
***The Islamic Root of Sympathy based Morality:
A Case Study of Adam Smith, Darwin and their relation with the
Teachings of the Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him)***

Prof. Muhammad Mumtaz Ali^{1*}, Naseeb Ahmed Siddiqui²

¹ Department of Usul al-Din and Comparative Religion, Abdul Hamid Abu Sulayman Kulliyah of Islamic Revealed Knowledge and Human Sciences, International Islamic University Malaysia

² Doctoral Candidate, Department of Mechanical and Manufacturing Engineering, Faculty of Engineering and Applied Science, Ontario Tech University, Canada

ABSTRACT

What brings morality into existence found extensive interpretation since ancient times and one is more persuading than the other. However, following the enlightenment's empirical approach to which Darwin and Adam Smith turned their attention for every moral dilemma lies in the concept of Sympathy. Both the authors believe, though without logical proof but based on the observation that it is the innate consciousness of Sympathy towards fellow beings responsible for the judgment on morality. Adam Smith combined the struggle and sentiments as the sole premise to judge an ethical approach in society. Darwin with his concept of the evolution struggled to explain that sympathy in human lineage evolved into social instincts that gave it a more general flavor, strict empiricism. The question this article formulates is that was the concept of morality based on sympathy was a new and Western concept? Therefore, at first this article will detail the concepts of sympathy understood by Adam Smith and Darwin. It will highlight the process and situation behind such approach contextualizing the role of evolution. In the second part this article will discuss this concept of sympathy based morality in the teachings of the Prophet of Islam (peace be upon him) where he not only understood the nature of human existence but also evolved a new Medinan society. Moreover, it shows the contrasts and similarities between Islamic and Western understanding of sympathy based morality. Hence, it opens a new window to look at intellectual heritage and their relations.

Keywords: *Morality, Sympathy, Darwin and evolution, Adam Smith, Prophet of Islam, Revelation.*

*Corresponding author's email: mumtazali@iium.edu.my



Introduction

Is there any definition of morality? Or in particular, a scientific method to know what is the right thing to do? In both cases, the answer is no, not because there is any scarcity of definitions or methods but because they are abundant (Gerald Wallace, Arthur David McKinnon Walker, and Gerald Wallace, 1970). The origin of human morality claims to have taken into consideration mutual cooperation to survive for an objective goal. This led to the evolution of the selection of partners and the concept of a social group working on a similar task. With *Homo heidelbergensis* a group feeling of 'we' overtook the individual's self-centered trait. Early humans developed the tribe and started to live with an objective goal for society. Such development saw the emergence of customs to define wrong and right (Tomasello, 2018). This explanation is very recent and the author Michael Tomasello states that *'They touched on a sense of sympathy and fairness (inherited from early humans), which became moral norms'* (Tomasello 2018, p.75). The possible development of such a sense of sympathy has a different way forward, he says *'In contrast to evolutionary approaches that base their arguments on reciprocity and the managing of one's reputation in the community, I emphasize that early human individuals understood that moral norms made them both judge and judged'* (Tomasello 2018, p.75). However, it is surprising that such a recent understanding from a psychological perspective did not find anything new in the process of humanity. Ibne Khaldun a 14th-century scholar has described such process in a somewhat similar fashion, he says, *'Human social organization is something necessary'* (Ibn Khaldūn 1967,p. 45) but that necessity finds its way through *'the fact that God created and fashioned man in a form that can live and subsist only with the help of food. He guided man to a natural desire for food and instilled in him the power that enables him to obtain it'* (Ibn Khaldūn 1967,p. 45). This natural desire forced humans to form groups:

However, the power of the individual human being is not sufficient for him to obtain (the food) he needs, and does not provide him with as much food as he requires to live. Even if we assume an absolute minimum of food-that is, food enough for one day, (a little) wheat, for the instance-that amount of food, could be obtained only after much preparation such as grinding, kneading, and baking. Each of these three operations requires utensils and tools that can be provided only with the help of several crafts, such as the crafts of the blacksmith, the carpenter, and the potter..... Through cooperation, the needs of a number of persons, many times greater than their own (number), can be satisfied (Ibn Khaldūn 1967,p. 45).

There are other important factors also as Ibn Khaldun says,

Likewise, each individual needs the help of his fellow beings for his defense, as well. When God fashioned the natures of all living beings and divided the various powers among them, many dumb animals were given more perfect powers than God gave to man (Ibn Khaldūn 1967,p. 45).

The Islamic Root of Sympathy based Morality

Which corroborates with another factor

Aggressiveness is natural in living beings. Therefore, God gave each of them a special limb for defense against aggression (Ibn Khaldūn 1967,p. 45).

Combining these different natural traits of Human beings which, for Ibn Khaldun are given by God:

It is absolutely necessary for man to have the co-operation of his fellow men... When, however, mutual co-operation exists, man obtains food for his nourishment and weapons for his defense. God's wise plan that man (kind) should subsist and the human species be preserved will be fulfilled. Consequently, social organization is necessary for the human species. Without it, the existence of human beings would be incomplete (Ibn Khaldūn 1967,p. 45).

Ibn Khaldun is inspired by the revelation and Tomasello narrated his opinion based on scientific assumptions. However, they both shows the similarity in the understanding of human society and, especially sympathy. When science believed that the universe was not created in time on scientific assumptions, it was a revelation that claimed for a created universe (Krauss, 2012). Similarly, the well-known arguments of no necessary connection between cause and effect supposed to be first proposed by David Hume (Nadler 1996) and Nicolaus of Autrecourt (Wolfson 1969) now have been well traced to al-Ghazali who defended this concept in detail in the 12th century, especially in his book *Tahafut al-falasifah* (Ghazzali and Marmura, 2000). Furthermore, the similarity between Copernican astronomy and the mathematics used to derive motions of planets and the overall effect of Islamic science made on European renaissance has already been established in finer details (Saliba, 2007). Why this detachment existed and what implication this deviation penetrated in the relation between reason and revelation? That is the major question to be answered by contemporary historians and philosophers.

