TAWHID AND THE CRITICISM OF MODERN HUMANISM: Reflection on Alî Sharî'atî's Thought

Zulfan Taufik & *Muhammad Taufik***
*Universitas Islam Negeri Sjech M. Djamil Djambek Bukittinggi, Indonesia
**Universitas Islam Negeri Mataram, Indonesia
Email: zulfantaufik@uinbukittinggi.ac.id

Abstract

The rise of modern humanism, with its promise of elevating human dignity through anthropocentrism, has paradoxically contributed to deepening global humanitarian crises. In this context, Islam, as a theocentric (God-centered) worldview, faces the urgent challenge of demonstrating its relevance and adequacy in addressing contemporary human concerns. This article explores the tawḥidic worldview of Alî Sharî'atî and his critical engagement with modern humanism. Utilizing a qualitative literature review and a descriptive-analytic method, the study examines Sharî'atî's primary texts to uncover how his understanding of tawḥid (divine unity) offers a compelling theological alternative to secular humanist paradigms. Sharî'atî positions tawḥid not only as the central doctrine of Islam but also as a transformative worldview that restores human dignity by re-establishing the vertical relationship between the human and the Divine. In his view, monotheism liberates individuals from subjugation to worldly powers by instilling accountability to a single transcendent authority—God—thereby affirming both human freedom and responsibility. The study argues that Sharî'atî's critique of modern humanism— whether in its liberal, Marxist, or existentialist forms—exposes deep contradictions stemming from the philosophical marginalization of the metaphysical. By re-centering the divine in discourse on humanity, Sharî'atî offers a vision of liberation rooted in spiritual ontology. This research contributes to contemporary Islamic thought and philosophical anthropology by demonstrating how Islamic theology can respond to and critique the failures of

modern humanism, offering an ethically grounded framework for addressing today's pressing humanitarian challenges.

Introduction

As a cultural movement, modern humanism has sparked a slew of initiatives aimed at reaffirming that humans are the subject. Recognizing the human self as a "subject" leads to the world becoming an "object" of rational inquiry, giving rise to science and technology. As a logical result, the term "anthropocentrism" was coined, and it influenced anthropology and epistemology. However, amid modern Western philosophy's frantic efforts to exert hegemonic influence through applying the philosophical tradition of humanism to every other culture and social structure, it turns out that several fundamental issues beset it. Humanism, rather than respecting human dignity, presents itself as a form of uncontrolled freedom (science, knowledge, and logic) that severely diminishes human values (Ezzuddin 2022, 134).

Building a civilization that prioritizes humans as the centre and yardstick for all that "exists" (beings) has produced several pressing issues, including the human ideals that humanism has defended. Humanism, which had its roots in modernism and emphasized rationality and the subject as the centre of everything, was destroyed, notably by the two barbaric World Wars (Anderson 2014, 4). According to Fritjof Capra, we have been in a severe global crisis since the beginning of the last two decades of the 20th century. A complex and multidimensional crisis whose aspects touch each life aspect, from health to environmental quality, social relations, economy, technology, and politics. The crisis has intellectual, moral, and spiritual dimensions; it is a crisis that is believed to be unprecedented in human history (Capra 1997, 3).

Criticism then hit the foundations of modern humanism, which is centered on the supremacy of reason and authority of the subject, based on the crisis it creates (Fauhatun 2020, 54; Mailloux 2012, 134; Negru 2009, 78). In a world that is anthropocentric and poor in human values, Islam, as a religion that originates from God (theocentric), faces a serious challenge to

prove that within itself, there are adequate human dimensions and have a fundamental role for humans today. Within the breadth of its horizons, Islam can combine rational models and revelations or humanistic and religious approaches. This is the space for modern Muslim thinkers to develop the concept of Islamic rationalism because religious and humanistic dimensions are both present in Islam (Wahyudin et al. 2019, 305).

Within the framework of Islamic thought, the worldview of tawhid is the core concept that forms the basis of analysis by Islamic thinkers such as Murtadha Mutahhari (1919-1979), Ismâ'îl Rajî al-Farûqî (d.1986), Hassan Hanafî (d.2021), and also Alî Sharî'atî (d.1977). This article focuses on the study of the thoughts of Sharî'atî, who is often considered the most important Iranian thinker of the 20th century (Nugroho et al. 2017, 251). Sharî'atî has a unique style among modern Islamic thinkers. He thoroughly mastered the intellectual heritage and actuality of the West, avoided apologetic, superficial modernism, and was able to counter it with a strong, fresh and unified view of the spiritual and philosophical nature of Islam using a mechanical amalgamation of "the best of both worlds." (Kurzman 1995, 25). As a thinker, Sharî'atî exhibits paradoxical sensitivity. He is a free thinker who constantly searches for truth in his life through mysticism, an intuitive understanding of the world, and the role of God in any sphere. At the same time, he appears in public to promote collective revolutionary action to fight for social justice and freedom from oppression (Faizal et al. 2022, 32).

