

Architectonics of Harmony through Compassionate Justice, Feb 4, 2014

International Seminar on Interfaith Harmony and Tolerance

Jointly Organized by:

Prime Minister's Department of National Unity and Integration,
International Islamic University of Malaysia,
Ma'din Academy from Kerala, India

Kuala Lumpur, February 3rd – 6th, 2014

The Architectonics of Harmony through Compassionate Justice: Natural Law and Islamic Jurisprudence as a Global Paradigm for Regional Integration

Keynote by Dr. Robert Dickson Crane

Part One

Developing a Global Paradigm for Regional Integration

A long time ago, the Roman philosopher, Cicero, wisely advised, “Before you discuss anything whatsoever, first define your terms. Today, in celebrating the United Nation’s Global Harmony Week, first advanced three years ago by Prince Ghazi of Jordan, we might start by defining national unity and integration, an issue that has led to the formation of what scholars now consider to be an entirely new paradigm of thought.

Fifty years ago, I wrote a controversial article entitled simply “New Nationalisms”, which was chosen as one of the best articles on foreign affairs during the previous five years for a book compiled by the first liberal think-tank in

Washington, the Ripon Society. The arch conservative, William F. Buckley, Jr., praised this think-tank by writing, “Who cares, really, about the Republican Party? Its soul is the property of the Ripon Society”.

The title of this book was *The Politics of Moderation: The Ripon Papers: 1963 – 1968*. That year, 1968, I expanded this article into one of five position papers on what Nixon and I agreed would become the defining paradigmatic issues in the world during future decades after the collapse of Communism.

One position paper was on stewardship of the global ecological environment, which was far ahead of its time.

Another path-breaking position paper was on national unity and integration. It addressed the definitional issues: What is a state? What is a nation? What is a nation-state? Are they mutually exclusive? If not, how can they be best integrated, namely, from above or from below, and only within states or beyond state boundaries in broader regional cooperation.

The occasion for this newly conceived issue in international affairs was one of the hottest issues during the Vietnam War, namely, how to prevent the spread of Communism throughout Southeast Asia resulting from the so-called Domino Theory. The naïve assumption was that if Vietnam “fell to Communism” then all the other countries would fall like dominos.

Today, the drone masters in America fear the equivalent threat in Osama bin Laden’s vaunted Islamic Caliphate of the World.

The U.S. Air Force had a solution to the major threat of the 20th century during the half-century long Cold War. It was true that in 1967 all the nations along the border of China, including the five nations within the country of Burma other than the minority nation of the Burmans themselves, were taking arms from China in their quest for either autonomy or statehood. The Air Force argued that the only way to prevent the spread of such insurgency was to bomb all of these insurgent peoples into submission. My counter-argument was that a vast bombing campaign against these peoples would radicalize them and lead to precisely what the Air Force wanted to prevent, namely, the Sino-Soviet conquest of Asia.

Since I have always worked with both liberals and conservatives on every issue, the world’s leading foreign policy think-tank, both then and today, the conservative Center for Strategic and International Studies, secured financing for

me secretly to visit the leaders of these organic nations all along the border of China that were aspiring to acquire some level of sovereignty either within or beyond the existing state structure of international law as it developed in Europe after the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648.

Invariably they said that I was the first foreigner they had ever met who understood their culture and their identity based on a common heritage from the past, common values in the present, and common hopes for the future. Only much later did I realize that I had absorbed the same culture from my father's roots in the Cherokee nation, now based in Oklahoma and Arkansas, in which my grandmother's brother was one of the last formally trained imams before the Cherokee religion was forbidden by order of Washington in 1905 and all the religious leaders were imprisoned.

All of the so-called indigenous people with whom I spoke in Southeast and South Asia, including the Nagas, were very clear that they would never accept subjugation to China or Communism or to any other Western or perverted Eastern ideology.

