of life to coexist under a common political structure, but the important question here is whether this common structure can tolerate Islamic distinctive identity or will it dissolve and integrate into a common culture, and it is clear that liberal pluralism tends towards the latter and this poses a real challenge to the code of humiliation over believers and honor over disbelievers, because this code does not tolerate any kind of negation of sameness or identity, but rather believes in a clear and unambiguous faith distinction. The issue of religious affiliation and human equality is also an important branch of this contradiction, because in liberal thought the concept of basic human equality grants the same moral status to all human beings regardless of religion and race, while in the Islamic system the concept of equality, although it considers everyone equal in human dignity and basic rights, is limited in terms of faith affiliation and hereafter success. It makes a clear distinction. This distinction is such a delicate and sensitive issue that in modern egalitarian societies, the code of kinship and kinship is presented as a discriminatory and unequal principle, although in reality the concept of Islamic equality is centered on justice and fairness and places religious affiliations within the confines of mere belief and not within the realm of social rights. Equality in Islam does not mean the abolition of contractual obligations, but equality in human dignity, justice and basic rights. (Al-Zahili, 1998) This important position of Wahba Al-Zuhaili clarifies the true

meaning of Islamic equality. Equality in Islam does not mean erasing religious affiliations, but rather considering everyone equal in human dignity and basic rights. Thus, the code of allegiance and renunciation that gives believers honor and superiority over unbelievers is actually based on the principle of justice and fairness, not injustice or discrimination. However, the liberal mind is unable to understand this difference and considers it a biased and unequal principle.

All persons possess equal moral worth simply by virtue of their humanity. (Rawls, 1971, p. 19)

,Rawls's statement is based on the liberal concept of equality which grants equal moral value to all individuals simply on the basis of being human and considers any kind of religious, racial or cultural distinction to be contrary to moral equality, and on this basis, the principle of humiliation over believers and honor over infidels is considered a discriminatory and unequal principle ,against modern egalitarianism. Although in the Islamic context this principle strengthens the brotherhood of faith on the one hand and also commands justice and kindness towards infidels on the other, this comprehensiveness is ignored in the liberal interpretation. Liberal criticism of the concepts of tolerance and innocence is another deep challenge, because liberal tolerance means that a person tolerates and recognizes the existence of ,other beliefs and actions, even if they are against his own choice while the Islamic concept of innocence is based on disbelief and polytheism. It commands aversion and separation, and this is where the liberal mind interprets Islamic tolerance as intolerance and bigotry. But in reality, Islamic tolerance is aversion to the belief of disbelief, not oppression or abuse of infidels, and this distinction is very important because Islam commands justice and kindness towards non-Muslims on a social level while maintaining tolerance on a religious level, and this is the true and balanced concept of Islamic tolerance, which is completely different from liberal tolerance. Al-Bari'ah in the Islamic concept does not require injustice or aggression, but it means the distinction of the contract with the obligation of justice and beneficence.(Al-Hawali, 1992)So This quote from Safar al-Hawali reveals the true meaning of Islamic innocence and makes ,it clear that innocence does not at all mean oppression or excess but rather is an expression of religious distinction that does not conflict with dealing with non-Muslims with justice and kindness. This is the important point that liberal criticism ignores and associates innocence with extremism and intolerance, even though Islamic teachings repeatedly command good treatment and justice towards the People of the Book, and innocence is .limited only to the sphere of faith

Tolerance requires accepting the coexistence of beliefs and practices one may strongly disagree with. (Walzer, 1997)

Walzer's definition of tolerance defines it as accepting beliefs and practices with which one strongly disagrees, and from here Islamic innocence is presented as an intolerant attitude, although Islamic innocence negates disbelief and polytheism at the doctrinal level, not the negation of social or human relations with followers of other religions, and thus when the concept of liberal tolerance collides with Islamic innocence, it creates an ideological conflict in which both sides are unable to understand each other based on their own concepts. The challenge of globalization and Islamic distinctiveness of the Ummah is the ,greatest and most widespread challenge of the modern era because globalization attempts to create a global cultural and economic system in which all characteristics and distinctions are ,erased and a universal human civilization comes into being while the Islamic code of humiliation over believers is dignity over Al-Kafirin presents Muslims as a distinct and unique community that must preserve its religious and cultural identity at all costs. This pressure of globalization places Muslims in a situation where they have to choose between their identity and global uniformity, and this is where the code of allegiance and disavowal emerges as a practical challenge and its observance becomes a difficult and complex obligation in a global society.Globalization seeks to build a unified global cultural model, while Islam adheres to the particularity of the nation and its civilization. (Shafiq, 2001) In this excerpt, Munir Shafiq clarifies the fundamental contradiction between globalization's project of cultural homogeneity and the preservation of Islamic distinctive identity, and this is the axis where the code of humiliation over believers and honor over disbelievers faces a severe challenge, because every step of globalization attempts to dissolve the unique identity of the Islamic Ummah and assimilate it into a universal culture, while the Islamic code considers this assimilation as a return to disbelief and polytheism and a violation of loyalty and innocence, and thus, under the pressure of globalization, the Muslim stands in a place where on one side is worldly success and modernity, and on the other, his faith and belief.Globalization compresses the world and intensifies the consciousness of the world as a whole. (Robertson, 1992)