Various studies on the figure of Alî Sharî'atî or his thoughts have been carried out. However, of the many writings and discussions about Sharî'atî's thoughts, few writings examine his thought system. Among the few, Yudian Wahyudi examines Sharî'atî's thoughts on free will by comparing them with Bint Shati's thoughts (Wahyudi 1998, 35). Then there is Elisheva Machlis, who reviews Sharî'atî's tawhid worldview and places her writings in the broader context of Western and Muslim thought (Machlis, 2014, 183). Ramadhan also tries to review Sharî'atî's theological thoughts on humanity. He concluded that the theology developed by Sharî'atî is a theology that liberates humans from the confines of harmful fatalism. The themes of humanity, definitely, are very thick in it. This is the antithesis of *kalam*'s traditionalism, which is more of a 'theomorphism' pattern (Ramadhan 2011).

Sharî'atî's revolutionary theological thoughts have also been contextualized and linked to various issues such as Politics (Khanlarzadeh 2020, 504; Nugroho et al. 2017, 251), technological revolution (Cahyanto 2020, 41), sociology (Pribadi 2023, 194; Tobroni 2016, 241), and epistemology (Ahmed & Subhani 2019, 30). However, unlike previous studies, this article examines Sharî'atî's tawhidic worldview, which also correlates with his critique of modern humanism. This article begins by narrating modern humanism and its inherent crisis, leading to human values degradation. By examining Alî Sharî'atî's thoughts, this article describes the framework of Islamic monotheistic thought and criticism of modern humanism from his roots of thought originating from ancient Greek myths to his appearance in modern Western schools such as liberalism, marxism, and existentialism.

Research Method

This article is library research based on qualitative data, so in general, it requires a descriptive-analytic method with the following steps: (a) describing the primary idea that is the object of writing; (b) discussing the primary idea, which essentially provides the author's interpretation of the ideas that have been described; (c) criticizing the primary ideas that have been interpreted; (d) conducting "analytic studies," namely studies of a series of primary ideas in the form of comparisons, relationships, development of rational models, and historical writing; and (e) concluding the results of writing. Sharî'atî's works that serve as his primary references are *Man and Islam: Lectures by Alî Sharî'atî, Marxism and Other Western Fallacies: An Islamic Critique*, and *on the Sociology of Islam*.

The reading and analysis of Sharî'atî's works above uses a philosophical approach. Among the characteristics of a philosophical approach is writing and studying the structure of basic ideas and fundamental ideas formulated by a thinker. Apart from that, conceptual analysis is an important characteristic and necessary in philosophical writing. Meanwhile, as an activity, the philosophical approach requires the author to read carefully, think carefully, express his thoughts clearly, and be willing to see their ideas based on a list of rational and critical thoughts (Tobia 2015, 575).

Result and Discussion
Modern Humanism and the Crisis

Modern humanism, which takes a critical stance against the monopoly of interpretation of truth held by the miraculous alliance of state and religion, blossomed with modern philosophy and science. Based on the study of the development of thought and culture of society, many experts conclude that historically, the modernity movement first appeared explicitly during the Renaissance and Aufklarung/Enlightenment, namely around 1500, in the context of the Christian West. One of the main pillars of the modern movement is the conceptual framework that Bede Griffiths calls materialist philosophy. The emergence of this philosophical trend also marks the end of the very idealistic and spiritual influence of Medieval thought patterns, as embodied in Church dogma/teachings that are very influential today (Copson 2015, 2-8).

In understanding the nature of modern humanism, at least it can be viewed from the historical side and the schools of thought in modern philosophy. From a historical point of view, humanism is an intellectual and literary movement that initially emerged in Italy in the second half of the 14th century. This movement can be the driving force of modern culture, particularly in Europe. Some figures are frequently cited as pioneers of this movement, for example, Dante, Petrarch, Michelangelo, etc. This movement that started in Italy and then spread to all corners of Europe aims to break free from the shackles of church power and free the mind from its binding confines. Through liberal education, they teach that humans are, in principle, free beings and have complete power over their existence and future. So, the external forces that impede human freedom must be broken immediately within certain limits (Grendler 2006, 79).

Meanwhile, from the perspective of philosophy, humanism is explained as an understanding that upholds the values and dignity of humans in such a way that they can gain a very high, central, and influential position, both in theoretical-philosophical contemplation and in daily life. In a sense, humans are seen as a measure for every judgment and the primary reference of every event in this universe. The assumption of this philosophical view is that humans are the center of reality in principle. In contrast to the philosophical views that developed in the Middle Ages, humanists hold fast to the stance that humans are not essentially *Viator Mundi* (pilgrims on earth), but instead, as a *Vaber Mundi* (worker or creator of his world). Therefore, all measures of evaluation and final reference of all human events should be

returned to humans themselves, not to forces outside of humans; like the power of God or nature (Manne 2016, 389).