Fortunately, my arguments in American and European journals and newspapers won the day, but it took almost another half a century for academicians to formulate such elementary wisdom into what are now called paradigms of thought with their own terminological definitions of state, nation, and national unity through regional integration.

The new paradigm of national identity conceived independently of state sovereignty has been developed only within the past decade or two and was thoroughly critiqued, both pro and con, in the lead section, entitled "The Integration of Regions" in the Summer/Fall 2013 issue of Georgetown University's scholarly journal *Forum: Georgetown Journal of International Affairs*.

The first two articles in this issue, namely, "Rethinking Regions and Regionalism" by Fredrik Soderbaum, and "Unity and Diversity in Regional Integration Studies" by Luk Van Langenhove, forecast that the "stubborn persistence of the nation-state and the inevitable march of globalization [based upon it] will be replaced by a world of regions". In fact, these and other leading scholars conclude that "the emerging regional architecture of world politics ranging from trade to conflict management now already constitutes the new world order".

The prevailing but perhaps obsolescing emphasis on inter-state regional organizations, based on the Eurocentric model of state sovereignty transfer and supra-national political unification, they argue, is shifting or should shift to cultural cooperation among non-state actors, who make and unmake regional identities and can more effectively facilitate harmonious cooperation. During this process the state and state-based polities are being “unbundled” and a new multi-dimensional process of regionalization is articulating transnational and universal interests, for example, in the current move toward South-South cooperation as a pluralistic form of regional solidarity.

II. Developing a Common Language for Regional and Global Integration

If regional integration is not to be based exclusively on state sovereignty created by human fiat but also on the higher interests of the human person and human communities, on what are such higher interests to be based?

We have a model in the Founders of the United States of America two and a half centuries ago. They based the Great American Experiment in community self-determination on natural law, which it was the duty of the legislature to seek from divine revelation, from scientific observation of the physical laws of the universe, including human beings, and on rational thought in understanding the normative coherence within each source and among them both.

They did not seek freedom and democracy as ultimate ends but rather as means to transcendent justice. The Preamble to the U.S. Constitution declared that the purpose of creating a Union of the people was, in order of priority, to establish justice, insure domestic peace, provide for the common defense, promote general prosperity, and secure the blessings of liberty.

Freedom was a result, and indeed the last result, of justice. Democracy was a technique of government within the higher framework of a republic, which by definition recognizes that the ultimate power and legitimacy comes from God, from whom the purpose of human community is to derive guidance.

The ultimate purpose of regional integration at every level, whether sub-national, national, or supra-national, therefore is to seek justice as a normative framework for human responsibilities and corresponding human rights.

The task in developing a higher framework for human community integration therefore is to develop a language of justice common to a sovereign polity like Malaysia and to the several layers of community within it.

Unfortunately, the word justice is radioactive in any secular society committed only to maintaining the stability of the status quo or existing order with all of its existing injustices. In President Obama's first major foreign policy speech after his first inauguration, he chose Cairo as his preferred venue. He personally wrote this speech and included the word justice. Five times the speech writers deleted this word and each time he put it back in. On the plane over to Cairo he read the official transcript of his speech and found that again justice was deleted. He put it back in his oral delivery, but never again in the first four years of his presidency did he ever again mention justice except in the sense of punishment or retribution.

Our challenge in developing a harmonious world is to revive and develop a common language of justice through holistic education in both theory and praxis by bringing together the best of all civilizations and religions in order to universalize their spiritual awareness and plurality of wisdom by interfaith cooperation in pursuing the vision of peace, prosperity, and freedom through the interfaith harmony of transcendent and compassionate justice for everyone.

Part Two

Developing the Architectonics of Compassionate Justice

I. The Infrastructure of Basic Premises

The architectonics of harmony through compassionate justice consists of three elements: 1) an infrastructure of basic premises or characteristics, 2) a hierarchical architecture of purpose, and 3) a methodology for their application. Together these three can produce a universal language for all civilizations.