Robertson's statement that globalization shrinks the world and intensifies a universal consciousness indicates that in the modern global system, all nations and cultures are coming closer to each other and their boundaries are disappearing, and in this global consciousness, the Islamic code of loyalty and disavowal is seen as an obstacle that disrupts this project of uniformity, and therefore the modern global society considers this code to be an unnecessary and outdated principle, while from the Islamic point of view, this code is the guarantee of the survival of the Ummah and the preservation of its cultural identity. Thus, all the points of this discussion together prove that the challenges facing the code of humiliation over believers and dignity over infidels in ,the context of liberalism are not merely superficial or temporary but are deep ideological and intellectual, which undermine the basic meaning of this code. And its practical application affects both.

Part III: Interpretative Difficulties of the Code in the Context of Secularism

The basic demand of secularism is the separation of religion and state and the submission of all political and legal matters to human reason and will, while the Islamic code of humiliation over believers and honor over disbelievers is a doctrinal principle that encompasses every aspect of a believer's life and organizes .his loyalties and relationships under a higher religious order ,When these contradictions come into conflict with each other difficulties arise in the interpretation of the code and its practical application that are not limited to intellectual debate but also complicate the everyday relations between a secular state and its Muslim citizens. Thus, when the theory of the separation of religion and politics is applied to the code of allegiance and disassociation, the question arises as to whether a Muslim can ,separate his religious allegiance from political and legal matters and whether this separation itself is not against the spirit of the code that links every action and every relationship of the believer to obedience to Allah and His Messenger.

Indeed, secularism is based on the separation between religion and the state, and the removal of religious authority from the political and legislative spheres, and making human will the highest source of power. (Amar, 1997) This statement by Muhammad Amar reveals the true meaning of secularism and clarifies its fundamental characteristic, namely the separation of religion and state and the recognition of human will as the source of authority, and this is the point where the code of humiliation over believers and honor over disbelievers faces a major interpretive difficulty, because this code binds the believer to a loyalty that is beyond state sovereignty and human law and its source is revelation, not human will, and thus in a secular system this code either remains a meaningless symbol or leads to constant conflict with state courts and legal structures.

Liberalism demands the separation of church and state, but it cannot demand the separation of politics and morality. (Sandel, 1982) This important position of Sandel highlights an important difference between liberalism and secularism: although liberalism demands the separation of church and state, it cannot separate politics and ethics, and this is the point where the Islamic code can maintain its moral and principled status. However, the problem is that in a secular system, this moral and religious code is excluded from the political and legal sphere and is considered a purely personal and private matter, while in the Islamic concept, this code governs both private and collective life, and thus its interpretation in a secular framework becomes problematic where it is either completely negated or distorted from its original meaning and turned into a private symbol. The question of state neutrality and religious loyalty is another

fundamental challenge facing the code of allegiance and disassociation in the context of secularism, because the secular state requires that it remain neutral in matters of all religions and not give preference or superiority to any religion, while the Islamic code gives a clear and unambiguous command to be gentle with their brothers in faith and respectful and firm against the infidels. This contradiction is exacerbated when a Muslim wants to perform his religious duties in a secular state and state institutions restrict or prevent this practice in the name of impartial policies, and thus the Muslim is faced with a situation where no reconciliation between his religious loyalty and state impartiality seems possible. The secular state imposes neutrality towards all religions, while the religious affiliation imposes on the believer a special system of loyalty and commitment.(Al-Bashri, 2011) Tariq Al-Bishri in this excerpt illustrates the fundamental contradiction between the assumption of a secular state and religious loyalty, that while the secular state claims equality and indifference to all religions, religious affiliation demands a specific system of loyalty and commitment from its adherents, and this is where any attempt to adapt the code of humiliation over believers and honor over disbelievers to a secular system fails, because where the state adopts an equal and impartial attitude, the Islamic code dictates a preferential and discriminatory attitude, and these two contradictory requirements can never coexist.