However, this article proliferates our knowledge in this direction by tracing the route of morality theory based on sympathy. This theory based on morality is related to Adam Smith and Darwin. The objective is to begin a paradigm shift in understanding the role of revelation as a first reason. It prepares a methodology for scholars to bring some new futuristic ideas from revelation and should avoid the apologetic approach to prove the truth of revelation from science, as is the case with the Muslim community, though ill-treated (Taslaman, 2006). In what follows the moral theory based on sympathy will be discussed with respect to Adam Smith and Darwin. This discussion will be followed by the investigation of the Islamic roots of sympathy theory.

Sympathy: a judge of morality

The concept of the struggle for life, as Darwin calls it, is not only meant to kill for one's own selfishness but, said Darwin:

I should premise that I use the term Struggle for Existence in a large and metaphorical sense, including dependence of one being on another, and including (which is more important) not only the life of the individual but success in leaving progeny (Darwin 1859, p.33).

In order to placate the concept of the struggle for existence, it must be elaborated on the basis of dependency not mere murder. Nevertheless, it seems not simple to keep above view constant, as Darwin at another place says:

Nothing is easier than to admit in words the truth of the universal struggle for life,.....Yet unless it is thoroughly engrained in the mind, I am convinced that the whole economy of nature, with every fact on distribution, rarity, abundance, extinction, and variation, will be dimly seen or quite misunderstood (Darwin 1859, p.33).

By infusing economic flavor to the natural process of ecology and how laws of nature ought to work, the whole concept was siphoned to objective production in nature through struggle and competition. In a strict sense,

As the mistletoe is disseminated by birds, its existence depends on birds; and it may metaphorically be said to struggle with other fruit-bearing plants, in order to tempt birds to devour and thus disseminate its seeds rather than those of other plants. In these several senses, which pass into each other, I use for convenience sake the general term of struggle for existence (Darwin 1859, p.33).

This seemingly arcane concept, at first sight, might have been looked extraordinary but the literature has traced the inspiration behind it (Cockfield, Firth, and Laurent, 2007). The general view is that there is ample similarity between Adam Smith and Darwin that it is impossible to look for another way. In *Wealth of Nations* (Smith, 2007a) Smith argued that:

The division of labor, from which so many advantages are derived, is not originally the effect of any human wisdom, which foresees and intends that general opulence to which it gives occasion. It is necessary, though the very slow and gradual consequence of a certain propensity in human nature which has in view no such extensive utility; the propensity to truck, barter, and exchange one thing for another (Smith 2007, p.15).

Division of the labor concept was held responsible for the increased production but this natural propensity, Smith argues, is not the result of human wisdom but *“The difference between the most dissimilar characters, between a philosopher and a common street porter, for example, seems to arise not so much from nature as from habit, custom, and education”*(Smith, 2007, p.17). Smith linked that natural propensity with the process of human development, that is, how a man came to be, depends only on the kind of environment he has been through excluding the inherent proclivity towards other things. Smith, rightly described such acquired skills as a profession in a specific field, which he already connected with *“But man has almost constant occasion for the help of*

The Islamic Root of Sympathy based Morality

his brethren, and it is in vain for him to expect it from their benevolence only. He will be more likely to prevail if he can interest their self-love in his favor, and show them that it is for their own advantage to do for him what he requires of them" (Smith, 2007, p.16). It is the persuasion of someone's self-love for something that can get for asker what the giver can get from asker. There is no scope of benevolence too, "but man has almost constant occasion for the help of his brethren, and it is in vain for him to expect it from their benevolence only" (Smith, 2007, p.16). But surprisingly, this seemingly cruel and chaotic process of development "led by an invisible hand to promote an end which was no part of his intention" (Smith, 2007) forms a coherent and orderly social system. Mysterious 'invisible hand' which is responsible for the formation, for Smith, who used it at three different places (Rothschild, 2018), narrates a somewhat obscure picture. Emma Rothschild has argued from one perspective that "The success of the invisible hand depends on whether people choose to pursue their own interests by political influence, by the use of force, or in another way" (Rothschild, 2018, p.321). On one hand Smith does not consider the disposition in man towards something as 'natural' but on the other hand, he involved some invisible hand in a context that suits his concept of self-interest rather than cooperation. However, it seems puzzling that Smith considered the opposite of self-love or self-interest as benevolence, which is strictly opposite of contraries. It can be asked, why it was not deemed necessary to consider cooperation instead? Benevolence is embedded in sympathy, they are from each other, but cooperation can be for the sake of economic and political shared gain, and to call it into the same court of self-interest will not do justice to this full of wisdom propensity. Others have argued in a different manner (Kropotkin, 2006). For Darwin this oblivion towards sympathy was countered by the omnipresence struggle for the existence of species as per the economy of nature, as he puts, "a struggle for existence inevitably follows from the high rate at which all organic beings tend to increase" (Darwin, 1859, p.34). Ostensibly, there exist similarity with Adam Smith and Darwin in terms of struggle for survival, so much that Karl Marx had said in a letter that, "It is remarkable how Darwin rediscovers, among the beasts and plants, the society of England with its division of labor, competition, opening up of new markets, 'inventions' and Malthusian 'struggle for existence'" (Marx, 1862). However, the known departure comes when Darwin turns the struggle for existence into a concept of natural selection which proposed evolution due to variations. Darwin said:

Owing to this struggle for life, any variation, however slight and from whatever cause proceeding, if it be in any degree profitable to an individual of any species, in its infinitely complex relations to other organic beings and to external nature, will tend to the preservation of that individual, and will generally be inherited by its offspring. The offspring, also, will thus have a better chance of surviving, for, of the many individuals of any species which are periodically born, but a small number can survive. I have called this

principle, by which each slight variation, if useful, is preserved, by the term of Natural Selection, in order to mark its relation to man's power of selection (Darwin, 1859, p.33).