The issue of basic premises again is terminological. What is transcendent and compassionate justice? Many people have told me that compassionate justice is an oxymoron, because justice and compassion are opposites. In a secular culture or even in a religious culture like Old Testament Judaism this is true. In human history, however, before the so-called European Renaissance and even today in

every traditionalist civilization all culture is religious in a search for the highest purpose and meaning in life.

The greatest wisdom that I have encountered in a lifetime of studying comparative legal systems came in 1982 from two Buddhist monks, who had just arrived at a village of monasteries being built in Baca, Colorado, by a Canadian billionaire. These Buddhist monks came from Nepal to establish a monastery representing Tantrayana Buddhism. I had been invited to organize a pow-wow of traditionalist leaders from various Native American nations.

The wife of the Canadian billionaire asked me to entertain these two Buddhist monks for five minutes while they waited for a shuttle to take them into the little town of Baca for supplies. Not knowing how to entertain Buddhist monks, I asked them to explain the essence of Buddhism in five minutes.

They laughed and said, “We do not need five minutes to explain anything that simple. First we have Hinayana Buddhism, which teaches the art of separating oneself from addictions to the material world. Once one has done this, one arrives at Mahayana Buddhism, in which one becomes aware of nirvana, which may be defined as nothing, no-thing, that is, as the transcendent and ultimate dimension of reality, which in the Western religions is sometimes known as ‘God’ or Allah.”

Then they continued, “Finally, one reaches the level of Tantrayana or Tibetan Buddhism, in which one’s great desire is to bring compassionate justice to every living person and to every single thing in the world.

My response was immediate. “You may not know that I am a hidden Muslim, but I can tell you that you have just summarized the essence of Islamic wisdom and Islamic jurisprudence in less than one minute.

Islamic jurisprudence, known as the *maqasid al shari’ah*, is primarily a system of holistic education designed to guide individual persons and communities in the pursuit of compassionate justice. To the extent that Islamic law has to be enforced, the entire system has failed. This is the precise opposite of Western law in secular states, where law is considered to exist only to the extent that it is enforced by coercion through the penalties of civil or criminal law.

The reason for this holistic nature of Islamic jurisprudence is that its higher

purpose is to provide guidance in understanding and applying the universal responsibilities and rights inherent in the essence of Islam, namely, truth, love, and justice.

God tells us in Surah An'am 6:115, "The Word of your Lord is fulfilled and perfected in truth and in justice".

This is why the classical Islamic scholars and their followers today emphasize the *janib al wujud* or positive and constructive principles of affirmative action rather than the *janib al adami* or negative approach based on existential fear and punitive reaction.

The Prophet Muhammad, *salla allahu 'alayhi wa salam*, said "For every day on which the sun rises, there is a reward for the one who establishes justice among people". This is why the classical Islamic scholars also emphasize not merely the responsibilities and rights of persons and communities in both theory and action, but also the human virtues that the Christian theologian, Hans Kung, has popularized as a system of global ethics.

The higher guidance within this double wisdom of affirmative purpose and personal virtue was spelled out by two of the greatest Islamic scholars, Shamsuddin ibn al Qayyim (who died in 748 A.H., 1347 A.C.) and his mentor Imam Ahmad ibn Taymiyah (d. 728). Ibn Qayyim wrote: "The Islamic law is all about wisdom and achieving people's welfare in this life and the afterlife. It is all about justice, mercy, wisdom, and good. Thus any ruling that replaces justice with injustice, mercy with its opposite, common good with mischief, or wisdom with nonsense, is a ruling that does not belong to the Islamic law".

The first of the four basic premises of Islamic jurisprudence is its holistic nature embodied in the term *tawhid*, according to which the entire created order exists in unitary harmony. The things and forces we can observe are real, but their existence comes from God. They do not exist independently of His purpose.