A liberal state does not seek to promote any particular conception of the good life. (Rawls, 1993)

This statement by Rawls illustrates the impartial nature of the liberal state that does not want to promote a particular concept of the good life, and this is the point where the Islamic code of allegiance and non-disclosure, which promotes a particular good life, namely faith and its requirements, clashes with this impartial assumption of the secular state and it has to either give up its claim or challenge the traditional interpretations of the secular system, and as a result of this conflict, the interpretation of the code becomes difficult where its voice is either suppressed or it is presented as an extremist and undemocratic position. The concept of the secular nation-state and the Muslim Ummah is also an important dimension of this contradiction, because the secular nation-state bases its foundation on national sovereignty and territorial affiliation, while the concept of the Islamic Ummah is a faith community that transcends any geographical or ethnic boundaries. When this conceptual difference is applied to the code of allegiance and disavowal, an interpretive confusion arises where, on the one hand, a Muslim is required to be loyal to his nation-state, while on the other hand, his code of faith binds .him to a religious relationship with the entire Muslim Ummah When there is a conflict between these two loyalties, the Muslim becomes a victim of moral and practical confusion. The nation in the Islamic concept is a complex relationship that transcends national and geographical boundaries, while the modern state is based on national sovereignty and regional affiliation. (Qaradawi, 1997)

The Islamic Ummah is a religious bond that transcends all national and geographical boundaries, while the modern state is based on national sovereignty and territorial affiliation, and this is where the interpretation of the principle of humiliation over the believers and dignity over the infidels in the secular nation-state becomes a complex issue, because this principle links the believer to his entire Ummah and demands strength and unity from it against the infidels, while the nation-state seeks to unite all its citizens under a common national identity, regardless of religion, and thus these two perspectives become contradictory.

The nation is an imagined political community imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign. (Anderson, 1983)

Anderson defines the nation-state as an imaginary political community that considers itself limited and autonomous, and this autonomy and limitation are radically different from the concept of the Islamic Ummah, which is unlimited and open to all humanity provided that it accepts the bond of faith, and thus there is an unbridgeable gulf between the concepts of the secular nation-state and the Islamic Ummah that makes the interpretation of the code of allegiance and disassociation in a secular context almost impossible, because any interpretation would either deviate from the spirit of the code or clash with the state structure.

The status of religious values in international relations is another ,important challenge for regulation in the context of secularism because the secular theory of international relations gives priority to interests and power over moral and religious principles, while justice, loyalty and mercy have been declared as fundamental principles in the Islamic foreign policy system and the code of loyalty and non-disclosure also affects the policies of Muslims in international relations. When this contradiction comes to the practical level, it is seen that in a secular world system, Muslim governments find it difficult to present their religious values in international policies and are often forced to sacrifice or weaken their religious identity in order to establish their place in the world system.

It is not possible to isolate international relations in Islam from the values of parental ethics; Justice, loyalty and mercy are the governing principles of international conduct. (Al-Zahili, 1981) above illustrates the fundamental characteristic of Islamic international relations that they cannot be separated from moral and religious values, and that justice, loyalty, and mercy are its governing principles. This is the point where a fundamental conflict occurs between the secular theory of international ,relations and the Islamic code of loyalty and non-violence ,because in the secular system, interests and power are central while the Islamic code commands believers to be gentle with their brothers in faith and firm against infidels, and this means that religious values have a central position in Islamic international relations that challenges the foundations of secular theory.

Realist theory assumes that international politics is governed primarily by interests and power rather than moral principles. (Morgenthau, 1948)

Morgenthau's statement presents a realistic theory of international relations that gives priority to interests and power over moral principles, and this is the point where the Islamic code of wilā wa barā is seen as an impractical and unrealistic principle in the secular international system, because this code mandates ,the introduction of religious values into international relations while the secular system wants to limit these values to mere personal matters or internal policies, and thus the interpretation of this code at the international level is fraught with serious difficulties. The conflict over the role of religion in private and collective life is an important and final point of this discussion in the context of secularism, because the secular system wants to limit religion to private and personal life, while Islam presents religion as a comprehensive system that regulates all aspects of the life of the individual and society. This contradiction, when applied to the principle of humiliation over believers and honor over disbelievers, shows that this principle is not merely a personal or private belief, but a social and cultural principle that determines the relations of Muslims with each other and their dealings with non-Muslims, and limiting it to the private sphere is contrary to its true spirit and its collective application.Al- ,Gharbaean Secularism tends to limit religion in private affairs while Islam views religion as a comprehensive system that regulates the affairs of the individual and society. (Qutb, 1988) This quote from Muhammad Qutb illustrates the fundamental difference between Western secularism and the Islamic concept of religion. Whereas secularism attempts to limit religion to the private sphere, Islam sees religion as a comprehensive system that regulates all the affairs of the individual and society. This is the point where interpreting the principle of humiliation over the believers and dignity over the disbelievers in a secular context becomes a fundamental problem, because the application of this principle is not limited ,to the mosque or the home, but rather encompasses all political economic, and social matters, and any attempt to limit it to the private sphere distorts its true meaning.