If humanism is defined so, then modern philosophical schools such as liberalism, marxism, pragmatism, existentialism, and others, can be categorized into humanism. Thus, it means that humanism is not just a philosophical school that is vis a vis with other major schools of philosophy, but that it underlies the birth of a large number of the most influential philosophical schools of the modern century. Humanism's ability to influence other philosophical schools of thought cannot be separated from its fundamental characteristics: freedom of thought, skepticism, naturalistic rationalism, and self-fulfillment. All intellectual classes have always considered the name humanism later, very suitable to express their movement and thought ideals.

Modern humanism finally characterizes human humanity apart from supernatural elements (Engelke 2014, 292). Even, William McIllroy defines modern humanism as a humanist movement that rejects religious beliefs. The term humanism has been used as an umbrella of meaning to cover the humanist movement since the late 18th and early 19th centuries (McIlroy 2004, 2). In modern Western history, the Enlightenment was the height of Western optimism about the power of human reason. People began to suspect various forms of religious and philosophical teachings as myths or empty fantasies. Instead, they put great trust in science and technology that was flourishing at that time.

However, modern humanism, which was initially born as a radical reaction to religious arrogance, later emerged as an era of subject hegemony in various fields of life. Both in the social, economic, political, cultural, and religious fields. For example, liberal humanism, which tries to liberate humans from the influences of bureaucratic institutions and church domination, actually presents itself as a new tyrannical force hiding behind the term 'liberalization'. Meanwhile, marxist-humanism, which tries to lift humans from isolation, is even more alienated by the shackled production and work. In such a context, the position of humans is degraded. Humans, who were previously considered the center of the universe, have now changed simply as an element of an economic system or political system (Viktorahadi 2018, 278).

Criticism then hit the foundations of modern humanism, centering on the supremacy of reason and subject authority based on the crisis it created. One of the main things in rejecting and criticizing modern humanism is the movement that carries the theme of antihumanism. Antihumanism does not describe a hatred of humanism. However, it is a system of thinking that uses a critical, scientific and philosophical approach to humanism and tries to show that humanism does not have to be seen as something universal. Antihumanism seeks to deregulate various principles and rules about humans presented by Western world humanism (Braidotti 2019, 31; Petrovskaya, 2023, 3).

On the other hand, antihumanism can also be understood as an alternative thinking system that wants to see and understand the dimensions of humanity. However, these dimensions are ignored, set aside, or marginalized philosophically due to the exaltation of rationality by modernity. Nazism, fascism, capitalism and marxism are real examples of the configuration of modern rationality that actually attack humanity. Likewise, the practice of technological progress, although it is beneficial, on the other hand, actually tends to enslave humans. Various themes of antihumanism also aggressively attack modernity and humanism, which focuses too much attention on subject autonomy, such as the theme of "power" proposed by Foucault, "paralogy" proposed by Lyotard, and "deconstruction" developed by Derrida (Durkin 2022, 292; Haines & Grattan 2017,173).

In simple terms, the criticisms that came against modern humanism were caused by the crisis that resulted from it. Modern humanism, intended initially to lead humans to reach enlightenment, where freedom of tolerance is the ideal and mega project, has abandoned humans in the jungle of false splendor and even undermined humanity itself.

The Worldview of Tawhid

Tawhid is the core teaching of Islam. As al-Faruqi said, tawhid contains the most significant and prosperous meaning in Islamic treasures. All cultures, civilizations, or history, if condensed into one sentence, then it is the sentence of tawhid (al-Faruqi 1988, 9). When the idea of tawhid is used in the realm of divinity, it will mean "the oneness of God". However, Islam includes the worldly, mental, and divine fields simultaneously (Kounsar 2016, 95). Therefore, for Sharî'atî, tawhid is not simply a philosophical-religious theory, which means "God is one", but is a worldview. With the

tawhid worldview, Sharî'atî attempted to synthesize the materialism and extreme religious worldviews, which, according to him, were too one-sided.

Sharî'atî calls tawhid a humanistic religious worldview. Just as the end of the materialistic view of life gives birth to pleasure hunters, the end of the religious view of life, according to Sharî'atî, results in all-afterlife and the neglect of human potential. This is because the cosmic force that is believed by extreme religious views is the Almighty, the perfect will, before which the human's will becomes paralyzed, and the absolute Ruler and law that demands blind obedience from humans. In His presence, man cannot move the power of his will as a free being. While the materialist worldview views the universe as absurd, ownerless, and meaningless, extreme religious views degrade human beings into trivial, very weak, and utterly insignificant in the plan of creation. This fanatical view, for Sharî'atî, inhumanly tends to strip the man of his free will and his personality and essence (Sharî'atî 1996, 27-28).

In contrast to materialism and extreme religious worldviews, Sharî'atî says that the humanistic religious worldview views humans as progressive, always seeking perfection, and very human. This awareness devotes itself to restoring spiritual meaning to nature, helping humans achieve their religious awareness, as well as awakening humans to their mission as representatives or caliphs of God on earth and as the shapers of their destiny and the fate of all mankind (Sharî'atî 1996, 28). This humanistic religious worldview, based on tawhid, is essentially in conflict with various inconsistencies in society, humanity, the world of existence, and between the physical and metaphysical worlds. In various monotheistic scriptures, humans and nature are seen as something that has meaning, purpose, and self-awareness. The universe is not accused of being absurd, pointless, and indifferent to human spiritual needs. Humans are seen as independent beings and have unlimited potential. His fate is determined by himself, not by external forces.