The second premise is esthetic. The nature of transcendent reality, and of all being, is Beauty, which precedes and is independent of cognition. The flower in the desert is beautiful even if no person sees it. Beauty, and necessarily therefore Islamic law, consists of unity, symmetry, harmony, depth of meaning, and breadth of applicability. The greatest beauty is the unitive principle of *tawhid* itself, because without it there could be no science and no human thought at all.

The third premise of Islamic jurisprudence is its approach to knowledge, which sentient beings on earth and elsewhere in the universe must seek rather than create, because all knowledge is merely a derivative and an affirmation of the unitary harmony inherent in everything that comes from God.

Every person is created with a need and a corresponding intuitive capability to seek and to know transcendent reality and to submit lovingly to God in thought and action. This is why throughout history human beings have entered into community not for mere physical survival but primarily to fulfill this transcendent need. The primordial purpose of law as a positive paradigm of compassionate justice is to give meaning to everything man can observe. And meaning comes from God, Who gives purpose to everything He has created.

The fourth and most easily understood premise of Islamic law is its normative or purposive, goal-oriented nature. In their “Universal Principles of Human Rights,” Islamic scholars over the centuries have identified several irreducibly highest principles. These are known variously as the *maqasid* or purposes, as the *kulliyat* or universals, and as the *dururiyat* or essentials of justice. Each one of these highest principles of human rights heads its own decision-tree or hierarchy of purpose through three levels of increasing specificity proceeding from the generic and abstract to specific courses of action.

II. The Hierarchy of Purpose

The classical five *maqasid* (*al dururiyat al khamsah*) or *huquq* (sing. *haqq*) of Al Ghazali in the 4th Islamic century were the protection of *din* (faith and religion), *haya* (life), *mal* (private property), *karama* (dignity and honor), and *‘ilm* (mind and knowledge). Later scholars, especially Al Shatibi, added *nasl* or *nasab* (family and community) and *hurriyah* (self-determination or political freedom). Some twenty-first century scholars have added an eighth *maqsad*, known as *haqq al mahid* or respect for the physical environment.

These eight universal human rights can be divided or categorized into four principles of guidance and four of application. The third principle of guidance, which requires respect for human community, and the first principle of application, which requires respect for political self-determination, are the most relevant for the success of any system of national unity and integration.

Principles of Guidance

1. Respect for Divine Revelation and Freedom of Religion

The first principle, known *ashaqq al din*, is the duty to respect divine revelation. Classical Islamic scholars interpret this to require freedom of religion, which means that each human has the right freely to seek truth. This primary belief in divine revelation provides the framework for the following additional principles of human rights in Islam.

2. Respect for the Human Person and Life

The second principle, *haqq al nafs*, is the duty to respect the human person and life itself. This principle provides guidelines for what in modern parlance is called the doctrine of just war, so beautifully and coherently spelled out in the Qur'an, hadith, Sunnah, and Sirah.

3. Respect for Family and Community

The third principle of guidance is the duty to respect the family and the community at every level all the way to the community of humankind as an important expression of the person. This principle teaches that the sovereignty of the person, subject to the ultimate sovereignty of God, comes prior to and is superior to any alleged ultimate sovereignty of the secular invention known as the State. This is the opposite of the Western international law created by past empires, which is based on the simple principle of "might makes right".

One of the most important of the subordinate goals *or hajjiyat* deriving from this purpose of Islamic jurisprudence is the principle of subsidiarity whereby all problems should be resolved at the lowest level of community before resorting to any higher levels.

4. Respect for the Environment

The fourth principle of guidance has always been so important that it never had to be articulated until recently. This is *haqq al mahid* (from *wahada*), which is respect for the physical environment. The issue of balance in the *maqsad* of *haqq al mahid* concerns the relative priorities in protecting the

environment versus protecting the other essential purposes of human life. This is part of the broader problem of relating the spiritual and the social as foci in a single paradigm of *tawhid*.

Principles of Application

1. Respect for Economic Justice with Broadened Capital Ownership

Economic justice is the first of the four principles of application. This requires respect for the rights of private property in the production of wealth as a universal human right of every human being, as well as respect for the free market and a system of money and banking designed to reduce the wealth gap by basing credit on future profits rather than on past wealth accumulation.