Religion is increasingly confined to the private sphere in modern secular societies. (Casanova, 1994)

Casanova's statement reflects the tendency in modern secular societies to confine religion to the private sphere, and this tendency is the greatest challenge to the code of humiliation over believers and honor over infidels, because this code is by its nature a public and collective principle that determines the ,collective life of Muslims and their relations with non-Muslims

and restricting it to the private sphere destroys its very foundation. Therefore, any interpretation of this code in a secular system will either deviate from its true spirit or present an interpretation that will be a failed attempt to combine both secular values and Islamic principles. All the points in this discussion point to the fact that the framework of secularism is such an inhospitable environment for the code of loyalty and abstention that its correct interpretation and practical application are almost impossible, and that this code, in its entirety, is And in the comprehensive sense it only makes sense in a system that recognizes religion as part of collective and political life and not restricts it to the private sphere.

Part IV: The Problem of Human Brotherhood and Religious Discrimination in the Context of Humanism

When the philosophy of humanism or anthropocentrism comes to the fore in its complete and comprehensive meaning, it places man at the center of all values and standards and considers him self-sufficient and independent, independent of any transcendent reality. Whereas in the Islamic system of thought and action, the center is given to Allah Almighty and man has been declared His vicegerent and deputy who turns to this supreme reality in all his actions and rests. When these two points of view are compared with the code of humiliation over believers and honor over disbelievers, the issue of human brotherhood and religious distinction takes on a complex form where humanism wants to unite all humans in a single universal brotherhood, while the Islamic code gives priority to brotherhood of faith and gives .believers a separate and distinct identity compared to infidels Therefore, a comparative study of anthropocentrism and God-centeredness uncovers the fundamental root of this problem and proves that while humanism makes man the standard and measure of everything, Islam considers the will and command of Allah the standard of everything, and as a result of this fundamental difference, the interpretation of the code of allegiance and disassociation also becomes completely different. Modern human philosophy is based on the centrality of man and his independence, while the Islamic concept is based on the centrality of God and the opposition of man to the earth. (Amar, 2000)

This quote by Muhammad Amar clarifies the fundamental contradiction between humanism and Islam: whereas modern humanist philosophy gives man centrality and autonomy, Islamic thought gives God centrality and makes man his vicegerent and vicegerent. This is the point where the principle of humiliation over believers and exaltation over disbelievers becomes difficult to understand in the context of humanism, because this principle prioritizes the command of Allah over man's will and autonomy and commands believers to subordinate all their loyalties and affections to Allah and His Messenger, while in humanism, man's own will and his own understanding are the ultimate standard of reality.

Humanism is the view that human beings are capable of morality and self-fulfillment without belief in the supernatural. (Lamont, 1997)

Lamont's definition presents humanism as a theory that considers man to be capable of morality and self-fulfillment without any transcendental belief, and this is the point that is in complete ,contradiction with the Islamic code of loyalty and disavowal because this code is not based solely on human abilities or efforts at self-fulfillment, but rather on faith in Allah and obedience to His command, and thus this autonomous and transcendental human of humanism presents a concept completely opposite to the subordinate and obedient human of the Islamic code. The relationship between universal humanity and faith-based ,brotherhood is an important and sensitive aspect of this topic because humanism tries to include all humans in a single universal brotherhood and considers any kind of religious or belief-based distinction as an obstacle to this brotherhood, while in the Islamic system, faith-based brotherhood has precedence over universal human brotherhood and the code of humiliation over the believers. commands believers to have a special relationship and love for one another that is different from their relationship with the infidels. This issue becomes more complicated when we see that Islam, while commanding justice and kindness towards non-Muslims, prioritizes brotherhood of faith over all other human brotherhood, and this is where no reconciliation between humanism and Islam seems possible. The brotherhood of humanity in Islam does not abolish the brotherhood of faith, but integrates with it within the framework of justice, mercy and human dignity. (Al-Salabi, 2007)

This quote from Ali Muhammad al-Salabi clarifies the relationship between human brotherhood and brotherhood of faith in the Islamic concept, that human brotherhood does not cancel brotherhood of faith but is complemented by it in the realm of justice, mercy and human dignity, and this is the point where the Islamic code provides a balanced and comprehensive response to humanism's claim of universal brotherhood, because it gives brotherhood of faith a high and special status by ordering justice and kindness to all human beings, while humanism refuses to accept this distinction and wants to place all human beings on the same level without discrimination.

We are citizens of the world before we are citizens of any nation. (Nussbaum, 1996)

This statement by Nussbaum clarifies the concept of universal humanity that we are citizens of the world before we are citizens ,of any nation, and this universality requires that all national religious and cultural distinctions be put aside, and this is the position that poses the greatest challenge to the Islamic code of humiliation over believers and honor over disbelievers, because this code gives believers a special and specific identity and commands them to prioritize this faith identity over any universal identity, and thus the concept of universal brotherhood of humanism and the concept of faith brotherhood of Islam stand in opposition to each other. The clash of moral relativism and absolute values creates another deep ideological chasm between humanism and the Islamic code, because the modern philosophy of humanism considers moral values to be relative and conditional on social conditions, while Islam considers moral values to be absolute. and is authentically revealed and unaffected by any temporal or spatial change. When this ,contradiction is applied to the code of kinship and renunciation it is seen that the Islamic code is an absolute and unchanging principle that is equally applicable to Muslims in all times and places, while in the context of humanism it is seen as a relative and historical principle that can be adapted to changing circumstances or should be abandoned altogether. Ethics in Islam ,are based on absolute values, the source of which is revelation but contemporary philosophies tend to relativize ethics and relate values to social contexts. (Qutb, 1983)