For Sharî'atî, tawhid as a worldview views the entire universe as a unity. The world is not divided into the world now and hereafter, the natural and the supernatural, the substance and meaning, the soul and the body. Thus, tawhid views all existence as a single form, a single living organism possessing consciousness, creativity, taste, and intention. Meanwhile, the opposite of tawhid, namely shirk, is a view of life that sees the universe as a chaotic collection, full of variety, contradiction, and heterogeneity. There are all kinds of poles that have nothing to do with each other, even contradict each other, full of conflict tendencies, with all their desires, calculations, habits,

goals, and desires. Sharî'atî says that tawhid views this world as an empire in an analogical fashion. In contrast, shirk views it as a feudal system (Sharî'atî 1980b).

The world's life is a life of will, self-awareness and responsiveness, ideals, and goals, just like humans, only more comprehensive and absolute. On the other hand, humans are like the world, only smaller, relative, and imperfect. God, man, and nature are united because all three have an original unity. They all have similar direction, will, spirit, motion, and life. However, this unity is not intrinsically substantial, but rather that the three are not separate from each other and are not contradictory or even dispersed. Sharî'atî described this as a light with a lamp shining through it. Alternatively, like the relationship between a person's awareness of his own hands. His perception cannot be separated and alienated from his hand. However, his perception is not identical to his hand, nor is it a part of it.

Although ontologically this unity cannot be separated, epistemologically, everything is divided into two relative aspects: the unseen and the outer, or the sensory realm and the nonsensory realm. This, according to Sharî'atî, is not dualism, but a relative classification, according to the human condition and cognitive faculties. In the monotheistic worldview, nature, namely the real world, consists of a series of signs (*âyât*) and norms (*sunnah*). Using the word "sign" to designate a natural phenomenon contains a deep understanding. The "sign" is not hypostasis, two kinds of matter, two worlds, or two separate and contradictory poles. The word "sign" contains the meaning of indication or manifestation, synonymous with the term "phenomenon". In a very general sense, Phenomenology is based on the assumption that absolute truth, the basis and nature of the world, nature and matter, are all beyond human reach. Our experience, knowledge, and responsiveness may achieve only "what appears", not the "substance" of something. Namely the outward manifestation of the primary, supernatural, and nonsensory reality (Sharî'atî 1980, 82).

Sharî'atî said that among all religious, scientific, and philosophical books, only the Quran refers to all-natural objects, events, and processes as "signs". In both Islamic mysticism and Eastern pantheism, the material world is always depicted as a series of waves or bubbles on the ocean's surface (Allah or true nature) (Arrasyid 2020, 70; Ihsan et al. 2022, 22). Idealism and various religious and ethical philosophies also view the material world as a collection of inferior objects facing God. However, the Quran places a positive scientific value on these "signs". The Quran does not regard it as an

illusion or a veil that covers the face of truth. On the contrary, the "signs" are indications of the truth. In Sharî'atî's opinion, humans can only reach the truth by contemplating it seriously and scientifically, not by ignoring or putting it aside. The way the Quran views these "signs" or natural phenomena is more in line with the modern scientific approach than the ancient mystical approach (Sharî'atî 1980, 85).

From this point, Sharî'atî concludes that reaching the truth (*al-Haqq*) is not with the *wahdat al-wujûd* of the Sufis but the scientific and analytical *tawḥîd al-wujûd*. It immediately rejects multiplicity, plurality, and contradiction, whether in history, society or even within humans themselves. Thus, for Sharî'atî, tawhid must be interpreted as a union between nature and meta-nature, between humans and nature, between humans and humans, between God and the world and humans. All of this, in the teaching of tawhid, is a total system, harmonious, living, and conscious. Sharî'atî refers to surah al-Nûr [24]: 35,

> "Allah is the Light of the heavens and the earth. The example of His light is like a niche within which is a lamp, the lamp is within glass, the glass as if it were a pearly [white] star lit from [the oil of] a blessed olive tree, neither of the east nor of the west, whose oil would almost glow even if untouched by fire. Light upon light. Allah guides to His light whom He wills. And Allah presents examples for the people, and Allah is knowing of all things."

The verse describes the relationship between Allah and the world according to the monotheistic world-view. All existence is like a burning lamp. This is not the concept of *wahdat al-wujûd*, nor the multiplicity of existence, but *tauḥîd al-wujûd*.