2. Respect for Political Justice with Self-Determination

This principle requires respect for self-determination of both persons and communities through political freedom in association with other communities, including recognition that economic democracy is a precondition for the political democracy of representative government.

3. Respect for Human Dignity with Gender Equity

This principle states that the most important requirement for individual human dignity and honor is gender equity. In traditional Islamic thought, neither freedom nor equality are ultimate ends. They are essential means to pursue the higher purposes inherent in the divine design of the Creator for every person.

4. Respect for Knowledge and Dissemination of Thought

The last universal or essential purpose at the root of Islamic jurisprudence is respect for knowledge. This can be sustained only by observance of the first seven principles and also is essential to each of them. The second-order principles of this *maqсад* are freedom of thought, freedom for dissemination of thought, and freedom for assembly so that all persons can fulfill their

purpose to seek knowledge wherever they can find it.

This framework of Islamic principles for human rights is at the very core of Islam as a religion. Fortunately, this paradigm of law in its broadest sense of moral theology is now being revived by courageous Muslims determined to fill the intellectual gap that has weakened the Muslim *ummah* for more than six hundred years. This renewed effort for a spiritual renaissance in all faiths can transform the world for the good of all humankind.

III. A Methodology for Application

In every religion, as well as in every civilization, the values and virtues and their higher purposes are derived from sacred texts. This is especially true in Islam, because the Qur'an is believed to be divinely revealed word for word and because the Prophet Muhammad, *salla Allahu 'alayhi wa salam*, is revered as a model of its application in every sphere of life.

The methodology of understanding both the Qur'an and the Sunnah has a long history of development, but perhaps the best set of methodological principles was explained by Louay Safi in his paper, entitled "The Qur'anic Reading and Its Method", prepared for the two-week Scholars Institute at the International Institute of Islamic Thought in Herndon, Virginia, in July and August, 2010. The four most important are the following:

Principle 1: Rights and obligations cannot be established on the basis of individual statements of the Qur'an and Sunnah, but have to accord with the totality of relevant statements. Therefore a jurist is required, according to this principle, to consult all relevant texts before rendering a specific ruling.

Principle 2: The multiplicity of Qur'anic rules must be reduced to a coherent set of universal principles. The universal principles should be used to ensure the systematic application of the shari'ah in a modern context. Such systematization should prevent an application of a specific rule (*khas*) in violation of a general (*'am*) or a particular (*juz'i*) in violation of a universal (*kuli*).

Principle 3: Because the generalization of a rule presupposes that the reason for its enactment is clear, no rule should be generalized unless its reason has been explicated. This principle requires that Qur'anic rules in relation to social actions

and interactions should be understood fully and be systematized with other rules. This requirement avoids the literalist application of the *fiqh* or detailed rules beyond their intended purpose.

Principle 4: The universalization of a principle requires that the conditions of its application be identical, regardless of time and space. Therefore, the principle can be declared universal only if the particularity of the context for which it was intended is evident.

The architectonics of universal jurisprudence requires that its infrastructure of basic premises, its superstructure of purpose, and its methodology of application reinforce each other in a global paradigm of compassionate justice.

Part III

Qur'anic Guidelines for the Natural Law of National Unity and Integration

I. The Issue of Natural Law

The four basic premises of the maqasid al shari'ah as a universal system of jurisprudence, namely, the ontological, aesthetic, epistemological, and normative harmony of holistic *tawhid*, give rise to the question whether there is a natural law of nations distinct from an un-natural law of states and whether there is a natural law of national unity and integration.

This raises the prior question whether there is such a thing as natural law that must be discovered, as distinct from the positivist law that human beings create. This was the basic issue in the founding of the United States of America.