This evolution based on natural selection, as it seems, triggered a continuous chain of new existences affected by different factors but it has been argued that Darwin chiefly believed in 'discontinuous evolution' (Osborn, 2018). Darwin connected this natural selection with man's power of selection and departed from maintaining no role of wisdom. As he again says:

As man can produce and certainly has produced a great result by his methodical and unconscious means of selection, what may not nature effect? Man can act only on external and visible characters: nature cares nothing for appearances, except in so far as they may be useful to any being. She can act on every internal organ, on every shade of constitutional difference, on the whole machinery of life. Man selects only for his own good; Nature only for that of the being which she tends. Every selected character is fully exercised by her, and the being is placed under well-suited conditions of life (Darwin 1859,p. 88).

It is as if, the invisible hand of Smith found a way in natural selection that every small variation that creates wellbeing is considered by default by nature. One can ask, what is the proof of such an invisible cause on apparent natural progress? It seems to fulfill the requirement of saving the phenomena concept (Bogen and Woodward, 1988) whereby what is apparent is narrated without involving in the causal interpretation of the process. These small variations which came to be through changes in the environment and living condition will be adapted is an apparent reality that does not necessarily conclude self-working of evolution because its contraries are also ostensible. There are only options available for any species when it met with a changing environment, either it will sustain incorporating necessary skills or it will die, it is not something ex nihilo people were not aware of. It solely depends on the effort of species according to its working horizon and not mere some invisible hand selecting for it, as Darwin said for nature linking with human selection to choose one or another thing suitable for the fittest. Did Darwin mean that nature by default knows good and bad for every fittest of this universe? *"Although natural selection can act only through and for the good of each being"* (Darwin, 1859, p.43) it seems the case. Given such omnipotence of nature, it will surely be asked, why does nature choose one over the other? and on what basis? Then, from where nature got such omnipotence skill to secure the growth of fittest or species? How would one explain considering the above facts, unintentional inclusion of benevolence of nature towards species that she wants well for each? It is well known that passenger pigeon and Dodo bird that was abundant in the past at two different parts of the world have gone extinct. Should the benevolent nature be held responsible for the murder of these species? Or she was unable to maintain it's

The Islamic Root of Sympathy based Morality

by default nature of benevolence? If the survival of fittest depends on the 'good of each being', it apparently demands there should not be any extinction. The ambiguity lies in the connection between the struggle for existence and natural selection based on the wellbeing of each species, the reconciliation seems inextricable.

Contrary to this *"the advocates of natural selection in ethics assert that morality, social as it is, has been produced out of, and in virtue of, the struggle for existence"* (Irons, 1901, p.272). However, that is not the complete story until one answers, why such a struggle for life is true for Humans as they are not without wisdom? Thomas Henry defined it,

There is another fallacy which appears to me to pervade the so-called 'ethics of evolution.' It is the notion that because, on the whole, animals and plants have advanced in the perfection of the organization by means of the struggle for existence and the consequent 'survival of the fittest'; therefore men in society, men as ethical beings, must look to the same process to help them towards perfection (Huxley, 1902, p.80).

Henry Fairfield Osborn has answered this puzzle to connect sympathy across the border:

...through sympathy and reflection, those actions which conduce to the survival of society come to have the high sanction of conscience. The further development of intellect renders a further development of morality possible..... the cruel process of natural selection is anticipated and obviated by more peaceful methods.' The development of intellect, moreover, leads to a still more significant development of morality, since it involves the gradual extension of sympathy beyond the tribe or nation.... The transformation is complete. The characteristic impulses of human nature are now directly at variance with the impulses which underlie the struggle for bare existence, and yet they are the product of this purely individualistic strife. The struggle for existence leads to the 'selection' of sympathy and intellect, and these turn the struggle of each against all into a struggle of each for all (Huxley, 1902, p.80).

Narration is engulfed in a purely evolutionary concept which later on includes wisdom that Smith has denied for Human struggle. However perplexing is the combination of struggle leading to sympathy, it does not seem to be in line with causal narratives. Once struggle begins with variations adopted, it should become more chaotic in every sense and its end as orderly society is a mere negation of struggle. This biological hypothesis, on the name of natural selection is in sharp contrast with other natural laws. In the beginning, the universe was in complete uniformity (Springel, Frenk, and White, 2006) and after dis-uniformity interrupted it became chaotic which is now known described as entropy. According to it an isolated system exposed to natural processes will end in increasing disorder or