This quote from Muhammad Qutb illustrates the fundamental difference between Islamic ethics and modern philosophies, that Islamic ethics is based on absolute values derived from revelation, while modern philosophies tend towards moral relativism and relate values to social circumstances, and this is the point where the principle of humiliation over believers and honor over disbelievers is seen as a difficult and complex principle in the context of humanism, because this principle, due to its absolute and unchanging status, does not accept any kind of relative interpretation or change, while the relative and context-dependent perspective of humanism considers it an outdated and irrelevant principle.

There are no objective moral facts independent of human beliefs and practices.(Rorty, 1991)

Rorty's statement clarifies the relativistic position on moral reality, that there are no objective moral facts independent of human beliefs and actions, and this is the point that clashes with the absolute and revealed foundations of the Islamic code of allegiance and disassociation, because this code is an expression of an objective and absolute reality independent of any human belief or action, which has been revealed by Allah and cannot be interpreted in any relative or conditional way, and thus the theory of moral relativism of humanism and the theory of absolute values of Islam stand in opposition to each other and no intermediary path can reconcile them.

The debates on human dignity and religious identity are another important aspect of this topic, because in humanism, human dignity is enjoyed equally by every individual as a human being and does not include any kind of religious, ethnic or cultural distinction, while in the Islamic concept, although human dignity is enjoyed by all humans as honorable creatures, religious

identity further strengthens and specifies this dignity and grants a special honor and status to believers through the code of loyalty and disassociation. This issue becomes even more sensitive when we see that the Islamic code grants honor and dominance to believers over infidels, which is presented as a discriminatory and unjust principle in the equal and non-discriminatory system of humanism.

,The dignity of man in Islam is established as a noble creature but the religious divinity remains an essential element in the formation of his personality and his cultural significance. (Al-Awa, 2006)

This quote from Muhammad Salim al-Awa illustrates the relationship between human dignity and religious identity in the Islamic concept, that human dignity is inherent to every human being as a noble creature, but religious identity is a fundamental element in the formation of his personality and cultural affiliation, and this is the point where the Islamic code differs from humanism's universal and non-discriminatory concept of human dignity, because this code grants believers a special and specific honor that is earned on the basis of faith and not simply ,on the basis of being human, and thus in the Islamic system human dignity and religious identity cannot be separated from each other but rather reinforce each other.

Human dignity is grounded in the equal worth of all persons regardless of race, religion, or social status. (Donnelly, 2013)

Donnelly's statement bases human dignity on the equal value of all individuals and excludes any distinction of race, religion, or social status, and this is the position that is in complete contradiction with the Islamic code of humiliation over believers and superiority over disbelievers, because this code considers religious identity to be a fundamental and decisive factor in determining human dignity and grants believers a special honor and status compared to infidels, which the universal and non-discriminatory system of humanism considers a discriminatory and unequal principle, although from the Islamic perspective this distinction is based on justice, fairness, and the truth of faith, and not on any oppression or injustice. A comparison of modern human rights concepts and the Quranic code is the logical and final conclusion of this discussion, because the modern human rights theory grants rights to all individuals equally on the basis of being human and does not subject them to any Nor does it ,make it conditional on a higher reality or religious command while the Quranic code of humiliation over believers and honor over disbelievers presents rights and duties in a comprehensive system where rights are determined by Allah and are associated with duties and responsibilities. This contradiction becomes even more profound when we see that the modern human rights system does not accept any religious distinction and grants equal rights to all human beings regardless of faith, while the Islamic code grants a special status to believers and a separate status to infidels, and thus no harmony between these two systems seems possible. Indeed, human rights in Islam are not a gift from the state or the community, but rather, they are rights prescribed by Allah, associated with obligation and responsibility. (Al-Zahili, 2005)

This quote from Wahba Al-Zuhaili clarifies the fundamental characteristic of Islamic human rights, that these rights are not a gift from the state or society, but are determined by Allah Almighty and are associated with duties and responsibilities, and this is the point where the Islamic code becomes radically different from the concepts of modern human rights, because in the modern system, rights are acquired simply by virtue of being ,human and are not related to any higher reality or religious order while in the Islamic system, the source of rights is Allah and they are balanced with responsibilities and obligations, and this which gives believers a ع أَذِلَّةٍ balance is the basis of the code of special status based on their faith and distinguishes them from infidels.