Therefore, the structure of tawhid rejects any contradiction or disharmony in all existence: human and nature, spirit and body, world and the hereafter, matter, and meaning, as well as legal, social, political, racial, national, territorial, genetic, or even economic contradictions. The consequence of the monotheistic view of life is the rejection of human dependence on a social force and the linking of humans in particular or each of their dimensions to the consciousness and will of the Almighty. Everyone's source of help, orientation, trust, and help is a single central point, an axis around which the whole movement of the cosmos revolves. Man's position in nature is an objective demonstration of this truth, which is clearly seen from the symbol of *tawaf* around the Ka'bah (Sharî'atî 1992, 82).

In the view of tawhid, humans are only afraid of one power and only feel responsible for one judge. On that basis, tawhid endowed humans with freedom and glory. Surrendering solely to Him, the most excellent norm, makes people rebel against all powers of lies, breaking all shackles and greed (Sharî'atî 1980b). There is no doubt that the concept of tawhid, as a worldview, is the central concept of Sharî'atî. This concept gives leeway to humans to develop their autonomy so that humans feel responsible for their actions. Because in it, humans are seen as humans who have high independence and dignity.

Criticism of Modern Humanism

The greatest calamity faced by humans today is the catastrophe of humanity. Even, Sharî'atî asserted that humanity is a species that is collapsing. Like a butterfly that escapes from its cocoon (metamorphoses), humans are in danger due to the success of their intelligence and efforts. What is even more astonishing is that ordinary humanity is sacrificed for the cause of its liberation. A kind of historical vortex, longing for liberation has forged the chains of human shackles, then offered hope for freedom, which led humans into a trap (Sharî'atî 1980, 36-38).

Sharî'atî sharply examines the weaknesses of modern humanism, starting from its genealogy of thought, the logical contradictions in it to the negative excesses it causes. As Hamid Algar points out, what distinguishes Sharî'atî's criticism from similar criticisms from other thinkers is Sharî'atî's deep mastery of the philosophical foundations of modern humanism and his attempt to show logical contradictions, not just scriptural arguments that show his differences with Islam (Algar 1980, 13).

Genealogically, Sharî'atî finds modern humanism a philosophical and cultural heritage that dates back to ancient Greece to its relative perfection in Europe today. It is said so because modern humanism rests firmly on a mythical perspective typical of ancient Greece, namely that between heaven and earth (the world of gods and the world of humans), there is competition, conflict, and even envy. The gods are an anti-human force whose inclination and endeavor are to rule humans arbitrarily and prevent them from attaining self-awareness, independence, freedom, and sovereignty over nature (Sharî'atî 1980, 17-18). The gods fear the threat to human consciousness, freedom, independence, and leadership over nature. Man should not use his knowledge and freedom because it would threaten the sovereignty of the gods. Moreover, if people are caught using it, they will be cursed with torment

and severe punishment in the hereafter. In such circumstances, humans are constantly trying to be free from this cage by fighting against the power of the gods so that their fate is free from their grip and they can achieve freedom of will and freedom of choice (Sharî'atî 1980, 18).

Through denial of gods, distrust of their mastery, and the severance of the relationship between man and heaven, Greek humanism struggled to arrive at an anthropocentric realm. That is to make man the touchstone of truth and falsehood, use man as a criterion of beauty, and give importance to that part of life that enhances human strength and pleasure. From an attitude of opposition to all that is heavenly, anthropocentrism also becomes worldly and tends towards materialism. Thus, Sharî'atî concludes that humanism in the West-from ancient Greece to modern Europe-has been dragged into materialism and suffered a similar fate in the liberalism of the encyclopedists and Western bourgeois culture and Marxism (Sharî'atî 1980, 19).

Based on this genealogical archetype, Sharî'atî sees that the greatest mistake of modern humanism, from Diderot and Voltaire to Feuerbach and Marx, is that they equate the mythical world of ancient Greece, which remained within the confines of material nature, with the sacred world of spiritual religion (great religion). They compare and even classify one human relationship with Zeus with human relations to Ahuramazda, Rama, Tao, Isa, and Allah. However, these two sets of relationships are opposite. Now that the situation has become clear, the two different currents are of the same origin from Greek humanism. For Sharî'atî, in theory, and practice, bourgeois liberalism and marxism share this humanistic materialism equally. Voltaire and Marx both turned a blind eye to the spiritual dimension of the humanistic essence. Bourgeois liberal society and communist society organizations finally meet in a single view of humanity, human life, and human society (Sharî'atî 1980, 18).

The central tendency of Marx's philosophy, which is materialistic, however, claimed to be a scientific understanding, is atheistic. In the introduction to his doctoral thesis, Marx quoted Prometheus as saying that he did not want to give up his wicked attitude and did not want to acknowledge the existence of God and worship God. "In sooth, all gods I hate," said Marx (Pedersen 2015, 354). Sharî'atî saw that Marx had inherited the religious views of Greek myth, just as Saint Simon and Proudhon did. Marx generalized the relationship between man and God in Greek religion with the relationship found in other religions; he did not realize that the Eastern view was entirely at odds. They dream of a God who is sympathetic

to humanity. It is not like the God of the Greek religion, who views humans as rivals and faces them with envy, which must be served with fear. Eastern religious treatises are based on the ascension of man from earth to heaven, from the physical and animal level to the angelic or divine nature.