entropy of the system. Hence, the idea that the universe is expanding does not necessarily entail that there is, in the universe any systematic order to be recognized without a cause. In this whole creation dilemma, only one planet earth has got the right amount of physical constants to survive and support life, which again was countered by the multiverse hypothesis though without proof (Weinberg, 1987; Hawkings and Mlodinow, 2010). Sussman and Wisdom's numerical simulation of the solar system for 100 million years shows that the evolution of the solar system along with Jovian planet's subsystem is chaotic (Sussman and Wisdom, 1988). The apparent problem which can be predicted with domesticated species is similar to noting down the positions of planets do not show order inherent in nature, which is as per quantum mechanics unpredictable (Trimmer, 1980). Darwin narrates altogether a different scheme whereby the whole bunch of fittest in every genus will be survived after initiation of chaos that is struggling. According to it, the world which is run by the weakest fittest (Human being) because "*The world's wealthiest individuals, those owning over \$100,000 in assets, total only 8.6 percent of the global population but own 85.6 percent of global wealth*" (Global Inequality, 2018), must extinct in near future in scarcity of resources, but the population is increasing and the ratio of inequality also. As if, once any variation initiated a disease in the body will go on increasing by adopting favorable condition even if one take antidotes as a precaution. Hence, there must not be any cure too, to allow natural selection which takes any favorable condition into account.

It would be improper to suggest that Smith and Darwin look struggle in the sense narrated above but their inclusion of sympathy as a moral foundation must come as a surprise, as it is in sharp opposition, says Smith,

How selfish soever man may be supposed, there are evidently some principles in his nature, which interest him in the fortune of others, and render their happiness necessary to him, though he derives nothing from it except the pleasure of seeing it. of this kind is pity or compassion, the emotion which we feel for the misery of others when we either see it or are made to conceive it in a very lively manner (Smith, 1790, p.11).

In addition to this smith further clarifies that

Pity and compassion are words appropriated to signify our fellow-feeling with the sorrow of others. Sympathy, though its meaning was, perhaps, originally the same, may now, however, without much impropriety, be made use of to denote our fellow-feeling with any passion whatever (Smith, 1790, p.6).

The reason behind such passion towards fellow beings rest on:

But whatever may be the cause of sympathy, or however it may be excited, nothing pleases us more than to observe in other men a fellow-feeling with all the emotions of our own breast; nor are we ever so much shocked as by the appearance of the contrary (Smith, 1790, p.9).

The Islamic Root of Sympathy based Morality

In another place, Smith argued that:

In order to produce this concord, as nature teaches the spectators to assume the circumstances of the person principally concerned, so she teaches this last in some measure to assume those of the spectators. As they are continually placing themselves in his situation, and thence conceiving emotions similar to what he feels; so he is as constantly placing himself in theirs, and thence conceiving some degree of that coolness about his own fortune, with which he is sensible that they will view it (Smith, 1790, p.17).

At some another round, by specifying it more exclusively:

Before we approve of the sentiments of any person as proper and suitable to their objects, we must not only be affected in the same manner as he is, but we must perceive this harmony and correspondence of sentiments between him and ourselves. Thus, though upon hearing of a misfortune that had befallen my friend, I should conceive precisely that degree of concern which he gives way to; yet till I am informed of the manner in which he behaves, till I perceive the harmony between his emotions and mine, I cannot be said to approve of the sentiments which influence his behavior. The approbation of propriety, therefore, requires, not only that we should entirely sympathize with the person who acts, but that we should perceive this perfect concord between his sentiments and our own (Smith, 1790, p.69-70)

In all such clarifications, Smith emphatically founded morality on sympathy, even without knowing the cause of it. By placing an impartial judge on behalf of self and fellow beings, the action will be judged as it will affect both in the same circumstances. In this way, the judgment will depend solely on sympathy rather than on reason, as Smith believes it, "*Nature has directed us to the greater part of these by original and immediate instincts*" (Smith, 1790, p.69). If not reason, than without providing the cause of sympathy and of this theory of morality, on what foundation Smith wants us to treat actions of fellow being in such a deep manner which enable one man to almost replace with all the required condition fulfilled of another man, to evolve for a while in another person's form?. Such deep definition of sympathy cannot be recognized anywhere in nature and especially in a political economy where Smith himself persists favoring self-interest. How can a person so involved in self-interest and competition be at the same time takes the burden to feel the sorrow of fellow beings?¹ This contrast, proponents will deal to explain in positive direction (Lamb, 1974) and opponents as they say, "*the Wealth of Nations is a stupendous palace erected upon the granite of self-interest*" (Stigler, 1971) will do in reverse but can this be reconciled on a fairground, without being biased to accept what is wrong? Postigo had tried to reconcile this contrast:

¹ Which as per smith is more near to sympathy than the feeling of joy

If we accept that Smith's framework of sympathy in TMS² was the foundation for what we understand as empathy today and, no doubt, influenced by his virtue ethics moral framework, then the reconciliation with his explanation of self-interest in WN³ does not present a struggle. First, the road to virtue demands that we seek personal flourishing through virtuous character building. This excludes self-interest as a central guide. Instead, the guide can only be moderation as a regulator for our actions, including those that are exclusively in the direction of self-interest. *In order to reverse excesses in the direction of self-interest, the corrective mechanism is compassion, which captures Smith's notion of sympathy.* Second, self-interest becomes fundamental in economizing actions in order to unfold the machinery of creativity in the pursuit of one's goals which, according to Smith, include the sympathy and approbation of others. Accordingly, the motivating factor of all behavior is sympathy as compassion, for we are fundamentally creatures in need of community and acceptance. Self-interest only brings us to a modicum of self-respect from which we then feel worthy to seek the good opinion of others. If we take self-interest too far, then we will not achieve the minimal sense of dignity to be a part of civil society. It is for this reason that self-interest cannot be the regulator of our behavior. Only sympathy as a precursor notion of empathy can regulate our plans toward flourishing and membership in community (TMS 85–7). To put this metaphorically, sympathy serves as the door that allows individuals the entrance to collective experiences with others in different realms (moral, economic, political, and so on). And the knowledge that each individual gains from these collective experiences function as an increasingly accurate measure for regulating self-interest and perfecting our states of character (Postigo, 2014, p.145).