Human rights are rights possessed by all persons simply in virtue of their humanity. (Nickel, 2007)

This statement by Nickel presents the basic definition of human rights, that these rights are enjoyed by all human beings simply by virtue of being human, and this definition is completely contradictory to the Islamic code of humiliation over believers and honor over disbelievers, because this code does not grant rights and status simply on the basis of being human, but rather associates it with faith and belief and grants believers a special honor and status compared to disbelievers, and thus the universal and non-discriminatory system of rights of humanism and the specific and discriminatory system of rights of the Islamic code stand in opposition to each other, and all the points of this discussion point to the fact that in the context of humanism, the issue of human brotherhood and religious discrimination is such ,a deep and complex issue that no easy solution is possible because it is a fundamental and irreconcilable conflict between .two contradictory worldviews

Part V: The Academic Interpretation of Islamic Thought in : the Face of Contemporary Intellectual Challenges

The intellectual challenges facing the principle of humiliation over believers and dignity over disbelievers in the contemporary era, which have been reviewed in detail in the previous discussions, are not limited to theoretical objections, but are also related to the practical application of this principle and its correct interpretation. In view of these challenges, there is a need to provide Islamic thought with a scholarly and balanced interpretation that, on the one hand, maintains the original spirit and objectives of this principle and, on the other hand, does not ignore the demands of the contemporary world. The first and fundamental step in this regard is to critically examine the excesses and deviations in the understanding of the code, because in both historical and contemporary periods, two extremes have emerged in the interpretation of this code, one of which has made it a mere program of war, conflict and hostility, while the other has softened and weakened it so much that it has lost its original identity and distinctive status, and both of these extremes are ,deviations from the central principle of Islamic teachings namely moderation and moderation. Indeed, deviation in the understanding of the Shari'i texts arises mostly from excess or excess; Excessiveness leads to exaggeration and violence, and excessiveness leads to dissolution and disintegration, and both are departures from the middle way of Islam. This quote from Al-Qaradawi clarifies the two main roots of deviation in the understanding of the texts of Sharia, where excess leads to exaggeration and violence, while deviation leads to weakening and dissolving the texts, and both of these are departures from the Islamic middle path. This is the point where these two extremes are also seen in the interpretation of the code of allegiance and disavowal. While one group has made it a justification for all kinds of oppression and hostility against non-Muslims, the other group has made it so general and meaningless that its distinctive and specific status has been lost. In order to avoid these two extremes, it is necessary to understand this code in its original context and objectives, and not to remove it from its original place under any external or political interest.

Extremism in the defense of liberty is no virtue, and moderation in the pursuit of justice is no vice. (Goldwater, 1960)

Although Goldwater's statement is in a liberal context, it is a universal principle that extremism in the defense of any value is .not a virtue and moderation in the pursuit of justice is not a vice This principle also applies to the interpretation of the Islamic code of loyalty and non-disclosure, because extremism in the ,defense of this code makes it a cruel and inhumane principle while moderation and balance in it give it the appearance of a fair and merciful principle. Thus, this quote points to the fact that the first requirement of the scholarly interpretation of Islamic thought in the face of any intellectual challenge is to avoid excess and excess and to follow the path of moderation. The Quranic foundations of moderation, justice and benevolence are fundamental for a balanced interpretation of this code, because the Holy Quran has commanded Muslims to be just, benevolent and moderate in every matter, and these are the principles that guide the correct interpretation of the code of loyalty and non-disclosure. When we look at this code in conjunction with the principles of justice and benevolence, it commands us to be gentle and loving towards believers on the one hand, and to be just and benevolent towards non-Muslims on the other. It is this balanced concept that makes this code a comprehensive and merciful principle, not a narrow-minded and biased program. Justice, beneficence, and moderation represent the moral foundation of human relations in Islam, and they are values

that transcend the boundaries of religious or ethnic affiliation. (Ibn Ashour, 1978)

This quote from Ibn Ashur establishes justice, benevolence, and moderation as the moral foundations of Islamic human relations ,that transcend the boundaries of religious or ethnic affiliation and it is this point that is key to a balanced interpretation of the code of humility towards the believers and honor towards the infidels, for when this code is read in conjunction with these principles, it becomes clear that gentleness and honor towards the believers does not mean injustice towards non-Muslims, nor does aversion towards the infidels mean oppression or excess towards them, but rather it means maintaining a clear distinction at the level of belief while upholding the principles of justice and benevolence at the social and human levels.

Justice is the first virtue of social institutions, as truth is of systems of thought.(Rawls, 1971)

This statement by Rawls considers justice to be the first virtue of social institutions, and this same justice also has a fundamental position in the interpretation of the Islamic code of loyalty and renunciation, because when this code is applied under the principle of justice, it excludes any kind of oppression or excess from its scope and gives it the form of a fair and balanced principle. Thus, the second important element of the scholarly interpretation of Islamic thought in the face of modern intellectual challenges is that it balances justice and benevolence with all kinds of ideological distinctions in such a way that there is neither weakness of faith nor violation of justice and fairness. The Sharia principles of interaction with non-Muslims are the most important and sensitive aspect of the practical implementation of this code, because on the one hand, the code of kinship and estrangement requires believers to express their ,aversion and separation from infidels, while on the other hand Islamic teachings also command justice, kindness, loyalty and peace with non-Muslims. These two requirements, when combined, form a balanced and comprehensive system where social and human relations are also built on the basis of justice and kindness while maintaining religious distinctions, and this is the Islamic system of interaction that is unique and distinguished from any other system.