In contrast to the perspective of Greek mythology regarding Prometheus, who was tortured for giving "divine fire" to humans, from a religious perspective, God's highest angel, namely Satan, was cursed by God for refusing to prostrate like other angels. Furthermore, "the divine fire" in the form of heavenly light of wisdom and revelation was entrusted by Allah to His apostles so that they could be brought to humankind. With the aspirations contained therein and hope and fear of God, they call to this light. In contrast to Zeus, in this case, Sharî'atî saw that God wanted man to be free from the bondage of nature. He announced his path of liberation, namely the Promethean quest. God calls mankind to victory over Zeus in the major religions and declares: "All the Angels have bowed down to you; also, the land and the sea were tamed for you" (Sharî'atî 1980, 19-20).

Apart from the genealogical aspect of mythology, Sharî'atî considers that the cause of modern humanism to take a form of resistance to theism is medieval Catholicism, which views Christianity as a religion per se as opposed to humanity. Catholicism also maintains the contradiction between heaven and earth found in ancient Greece and Rome. Moreover, with the Greek-style explanation of inherited sin and man's expulsion from heaven, Catholicism describes man as a helpless being cursed by God's wrath against an imperfect world and declares him a despicable, weak sinner. Catholicism only excludes the clergy and considers that the only way of salvation for all is to follow them without question why or for what (a blind faith) and through membership in the institution, by which the official manifestation of God is carried out.

Sharî'atî is very concerned about modern humanism, which seems to be a new religion for Western society. However, he sharply criticized many Western ideas, which tend to produce dehumanization. In his critique, Sharî'atî aimed at Western liberalism, marxism, and existentialism, which are representations of modern humanism.

The most worrying reality of Western liberalism is that humans as a primary and supra-material essence have been tragically forgotten (Kholil 2013, 153). Capitalism (as a manifestation of modern liberalism) considers humans as economic animals. So quickly, the need for artificial materials exceeds the speed of production technology, which is already so great, making

humanity increasingly drawn towards exile. Sharî'atî called this condition "the shackles of machineism". The machine, which was supposed to be a tool for humanity to rule nature and escape from the slavery of labor, was transformed into a mechanism that enslaved humans as an inevitable result of the shackles of *machineism* as explained above, Sharî'atî said that modern humans would experience alienation (Sharî'atî 1980a, 32-33).

Marxist humanism is a variant of atheistic humanism. This kind of humanism has one main task, namely to overthrow God from his throne, because religion and God make humans alienated from themselves and unable to realize their potential to become perfect and happy humans (Pedersen 2015, 357). Sharî'atî even considered that marxism fought religion more fiercely than other materialist teachings. Marxism is also fanatical and violent, but it uses the weakest logic, the most fragile foundations, and the most dubious in its attacks (Sharî'atî 1980a, 62). In Sharî'atî's view, when Marx attacked religion, he was referring to the crude and erroneous ideas of religious thought, which envision a future in place of the present world with all its economic and human shortcomings. However, on the other hand, a person who has studied the sources of the holy books and is a more conscious believer knows that religion considers the afterlife merely an understandable and logical continuation of this life (Sharî'atî 1980a, 69).

Meanwhile, in his intellectual system, Sharî'atî saw that marxism was a confusing ideology. In one of his phases, Marx was a materialist who considered human beings only as an element within the limits of the material world. Meanwhile, in another phase, he was an extreme supporter of sociology, giving society the freedom to face naturalistic and humanistic tendencies. Then, Marx arbitrarily classified the elements into infrastructure or superstructure. Infrastructure shows the way of material production, while the superstructure shows culture, morals, philosophy, literature, art, ideology, and so on. Consequently, Marx describes humans as equal to this superstructure. From classifications like this, Sharî'atî concludes that in marxism, humanity is only a product of the material production method. Because Marx details the production method as consisting of the means of production, human superiority in Marxism comes from the superiority of the means. So, for Sharî'atî, in Marxism, people talk about "equipmentism", not about humanism. In other words, as in Islam, humanity is not considered the descendants of Adam but the descendants of equipment (Sharî'atî 1980a, 35).

As for existentialism, it emerged to rebel against both its predecessor claimed to be humanism, namely liberalism and Marxism. Existentialism tries to answer how humans should live after so many catastrophes have shattered their illusions of freedom. Therefore, Sharî'atî considers that existentialism has more right to be called humanism than its two predecessors. Compared to capitalism, which recasts humans as economic animals, or Marxism, which considers humans as objects of organized substances, existentialism makes humans as God and worships them greatly. For this reason, in criticizing existentialism, Sharî'atî focuses more on Sartre's atheistic existentialism, which is claimed to be humanism (Sharî'atî 1980a, 44).