This reconciliation does not answer the problem of what motive led Smith to explain morality in such a philosophical manner by avoiding any standard or absolute reference point to judge actions. By not employing standard, Smith has opened in a court of morality actors being their own judge. The priest has stretched this idea to Darwin, who anyhow tried to convert the philosophical employment of sympathy into biological evolution on its own:

The following proposition seems to me in a high degree probable—namely, that any animal whatever, endowed with well-marked social instincts, would inevitably acquire a moral sense or conscience, as soon as its intellectual powers had become as well developed, or nearly as well developed, as in an." Thus, in the human lineage, sympathy evolved into the social instincts, which Darwin considered to be especially strong among members of the same community of organisms (Priest, 2017,p.586).

² It means the book, Theory of moral sentiments

³ Book, Wealth of nations

The Islamic Root of Sympathy based Morality

Neither Smith nor Darwin seems to draw attention to the inspiration behind such contrasting views that transform struggle into sympathy. This arcane angle with the ever-proliferating deep status of sympathy avoiding reason and social-behavioral aspect was by evolution touched on humans provide a framework to devoid any *a priori* idea in existence. In lieu of knowledge of *a priori* about sympathy, an all-time struggle of species will result in jealousy, competition, and anger. To simply bring sympathy out of evolution on assumptions unleashed the argument of evolution, as Darwin based his assumption on empirical experience which is only saving the phenomena. Morality is an issue which implicates both philosophical and practical approach to judge any action, in this regard, Smith and Darwin were unable to show where these concepts can be applied in a practical sense rather than narrating how something is supposed to happen, it is mere conjecture. Bold theories predict future and allow instances to check its validity. Due to such unrealistic proclivity towards sentiments, till now, Smith and Darwin are known with their concept of self-interest and struggle of species. Because it seems impossible to demonstrate at the same time, the existence of self-interest and sympathy or struggle for existence and sympathy, as has been narrated through several examples by both the authors.

It is argued, therefore, that sympathy alone cannot be the foundation of morality but one of the ways to form the society. If reason cannot be considered a judge, then sympathy which is not present all the time, also cannot be given status to judge any action. In the scarcity of both reason and evolutionary assumption of sympathy, is there any way to use sympathy in its proper way which can form a society with proper function?. Societies which bear strength, to not only change its own course but the course of neighboring societies different from each other?. Can such a deep concept of sympathy be practically demonstrated and acted upon by people? Was it the first time in history that sympathy was called for action in human development? Are Smith and Darwin pioneers of the theory of morality based on sympathy?. The next section will answer these startling questions in brief.

The evolution and formation of Medinians Muslim society

After 13 years of tough evolution of the new society of Muslim in Makkah, that minority along with Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) migrated to a small oasis *Yathrib* (Madina)(Al-Bukhari 1997, 3851). As they move, these new bearers of faith kept in mind ``*The Prophet (peace be upon him) said, "The (reward of) deeds depend on intentions, and every person will get the reward according to what he intends. So, whoever migrated for Allah and His Apostle, then his migration will be for Allah and His Apostle, and whoever migrated for worldly benefits or for marrying a woman, then his migration will be for what he migrated for"*(Al-Bukhari, 1997, 2529). Such teaching brings every believer into a mirror to question his own self, there is no other one to know, what he or she intends to move for. The actor becomes the judge of his own

movement but that he is not alone in knowing his intention, a believer thinks of accountability in the presence of God. So whoever evolves from that variation in nature was in good standing to corroborate and adapt this circumstance. Why would anyone force himself to take that serious step after being Muslim? It was said to them by Lord *“And to those who migrated in Allah’s cause after being oppressed, We shall indeed give them a good place in the world, and indeed the reward of the Hereafter is extremely great; if only the people knew”(Raza, 2010,16:41)* . In addition to that, it was their pledge that *“The Prophet (ﷺ) said “None of you will have faith till he loves me more than his father, his children and all mankind””(Al-Bukhari, 1997,p.15)*. So, the evolution of this small society sprung on the basis of love which later on became so evident that it was converted as one of the ways to judge fellow believers. Migration to Madina created a huge loss and without a future clue what is going to happen, as evolution exercises its power. In simple words, it was a struggle from all the corners. They have left everything behind, their properties, relations, loved ones and then most importantly after embracing Islam their sin of *Jahiliya*. Those travelers were having a new Imaan and a leader of no compare, as they find him, so they became *Muhajir*.

On the other hand, after embracing Islam by the six people of tribe *Aws* and *Khazraj* at the place of *Aqabah*, Islam already entered in Madina. With the pledge at the hand of Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) Medinians were desperately waiting for him to emigrate Medina. At the second *Aqabah* around 70 people including three women converted to Islam and when Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) send Mus'ab of 'Abd ad-Dar (May Allah be pleased with him) to teach Islam in Medina, in eleven months there was a lot of conversion due to Mus'ab (May Allah be pleased with him). At one hand there are people waiting for the coming of Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) and there were people who emigrated on the call of him.