Almost all of America's Founders were familiar with the so-called contract theories of Hobbes, Locke, and Rousseau, who taught that the authority of government comes from a contract among people, but all of America's founding men and women rejected this as the ultimate source of political legitimacy. Instead, they based their so-called Revolution almost entirely on the teachings of their real mentor, Edmund Burke, who led the minority Whig Party in England. He supported the American colonists' demands for reform and taught that the

source of legitimacy both in England and in its colonies comes from a contract between man and God, for Whom both persons and their communities can serve only as stewards. In Islamic jurisprudence, this is known as *khilafa*, which is the first of the four goals or requirements of *haqq alhurriyah*, namely, political justice, the other three being *shurah*, *ijma*, and an independent judiciary.

The ultimate in illegitimacy, according to Edmund Burke, was the French Revolution, which denied all transcendent authority and was a perfect model of a so-called sovereign state based exclusively on the principle of might makes right. At Harvard Law School, where I spent three years specializing on international law and international investment, we were told that a state by definition is whatever polity can impose its will on more than 50% of a given territory. This is also a perfect definition of colonialism.

At the conclusion of the Constitutional Convention in 1789, Benjamin Franklyn was asked, “What have you created”. He replied, “We have created a republic, if we can keep it”. He regarded the Great American Experiment in Self-Determination as just that, an open-ended experiment.

The essence of a republic, as distinct from a mere majoritarian democracy, is the reliance of the legislative branch of government on the divine source of its ultimate guidance. Simply put, a republic by definition is based on natural law.

What, however, is natural law? In the modern terminology developed in the 19th century, natural law is exclusively what one can observe in the physical world. This definition is designed to exclude any higher dimension of reality, including God.

This modern definition is the exact opposite of the traditional Christian teachings, as well as of the equivalent Islamic teachings on the Sunnat Allah or the way of God.

As explained in my three-volume, one-thousand-page textbook, *Islam and Muslims*, which is about to be published, the entire history of Islamic thought and civilization can be summarized as either conflict or cooperation among the three sources of truth, namely, *haqq al yaqin* or divine revelation, *‘ain al yaqin* or physical science, and *‘ilm al yaqin* or rational thought.

Some extremists taught that revelation trumps science and reason, whereas other extremists believed the opposite. The moderates believed that the Sunnah of Allah or natural law includes both revelation and scientific reason, but they differed on their priorities. They included human reason as a principal part of natural law simply because humans are part of nature and can be rationally observed.

Probably more than half of all Muslims in the world would add a fourth source of natural law under the influence of literally hundreds of orders and sub-orders of Sufism, especially those emanating directly or indirectly from the illuminationist school of Shebab al Din Suhrawardi, who lived in Persia during the twelfth century after Christ when the majority of people in this part of the world were still Sunnis.

These Sufis believe that the human spirit is always in the presence of God and that it informs or infuses the human soul with the light of higher reality, which the soul as the decision-making part of the human person can either accept or reject for translation into thought and action.

This spiritual emphasis is common in all the world religions, but perhaps is best known in Eastern Orthodox Christianity through the “Jesus Prayer” and among Muslims and Buddhists through the book *Pray without Ceasing: The Way of the Invocation in World Religions*, edited by Patrick Laude, who teaches comparative theology at the Georgetown University campus in the Qatar Foundation

II. Qur’anic Dialectics of Community Harmony

Throughout divine revelation, but most insistently in the Qur’an, we are encouraged to appreciate the symbolic value of contingent reality, namely, of the physical world. The first order of symbolism is the coherent diversity of Creation, which points to the Oneness of its Creator. This is the essence of *tawhid*.

The coherent unity in diversity is perhaps shown best in the pairing of opposites as the basis of reproduction in animal and plant life. In Surah An’am 6:38 we read “There is no beast that walks on the earth and no bird that flies on its two wings that is not a community like yourselves”.