From the descriptions that have been presented regarding the crisis developed by modern humanism, both Western liberalism, Marxism, and existentialism, it can be seen that Sharî'atî is consistent in criticizing these thoughts. The absence of God (metaphysical) in philosophical foundations has led to inevitable contradictions in modern humanism. Ultimately, even though these schools strive to elevate human dignity, these ideals have never been realized. However, look closely at the construction of humanism developed by Sharî'atî and the main points that form his criticism of modern humanism. In that case, Sharî'atî does not reject all elements of modern humanist thought. In several parts, he appreciates and adopts modern humanist thoughts by giving them an Islamic breath. This is where Sharî'atî's eclecticism lies in combining and synthesizing contradictory understandings.

Conclusion

Sharî'atî's critique of modern humanism has concluded that its doctrine has failed to raise the dignity of humanity. Sharî'atî's position is not only a critic of modern humanism but also more or less influenced by modern humanism, especially in terms of methodological aspects, such as by Western liberalism, marxism, and existentialism. However, Sharî'atî rejects essential things because he still maintains his religious views. Because of this, Sharî'atî has corrected many views of modern humanism, which he considered contrary to religious views.

Sharî'atî was convinced that Islam would play an essential role in the new life and movement. Islam provides a profound spiritual interpretation of the universe through its monotheistic, noble, ideal, and logical worldview. In addition, the role of Islam will be felt, especially from the point of view that Islam is not content to only fulfill one philosophical or spiritual need,

or only by presenting an ethical point of view; Islam struggles to realize the worldview of tawhid and the worldview of human virtues in real life. Therefore, tawhid is the core of Islamic teachings which is the basis for responding to humanitarian crises.

References

Ahmed, Y. A. M., & Subhani, Z. H. 2019. The Methodology of Ali Shari'ati: A Comparison with Durkheim's and Weber's Sociology of Religion. *IIUM Journal of Human Sciences*, 1(2):30-42. https://journals.iium.edu.my/irkh/index.php/ijohs/article/view/73.

Akhavi, S. 1995. Shariati, Ali. In J. L. Esposito (Ed.). *The Oxford Encyclopedy of The Modern Islamic World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

al-Faruqi, I. R. 1988. *Tauhid.* Bandung: Penerbit Pustaka.

Algar, H. 1980. Preface. In *Marxism and Other Western Fallacies: An Islamic Critique*. Bandung: Mizan Press.

Anderson, K. 2014. Mind Over Matter? On Decentring the Human in Human Geography. *Cultural Geographies*, 21(1):3-18. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/1474474013513409.

Arrasyid, A. 2020. Tasawuf dan Problematika Modernitas: Menimbang Maqamat dan Ahwal Abu Nashr as-Sarraj. *Jurnal Fuaduna : Jurnal Kajian Keagamaan Dan Kemasyarakatan*, 4(1):70-82. DOI: https://doi.org/10.30983/fuaduna.v4i1.2662.

Braidotti, R. 2019. A Theoretical Framework for the Critical Posthumanities. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 36(6):31-61. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276418771486.

Cahyanto, F. 2020. Filsafat Manusia Ali Syari'ati: Kesadaran dan Kebebasan Mausia di Era Revolusi Teknologi 4.0. *Academic Journal of Islamic Principles and Philosophy*, 1(1):41-62. DOI: https://doi.org/10.22515/ajipp.v1i1.2413.

Capra, F. 1997. *Titik Balik Peradaban: Sains, Masyarakat dan Kebangkitan Kebudayaan*. Yogyakarta: Yayasan Bentang Budaya.

Copson, A. 2015. What Is Humanism? In *The Wiley Blackwell Handbook of Humanism.* UK: Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118793305.ch1.

Durkin, K. 2022. Adventures in the aAnti-humanist Dialectic: Towards the Reappropriation of Humanism. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 25(2): 292-311.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/1368431021991775.

Engelke, M. 2014. Christianity and the Anthropology of Secular Humanism. *Current Anthropology*, 55(10):292-301.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.1086/677738.

Ezzuddin, R. A.-S. 2022. Towards Building a Monotheistic Humanism in the Context of the World of Modern Philosophy. *Al-Daleel*, 5(3):134-157.

Faizal, L., Qohar, A., & Wahid, A. A. 2022. Telaah Pemikiran Ali Syari'ati tentang Pemerintahan Islam Kontemporer. *Jurnal Tapis: Teropong Aspirasi Politik Islam*, 18(1): 27-42.
DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.24042/tps.v18i1.12222.

Fauhatun, F. 2020. Islam dan Filsafat Perenial: Respon Seyyed Hossein Nasr terhadap Nestapa Manusia Modern. *Jurnal Fuaduna: Jurnal Kajian Keagamaan Dan Kemasyarakatan*, 4(1):54.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.30983/fuaduna.v4i1.2728.

Grendler, P. F. 2006. Humanism: Ancient Learning, Criticism, Schools and Universities. In A. Mazzocco (Ed.). *Interpretations of Renaissance Humanism*. Leiden: Brill.

Haines, C. P., & Grattan, S. 2017. Life After the Subject. *Cultural Critique*, 96:1-36.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.5749/culturalcritique.96.2017.0001.