At this juncture it is necessary that the two societies inspired by the same reason should have a concrete foundation for cooperation, but what would be that foundation in terms of morality. As all of them came to be what they are for the sake of God and His Messenger, as it was revealed during 622-623AD that *“and accept whatever the Noble Messenger gives you, and refrain from whatever he forbids you, and fear Allah; indeed Allah’s punishment is severe”* (Asad, 1980). So there is no way out to do things out of context. The ruling remains the revelation on every aspect of the action. To bring these two societies into a joint venture and built the feeling of belongingness, there is lot of places in the Quran where it talks about the Muslim Brotherhood during the first year of Migration, *“And the Muslim men and Muslim women are the friends of one another; enjoining right and forbidding wrong”* (Raza, 2010, 9:71) and it is said:

The Islamic Root of Sympathy based Morality

And hold fast to the rope of Allah, all of you together, and do not be divided; and remember Allah's favor on you, that when there was enmity between you, He created affection between your hearts, so due to His grace you became like brothers to each other; and you were on the edge of a pit of fire (*hell*), so He saved you from it; this is how Allah explains His verses to you, so that you may be guided (Raza, 2010, 3:103).

Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) has said:

The parable of the believers in their affection, mercy, and compassion for each other is that of a body. When any limb aches, the whole body reacts with sleeplessness and fever (Al-Bukhari, 1997,5665).

Such unknown but persuading teachings led to the evolution of a society that embraced all the people with the difference in color, race, nationality, culture, and others. The point is that, unlike the Smith and Darwin, there was no natural struggle on the contrary believers were prone to help other believers, and there is a lot of evidence available for it. The most important turning point, from our point of view, is that in the initial days of the formation of Islamic society the concept of brotherhood surpassed the blood relation, even more deeply, as is reported in Hadeeth:

The Messenger of Allah established the bond of brotherhood between (some of) the Quraish and (some of) the Ansar, and he established the bond of brotherhood between Sa'd bin Ar-Rabi' and 'Abdur-Rahman bin 'Awf. Sa'd said to him: 'I have wealth, which I will share equally between you and me. And I have two wives, so look and see which one you like better, and I will divorce her, and when her 'Iddah is over you can marry her.' He said: 'May Allah bless your family and your wealth for you. Show me -i.e., where the market is.' And he did not come back until he brought some ghee, and cottage cheese that he had leftover. He said: 'The Messenger of Allah saw traces of yellow perfume on me and he said: 'What is this for?' I said: 'I have married a woman from among the Ansar.' He said: 'Give a Walimah (wedding feast) even if it is with one sheep (An-Nasai, 2007,3388)

This concept of brotherhood should be taken as *variation* due to circumstances. That was done for the sake of securing the society to cope up with the tough conditions. Apart from that, this brotherhood was so deep that it included, Inheritance share in wealth even some were ready to give their wives which goes beyond the imagination. It was an economic and political solution to which Muslims met in the early stages of *Hijrah*. Due to this economic pact stability came in the society because everyone was taking care of every other. One should ponder over the political, economic and sociological insight of Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) that how he is evolving and forming this new society by providing necessary variations to cope up with new conditions of life. Once more his unmatched wisdom brings the society into the consciousness of neighbors:

The Prophet (peace be upon him) said, "By Allah, he does not believe! By Allah, he does not believe! By Allah, he does not believe!" It was said, "Who is that, O Allah's Messenger (peace be upon him)?" He said, "That person whose neighbor does not feel safe from his evil." (Al-Bukhari, 1997, 6016)

As per Smith and Darwin, these words of wisdom as a rule to follow cannot form an orderly society which is based on struggle and even sympathy can judge the actions but where it can become one of the pillars of reason and revelation at once finds a place through Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him). The evolution of this Muslim society whose previous sins have been forgiven now found a new kind of teachings from their lord and in this evolution a verse declares that:

Indeed Allah does not change His favor upon any nation until they change their own condition (Raza, 2010,13:11).

Though, one can apparently acknowledge the motivation and a central point of contemplation for that Muslim society at the beginning of the Medinians evolution. They were warned about the consequences they may fall into if proper measures would not be taken. It is due to the fact that, in the Medina itself there were *Munafiq*, Jews and always a fear of attack from the pagans of Makkah. To extend the limit, there were Byzantine in the west and Persian in the east. The circumstances were tough and fertile; any laziness on behalf of the Muslim may lead to a catastrophe. In Darwinian terminology, that natural selection is based on good fortune, will not allow this evolving society to go beyond own territory. The verse explained that it is not the natural selection who is going to affect the position of a 'willed' man, but the man's will itself. There is no other cause which can improve the condition until the very being wants to improve, but it may lead to good or bad, is not to be called into question by concentrating only on the actor, rather it was told to Muslim that, you try and Allah is there to change the situation. It is related in detailed that:

The Prophet (peace be upon him) said, "Allah says: 'I am just as My slave thinks I am, (i.e. I am able to do for him what he thinks I can do for him) and I am with him if He remembers Me. If he remembers Me in himself, I too, remember him in Myself; and if he remembers Me in a group of people, I remember him in a group that is better than they; and if he comes one span nearer to Me, I go one cubit nearer to him; and if he comes one cubit nearer to Me, I go a distance of two outstretched arms nearer to him; and if he comes to Me walking, I go to him running (Al-Bukhari, 1997,7045).

Given such extraordinary presence of God in the life of Muslim, everybody was conscious that, any difficult condition can be changed not only mere by depending on the resources but by a deep feeling that everything is from the resources of the lord, if he wills, severe conditions of life can be changed. The presence of God in forming the society is evident that revelations are coming as per the situation. Those situations, in Darwinian terms for a species variation, were responded by God sometimes through revelation and sometimes through the Prophet himself. Due to

The Islamic Root of Sympathy based Morality

this linked and 'on the time' revelation, Muslims must have got abundance reason to feel the presence of God. And this presence along with the physical presence of Prophet Muhammad ﷺ was corroborating the reason to fine-tuned belief rather deep and follow the commands in a very strict manner.