In Surah Ya Sin 36:36, we read, “Limitless in His glory is He Who has created opposites (*zawjain*) in whatever the earth produces, and in men’s own selves, and in that of which they as yet have no knowledge”. The term *zawjiyah* means harmony in the mutual interdependence of opposites. This is shown in the positive and negative charges of electrons in modern quantum physics and perhaps even in the existence of parallel universes as a solution to the enigma of string theory. This dialectics of natural law is the foundation of the universe.

Another primary instinct in human nature is not only to form pairs but out of them to grow ever larger communities. This too is part of the structure of the universe. In Surah al Dhariyat 51:47-49 God tells us, “And it is We who have built the universe (*sama’a*) with Our creative power, and verily it is We Who are steadily expanding it”.

Of course, the natural and positive attraction to unity in diversity competes with a natural attraction to exclusivity. This is why the Qur’an again and again urges persons and communities to use their freedom of thought and action to compete constructively rather than destructively. In Surah al Ma’ida 5:48 we are warned, “To each of you have We prescribed a law and an open way. If Allah had so willed it, He would have made you a single people, but His plan is to test you in what He has given you; so strive as in a race in all virtues”.

The term for “law” here is *shira’ah*, which means “universal ethics”, and the term for “open way” is *minhaj*, which means “universal process toward truth and justice”. The term *shari’ah* is a more restrictive term applying only to Muslims and valid only for them.

We are given the reason for diverse communities and even diverse religions in Surah al An’am 6:38, “We made you into nations and tribes, so that you may know each other”, whereby the purpose of knowledge is to cooperate for mutual benefit. This is the purpose of Ibn Khaldun’s differentiation between bad *asabiyah* based on exclusivist loyalties to oneself at the expense of others and good *asabiyah* based on pride in the best of one’s own community as a means to cooperate in bringing out the best of all communities.

This good community solidarity is based on the Islamic view of human nature expressed in the term *infaq*, which is the inclination to give rather than take in life. The human being is believed to be naturally virtuous, as distinct from burdened with original sin, but this good nature must be supported and shaped by a culture of holistic education and prayer.

III. Developing a Global Paradigm of Regional Integration

All aspects of human life, especially the permanent things in humanity's past, present, and future, are covered from all angles in the Qur'an. The coherence of the Qur'an as revealed over a period of twenty-two years in different contexts is one reason why Muslims regard the Qur'an as a miracle.

The twin purposes and roles of traditionalist religions are the spiritual well-being and happiness of every person and the maintenance of consensus on the responsibilities and rights necessary to live in an ordered society. The purpose of every individual is to become the person that one was created to be, because that is one's true identity. Therefore the greatest challenge in life is to become the person that one already is. The purpose also of every community from the nuclear family to the village and nation and on to entire civilizations as the highest form of group identity is the same.

As Charles LeGai Eaton has put it, this contrasts with the ultimate "false god", the shadowy presence behind all others, namely, the human ego with its pretensions to self-sufficiency. This is the cardinal sin of every rigorously secularist paradigm in public policy.

Islam as a religion is a holistic product of truth, love, and justice. The broad purpose of public policy in the Islamic view of life is to encourage creative thought designed to identify and solve problems and to educate the citizens of a polity in pursuing good order, general prosperity, and freedom through responsible self-determination. These three purposes include the concept that economic democracy through broad-based ownership of productive wealth is a precondition for the political democracy of representative governance. Such economic justice, known as *haqq al mal*, is the basis of Islam as a justice-oriented religion.

In conclusion, a global paradigm of regional integration must be founded on compassionate justice, especially on *haqq al nasl*, which is the third of the eight highest purposes or *maqasid* in Islamic jurisprudence, namely, on respect for family and community, as well as on all seven of the other essential and irreducible universals as developed over many centuries by some of mankind's greatest scholars and wise persons as paths to peace.

The organic nations and diverse religious communities in Malaysia, as well as in other countries around the world, have the opportunity to lead a spiritual renaissance and revival of all faiths leading to the harmonious transformation and integration of the entire world for the good of all humankind.

end