Ihsan, N. H., Sa'ari, C. Z. B., & Hidayat, M. S. 2022. Abdurrauf al-Singkili's Concept of Insan Kamil in Facing The Crisis of Modern Human Morality. *Islam Realitas: Journal of Islamic and Social Studies*, 8(1):22-35.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.30983/islam_realitas.v8i1.5487.

Khanlarzadeh, M. 2020. Theology of Revolution: In Ali Shari'ati and Walter Benjamin's Political Thought. *Religions*, 11(10):504.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.3390/rel11100504.

Kholil, A. 2013. Spiritualitas Khidir: Moralitas Islam Dalam Tindakan Sosial. *Ulul Albab: Jurnal Studi Islam*, 13(2):153-172. https://doi.org/10.18860/ua.v0i0.2373.

Kounsar, A. 2016. The Concept of Tawhid in Islam: An Overview of the Perspectives of Some Prominent Muslim Scholars. *Journal of Islamic Thought and Civilization*, 06(02):95-110.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.32350/jitc.62.06.

Kurzman, C. 1995. Historiography of the Iranian Revolutionary Movement, 1977-79. *Iranian Studies*, 28(1-2):25-38.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/00210869508701828.

Machlis, E. 2014. 'Alî Sharî'atî and the Notion of Tawḥîd: Re-exploring the Question of God's Unity. *Die Welt Des Islams*, 54(2):183-211.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.1163/15700607-00542p03.

Mailloux, S. 2012. Humanist Controversies: The Rhetorical Humanism of Ernesto Grassi and Michel Leff. *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, 45(2): 134-147.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.5325/philrhet.45.2.0134.

Manne, K. 2016. Humanism: A Critique. *Social Theory and Practice*, 42(2): 389-415.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.5840/soctheorpract201642221.

Mcllroy, W. 2004. *Foundation of Modern Humanism*. UK: Sheffield Humanist Society.

Negru, T. 2009. The Modernist Project of Post-Humanism. *Cultura International Journal of Philosophy of Culture and Axiology*, 6(1):78-89.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.5840/cultura20096120.

Nugroho, A., Warsito, T., & Surwandono. 2017. Ali Shari'ati's Revolutionary Islamic Thought and Its Relevance to The Contemporary Socio-Political Transformation. *Indonesian Journal of Islam and Muslim Societies*, 7(2): 251-276.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.18326/ijims.v7i2.251-276.

Pedersen, E. O. 2015. Religion is the Opium of the People: An Investigation into the Intellectual Context of Marx's Critique of Religion. *History of Political Thought*, 36(2):354-387. http://www.jstor.org/stable/26228603.

Petrovskaya, O. 2023. Farewell to Humanism? Considerations for Nursing Philosophy and Research in Posthuman Times. *Nursing Philosophy*, 24(3): 1-10.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/nup.12448.

Pribadi, D. T. A. 2023. Religious Socialism: The Cross-Pollination of Islamic Spirituality and Western Socialism in "Liberation Theology" of Dr. Ali Shari'ati's Thought. *Al-Risalah: Jurnal Studi Agama dan Pemikiran Islam*, 14(1):194-225.
DOI: ttps://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.34005/alrisalah.v14i1.2432.

Ramadhan, M. 2011. Teologi Kemanusiaan Studi Atas Pemikiran Ali Syariati. *Jurnal Theologia*, 22(2): 1-11.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.21580/teo.2011.22.2.609.

Shariati, A. 1980a. *Marxism and Other Western Fallacies: An Islamic Critique*. Bandung: Mizan Press.

Shariati, A. 1980b. *On the Sociology of Islam*. Bandung: Mizan Press.

Shariati, A. 1996. *Tugas Cendekiawan Muslim (Man and Islam)*. Depok: PT RajaGrafindo Persada.

Tobia, K. P. 2015. Philosophical Method and Institutions as Assumptions. *Metaphilosophy*, 46(4/5):575-594.
DOI: https://www.jstor.org/stable/26602329.

Tobroni, F. 2016. Pemikiran Ali Syari'ati dalam Sosiologi: Dari Teologi Menuju Revolusi. *Jurnal Sosiologi Reflektif*, 10(1):241-258.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.14421/jsr.v10i1.1144.

Viktorahadi, B. 2018. Kritik Jürgen Habermas Terhadap Peran Dan Fungsi Agama Dalam Masyarakat Modern. *Jurnal Theologia*, 28(2):273-298.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.21580/teo.2017.28.2.1879.

Wahyudi, Y. 1998. Ali Shariʿati and Bint Al-Shāṭiʾ on Free Will: A Comparison. *Source: Journal of Islamic Studies*, *9*(1):35-45. https://www.jstor.org/stable/26198312?seq=1&cid=pdf-

Wahyudin, W., Maimun, A., & Jalil, M. 2019. Islamic Humanism in Indonesia's Context: Discourse Analysis of Nationality Problems in Indonesia. *Ulul Albab: Jurnal Studi Islam*, 20(2):302-321. DOI: https://doi.org/10.18860/ua.v20i2.6772.