This evolution of Muslim society has been narrated to apparently declare the kind of process and principle on which that evolution was taking place. It is in these conditions that every aspect of Human development becomes ostensible. It was argued in the discussion of morality based on sympathy understood by Smith and Darwin in which they have only narrated these phenomena without proving it naturally because the mere description was already known to people which Ibn Khaldun has discussed. In addition to that, they have not discussed the cause behind the sympathy. It is at this juncture when it is already explained that Muslim believe Allah as the source of everything, the call was made to see their brethren on the terms described below:

None amongst you believes (truly) until he loves for his brother" - or he said "for his neighbor" - "that which he loves for himself (Al-Hajaj, 2007, Book1, Hadith 77)

The Messenger of Allah [SAW] said: "By the One in Whose hand is the soul of Muhammad, none of you has believed until he loves for his brother what he loves for himself of goodness (An-Nasai, 2007,5017).

Without a doubt, there is a striking similarity between the statements of Smith in defining the role of sympathy except for the unbiased observer and the Hadeeth narrated above. As claimed earlier, Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) proposed this startling concept in front of people. Nevertheless, this proposal should be read in conjunction with the above narration considering the formation of a new society. Even if there were problems with Muslims, they ought to behave by willingly changing their old behaviors of enmity, which was evident between Meccan and Medinians tribe. Now, due to the order of the Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) they have to mold their nature accordingly for the sake of Lord. From the tradition, it is clear that it was not any simple matter to be ignored because it may lead to disbelief if ignored. This love for each other cannot become part of nature until sympathy takes the lead role in defining the actions. This love is more severe than sympathy otherwise to give one's wife to his brethren is no simple task. This mutual love led to the judgment of every action 'by living the same condition' of his brethren concludes the matter in a peaceful way.

From the second perspective, a Muslim should love for his brethren what he loves for himself. This concept from the outset denies the possibility of any struggle for the sake of survival because it was told to the Muslims that:

Food for one (person) suffices two, and food for two (persons) suffices four persons and food for four persons suffices eight persons(Muslim 2007, 2059)

The survival of the definition of Smith and Darwin depends on life sustenance. However, due to such love towards Muslim brethren, one has all the options to avoid any struggle because the basic requirement of food was also been shared. This is only an example to narrate overall dynamics the concept of brotherhood along with various sayings to keep the love for brethren brought into the society. It is not possible to explain all the dimensions of such concepts here.

Hence, as was claimed, Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) formed a society which Smith and Darwin came to know through 'saving the phenomena concept'. Due to such a strong foundation that society flourished which fought with the two mightiest empires Roman and Persian with fewer resources. Though several factors contributed to the downfall of Muslim civilization in the later period, the loss of this brotherhood should be considered one of the more important ones. This perspective has ample consequences which started with the *Umayyad* dynasty. However, neither Smith nor Darwin was first to call this notion of sympathy for moral judgments. The evolution of sympathy by nature is absent from Darwin which has been regarded by Muslims from God because it is not the sympathy of love the ultimate source of moral judgment but God. At last a full society has been built on such notions as part of nature which came into existence through variations in the nature of humans. It would be an interesting topic for research to stretch the link between this line through historical survey, as Smith knew the Muslim world.

Conclusion

The morality based on sympathy has been discussed with three different perspectives. First, the concept of sympathy has been explained from Adam Smith's work and how he understood the sympathy by reconciling his notion of struggle and sympathy at once. Then how this struggle was also considered by Darwin in his theory of evolution. Darwin argued that Sympathy was developed due to evolution after generations. But they were not able to narrate the cause of sympathy which is the central contradiction between their concepts of struggle and sympathy. Secondly, this concept of sympathy has been stretched back to the saying of Prophet Muhammad ﷺ with almost the same statements and explanations. Thirdly it is argued that Smith and Darwin only narrated phenomena on the name of sympathy but Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) has evolved a whole new Muslim society based on that concept while describing the cause. So sympathy became one of the ways to develop the notion of morality but its ultimate judgment remains with God because everyone felt the presence of God every time due to the situational revelations. An interesting study could be made to see how such same concept reached to Smith or it was an independent idea.