,Al-asal in the relationship of Muslims with each other is justice justice and fulfillment of covenants, and it is not permissible for a mutual disagreement to turn into cruelty or aggression. (Al-Zahili, 1998)

'This quote from Wahba al-Zuhaili clarifies the basis of Muslims ,relations with non-Muslims, namely that the essence of justice goodness, and keeping promises is that it is absolutely not permissible for religious differences to turn into oppression or excess. This is the principle that makes possible a balanced interpretation of the code of humiliation over believers and honor over disbelievers. Although this code commands believers to hate disbelievers, this hatred can never take the form of oppression, excess, or breaking promises. Thus, this code preserves religious identity on the one hand, and on the other hand, it also helps in the formation of a peaceful and just social system.

Tolerance implies a respect for diversity and a willingness to live peacefully with difference. (Walzer, 1997)

Walzer's definition defines tolerance as the desire to live peacefully with respect for diversity and differences, and this tolerance is also an important element of the Islamic system of interaction, because Islam commands living with peace and respect with non-Muslims while maintaining one's identity and distinction at the level of faith, and thus the concept of Islamic tolerance is radically different from liberal tolerance, because it makes peaceful coexistence with others possible without any compromise with one's faith. The demands of interfaith and international relations in the modern era are a new and complex challenge for Islamic thought, because contact and dialogue between different religions and cultures have become an indispensable necessity in the modern world, and no nation or group can isolate itself from this universal connection. In this context, Islamic thought must provide a mechanism that, on the one hand, enables interfaith dialogue and international cooperation, and on the other hand, preserves the fundamental principles of Islamic faith and the code of loyalty and non-disclosure, and this is the delicate balance that establishing is the greatest challenge of contemporary Islamic thought. Dialogue between religions and civilizations is a human necessity imposed by the nature of the modern world, provided that it does not lead to the abandonment of al-Tawabat al-Aqdiya or the spread of Islamic theology. (Al-Alwani, 1993)

This quote by Taha Jabir Al-Alwani describes interfaith and intercultural dialogue as a human need that arises from the nature of the contemporary world, but at the same time imposes the condition that this dialogue should never lead to a renunciation of doctrinal principles or a weakening of Islamic identity, and this is where the contemporary interpretation of the Islamic code of humiliation over believers and honor over disbelievers plays an important role, because this code opens the way for Muslims to dialogue and cooperate with others while maintaining their identity and principles, provided that this dialogue does not lead to any kind of doctrinal compromise or loss of identity.

Dialogue is not merely a strategy for peaceful coexistence; it is a condition for mutual understanding in a pluralistic world. (Küng, 1991)

King's statement considers dialogue not merely a strategy for peaceful coexistence but a condition for mutual understanding in a pluralistic world, and this is the point that Islamic thought must include in its strategy, because in the modern world, Muslims have to develop dialogue and understanding with the bearers of other religions and cultures, but this dialogue must be in the light of the Islamic code of loyalty and non-discrimination, which on the one hand preserves religious identity and on the other opens the way for respect and understanding with others, and this is the .balanced path that protects against both excess and excess

Finally, a balanced and contemporary interpretation of the code of humiliation over the believers, honor over the disbelieversis one that understands this code in its original context and objectives and presents it in the context of modern intellectual challenges in such a way that it is a On the one hand, it should maintain its religious identity and distinctive status, and on the ,other hand, it should also include the principles of justice benevolence, and human brotherhood. The central point of this interpretation is that Walaa wa Baraa does not mean hostility towards or oppression of non-Muslims, but rather it means maintaining a clear distinction at the religious level and preserving one's religious identity at any cost, while living with justice, benevolence, and peace with all human beings at the social and human level. This is the comprehensive and balanced concept that makes the Islamic code a viable and defensible principle in the contemporary world.Less al-muqasud min al-wala wa al-bara abolition of the value of justice, mercy and coexistence, but the intention is to preserve the divine nature of the nation while adhering to the principles of fairness and benevolence in dealing with others. (Qaradawi, 1992)

This quote from Al-Qaradawi clarifies the true meaning of Walaa ,wa Baraa, that its purpose is not to abolish the values of justice mercy and coexistence, but rather to preserve the faith identity of the Ummah while maintaining the principles of justice and benevolence in dealings with others, and it is this balanced and contemporary interpretation that makes the principle of humiliation over the believers and honor over the disbelievers a viable and defensible principle in the face of modern intellectual challenges, because on the one hand it responds to the objections of liberalism, secularism and humanism that interpret this principle as intolerance and discrimination, and on the other hand it also maintains the original spirit and objectives of this principle.