The Islamic Root of Sympathy based Morality

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

Bibliography

- Al-Bukhari, Muhammad. 1997. *The Translation of the Meaning of Ṣaḥīḥ Al-Bukhārī Arabic-English (Vol.8)*. Edited by Dr. Muhammad Muhsin Khan. First. Riyadh: Darrulsalam publication.
- Al-Hajjaj, Imam Muslim. 2007. *Sahih Muslim*. Edited by Nasiruddin Al-Khattab. Riyadh: Darrulsalam publication.
- Asad, Muhammad. 1980. *Message of the Qur'an*. New Era Publications.
<http://www.islamicbookstore.com/b5696.html>.
- Bogen, James, and James Woodward. 1988. "Saving the Phenomena.Pdf." *The Philosophical Review*.
- Cockfield, Geoff, Ann Firth, and John Laurent. 2007. *New Perspectives on Adam Smith's The Theory of Moral Sentiments*. Edward Elgar. <https://eprints.usq.edu.au/3829/>.
- Darwin, Charles. 1859. *On the Origins of Species by Means of Natural Selection*. London: Murray Albemarle street. doi:10.1126/science.146.3640.51-b.
- Gerald Wallace, Arthur David McKinnon Walker, and Gerald Wallace. 1970. *The Definition of Morality - Gerald Wallace, Arthur David McKinnon Walker - Google Books*. Methuen.
https://books.google.com.my/books/about/The_definition_of_morality.html?id=YwsvAAAAYAAJ&redir_esc=y.
- Ghazzali, and Michael E (trans) Marmura. 2000. *The Incoherence of the Philosophers*. Edited by Daniel C. Peterson. *Islamic Translation Series*. USA.
http://library.perdana.org.my/Bk_scan/297.261-GHA.pdf.
- "Global Inequality - Inequality.Org." 2018. Accessed August 28.
<https://inequality.org/facts/global-inequality/>.
- Hawkins, Stephen, and Leonard Mlodinow. 2010. *The Grand Design*. First. New York: Bantam books publication.
- Huxley, Thomas Henry. 1902. *Evolution and Ethics, and Other Essays*. New York: D. Appleton and company. <https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/009795801>.
- Ibn Khaldūn, 'Abd al-Rahmān ibn Muhammad. 1967. *The Muqaddimah : An Introduction to History*. Edited by Franz Rosenthal and N.J. Dawood. Princeton university press.
- Imam Hafiz An-Nasai. 2007. *English Translation of Sunan An-Nasa'i*. Darussalam.
https://www.amazon.com/English-Translation-Sunan-Nasai-Books/dp/B003GNLXBS/ref=sr_1_1?s=books&ie=UTF8&qid=1536114119&sr=1-1&keywords=Sunan+Nasai.
- Irons, David. 1901. "Natural Selection in Ethics." *The Philosophical Review* 10 (3). Duke University PressPhilosophical Review: 271. doi:10.2307/2176263.
- Krauss, Lawrence.M. 2012. *A Universe from Nothing- Why There Is Something Rather than Nothing*. First. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Kropotkin, Petr Alekseevich. 2006. *Mutual Aid : A Factor of Evolution*. Dover Publications.
- Lamb, Robert Boyden. 1974. "Adam Smith's System: Sympathy Not Self-Interest." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 35 (4). University of Pennsylvania Press: 671. doi:10.2307/2709093.
- Marx, Karl. 1862. "Letter to Friedrich Engels." In *The Collected Works of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels*, 380–82. London: awrence&Wishart.
- Muslim, Imam Abul-Husain. 2007. *Sahih Muslim*. Edited by Nasiruddin Al-Khattab. First. Saudi arabia: Dar-us-Salam Publications Inc.
- Nadler, Steven. 1996. "'No Necessary Connection': The Medieval Roots of the Occasionalist

- Roots of Hume." *The Monist* 79 (3). Oxford University Press: 448–66. doi:10.2307/27903493.
- Osborn, Henry Fairfield. 2018. "Darwin's Theory of Evolution by the Selection of Minor Saltations." *The American Naturalist*. The University of Chicago Press/The American Society of Naturalists. Accessed August 28. doi:10.2307/2455836.
- Priest, Greg. 2017. "Charles Darwin's Theory of Moral Sentiments: What Darwin's Ethics Really Owes to Adam Smith." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 78 (4). University of Pennsylvania Press: 571–93. doi:10.1353/jhi.2017.0032.
- Raza, Imam Ahmed. 2010. *Kanz Ul Iman : The Treasure of Faith*. Edited by Muhammad Aqib Farid Qadri. UK: Ahlus Sunnah Publications.
- Rothschild, Emma. 2018. "Adam Smith and the Invisible Hand." *The American Economic Review*. American Economic Association. Accessed August 27. doi:10.2307/2117851.
- Saliba, George. 2007. "Islamic Science and the Making of the European Renaissance." *Transformations*. doi:10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004.
- Smith, Adam. 1790. *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*. Sao paulo: Metalibri digital library. https://www.ibiblio.org/ml/libri/s/SmithA_MoralSentiments_p.pdf.
- — —. 2007a. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. Edited by S.M. Soares. Metalibri digital library.
- — —. 2007b. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. Edited by Sores S.M. Metalibri digital library.
- Springel, Volker, Carlos S. Frenk, and Simon D. M. White. 2006. "The Large-Scale Structure of the Universe." *Nature* 440 (April): 1137–44. doi:10.1038/nature04805.
- Stigler, G. J. 1971. "Smith's Travels on the Ship of State." *History of Political Economy* 3 (2). Duke University Press: 265–77. doi:10.1215/00182702-3-2-265.
- Sussman, G J, and J Wisdom. 1988. "Numerical Evidence That the Motion of Pluto Is Chaotic." *Science (New York, N.Y.)* 241 (4864). American Association for the Advancement of Science: 433–37. doi:10.1126/science.241.4864.433.
- Taslaman, Caner. 2006. *The Quran: Unchallengeable Miracle*. Çitlembik Publications.
- Tomasello, Michael. 2018. "The Origins of Morality." *Scientific American, Published Online: 14 August 2018*; | Doi:10.1038/Scientificamerican0918-70 319 (3). Nature Publishing Group: 70. doi:10.1038/scientificamerican0918-70.
- Trimmer, John D. 1980. "The Present Situation in Quantum Mechanics: A Translation of Schrödinger's "Cat Paradox" Paper." In *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 323–38. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/986572>.
- Weinberg, Steven. 1987. "Anthropic Bound on the Cosmological Constant." *Physical Review Letters* 59 (22): 2607–10. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.59.2607.
- Wolfson, Harry A. 1969. "Nicolaus of Autrecourt and Ghazālī's Argument against Causality." *Speculum* 44 (2). The University of Chicago Press/Medieval Academy of America: 234–38. doi:10.2307/2847603.
- Zúñiga y Postigo, Gloria. 2014. "Adam Smith on Sympathy: From Self-Interest to Empathy." In *Propriety and Prosperity*, 136–46. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK. doi:10.1057/9781137321053_8.