Religious identity and civic coexistence are not necessarily contradictory; societies flourish when they balance conviction with mutual respect. (An-Na'im, 2008)

This statement by An-Naeem does not necessarily contradict religious identity and civic coexistence, but rather states that societies develop when they strike a balance between their faith and mutual respect, and this is the principle on which the ,contemporary interpretation of the Islamic code of is based because on the one hand, this interpretation commands believers to hold fast to their religious identity, while on the other hand, it also teaches them to live with respect and coexistence with others, and thus this code serves as a guiding principle for Muslims in the modern world that allows them to play their role

in the global community without losing their identity, and it is this scholarly and balanced interpretation that gives Islamic thought a strong and defensible position in the face of contemporary intellectual challenges.

Reference

Al-Awa, M. S. (2006). In the Islamic state system. Cairo: Dar al-Sharooq.
Al-Alwani, T. J. (1994). The crisis of contemporary Islamic thought. Cairo: Al-Muhammad Al-Muhammad for Islamic Thought.
Al-Alwani, T. J. (1993). Adab al-dikhil fi al-Islam. Cairo: Al-Muhammad Al-Almi for Islamic Thought.
Al-Bashri, T. (2011). Al-dawlah al-kinisa. Cairo: Dar al-Sharooq.
Al-Buti, M. S. R. (1991). Fiqh al-sirah al-nabawiyyah. Damascus: Dar al-Fikr.
Al-Hawali, S. (1992). Zahirah al-irjaa fi al-fikr al-Islami (Vol. 1). Jeddah: Dar al-Andalus.
Al-Salabi, A. M. (2007). Fiqh al-tamakeen fi al-Qur'an al-karim. Cairo: Dar al-Marfa'a.
Al-Zahili, W. (1981). International relations in Islam. Damascus: Dar al-Fikr.
Al-Zahili, W. (1998). Athar al-harb fi fiqh al-Islami. Damascus: Dar al-Fikr.
Al-Zahili, W. (2005). Human rights in Islam. Damascus: Dar al-Fikr.
Amar, M. (1997). Secularism between the West and Islam. Cairo: Dar al-Sharooq.
Amara, M. (1998). Islam and human rights. Cairo: Dar al-Sharooq.
Amara, M. (2000). Islam and man. Cairo: Dar al-Sharooq.
Anderson, B. (1983). Imagined communities. London: Verso.
An-Na'im, A. A. (2008). Islam and the secular state. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Appiah, K. A. (2006). Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a world of strangers. New York: Norton.
Casanova, J. (1994). Public religions in the modern world. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Donnelly, J. (2013). Universal human rights in theory and practice. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
Goldwater, B. (1960). The conscience of a conservative. New York: Victor Publishing.
Gray, J. (2000). Two faces of liberalism. New York: New Press.
Ibn Ashour, M. T. (1978). Al-maqasid al-sharia al-Islamiyya. Tunis: Al-Dar al-Tunisiya.
Küng, H. (1991). Global responsibility: In search of a new world ethic. New York: Crossroad.
Lamont, C. (1997). The philosophy of humanism. New York: Humanist Press.
Mill, J. S. (1859). On liberty. London: Parker and Son.
Morgenthau, H. J. (1948). Politics among nations. New York: McGraw-Hill.
Nickel, J. (2007). Making sense of human rights. Oxford: Blackwell.
Nussbaum, M. C. (1996). For love of country? Boston: Beacon Press.
Qaradawi, Y. (1982). Al-sahwa al-Islami. Cairo: Maktabah Wahbah.
Qaradawi, Y. (1992). Non-Muslims in the Islamic society. Cairo: Maktabah Wahbah.
Qaradawi, Y. (1997). Fiqh al-dawlah fi al-Islam. Cairo: Dar al-Sharooq.
Qutb, M. (1983). Contemporary thoughts. Cairo: Dar al-Sharooq.
Qutb, M. (1988). Jahliyat al-qarn al-'ishrin. Cairo: Dar al-Sharooq.
Rawls, J. (1971). A theory of justice. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
Rawls, J. (1993). Political liberalism. New York: Columbia University Press.
Robertson, R. (1992). Globalization: Social theory and global culture. London: Sage.
Rorty, R. (1989). Contingency, irony, and solidarity. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Rorty, R. (1991). Objectivity, relativism, and truth. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Sandel, M. J. (1982). Liberalism and the limits of justice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Shafiq, M. (2001). In the face of globalization. Beirut: Dar al-Sharooq.
Smith, A. D. (1991). National identity. London: Penguin.
Taylor, C. (1989). Sources of the self. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
Walzer, M. (1997). On toleration. New Haven: Yale University Press.