

Answer three questions, two from A and one from B. Do not write more than 3 sides per question. 15 marks each.

A. Understanding primary texts. Explain the meaning, context and significance of the passage from Ibn Khaldun and one passage from either Machiavelli or Luther. In each case your explication should cover a) the immediate meaning or key ideas, b) the context (where the passage fits in the argument or story), c) its relation to the work as a whole; if relevant you may add a fourth part d) how one or other of the main themes touched upon in the passage are addressed by other CS-202 authors.

1. "...the Bedouins are a savage nation, fully accustomed to savagery and the things that cause it. Savagery has become their character and nature. They enjoy it, because it means freedom from authority and no subservience to leadership. Such a natural disposition is the negation and antithesis [opposite] of civilization. All the customary activities of the Bedouin lead to wandering and movement. This is the antithesis and negation of stationariness, which produces civilization. For instance, they need stones to set them up as supports for their cooking-pots. So, they take them from buildings which they tear down to get the stones... The very nature of their existence is the negation of building, which is the basis of civilization.

Furthermore it is their nature to plunder whatever other people possess... When they acquire superiority and royal authority, they have complete power to plunder (as they please). There no longer exists any political (power) to protect property, and civilization is ruined.

Furthermore, since they use force to make craftsmen and professional workers do their work, they do not see any value in it and do not pay them for it. Now, labour is the real basis of profit. When labour is not appreciated and is done for nothing, the hope for profit vanishes, and no (productive) work is done. The sedentary population disperses, and civilization decays.

Furthermore, the Bedouins are not concerned with laws, or with deterring people from misdeeds or with protecting some against others. They care only for the property that they might take away from people through looting and imposts...

Under the rule of Bedouins, their subjects live as in a state of anarchy, without law. Anarchy destroys mankind and ruins civilization, since, as we have stated, the existence of royal authority is a natural quality of man. It alone guarantees their existence and social organization.

Furthermore, every Bedouin is eager to be the leader... There are numerous authorities and amirs among them. The subjects have to obey many masters in connection with the control of taxation and law. Civilization decays and is wiped out." (Ibn Khaldun, *Muqaddima*, Ch. 2, Section 25)

2. "(...) Whoever becomes the master of a city accustomed to freedom, and does not destroy it, may expect to be destroyed himself; because, when there is a rebellion, such a city justifies itself by calling on the name of liberty and its ancient institutions, never forgotten despite the passing of time and the benefits received from the new ruler. Whatever the conqueror's actions or foresight, if the inhabitants are not dispersed and scattered, they will forget neither that name nor those institutions; and at the first opportunity they will at once have recourse to them, as did Pisa after having been kept in servitude for a hundred years by the Florentines. But when cities or provinces are used to living under a prince, and his family is wiped out, since on the one hand they are used to obeying, and on the other have lost their former prince, they cannot agree on the choice of a new prince from among themselves and they cannot live in freedom without one. So they are slower to take up arms, and a prince can win them and assure himself of them more easily. But in republics there is more life, more hatred, a greater desire for revenge; the memory of their ancient liberty does not and cannot let them rest; in their case the surest way is to wipe them out or to live there in person." (Machiavelli, *The Prince*, Ch. 5)

3. "To return to our purpose, I believe that it has now become clear that it is not enough or in any sense Christian to preach the works, life, and words of Christ as historical facts, as if the knowledge of these would suffice for the conduct of life; yet this is the fashion among those who must today be regarded as our best preachers. Far less is it sufficient or Christian to say nothing at all about Christ and to teach instead the laws of men and the decrees of the fathers. Now there are not a few who preach Christ and read about him that they may move men's affections to sympathy with Christ, to anger against the Jews, and such childish and effeminate nonsense. Rather ought Christ to be preached to the end that faith in him may be established that he may not only be Christ, but be Christ for you and me, and that what is said of him and is denoted in his name may be effectual in us. Such faith is produced and preserved in us by preaching why Christ came, what he brought and bestowed, what benefit it is to us to accept him. This is done when that Christian liberty which he bestows is rightly taught and we are told in what way we Christians are all kings and priests and therefore lords of all..." (Luther, *A treatise on Christian liberty*)

B. Comparative overview. Answer one question, drawing a contrast between two or three CS-202 texts. Maximum four sides.

4. Compare Luther's idea of "emptying oneself" with the Sufi "purification of the heart" or "oneness" described by al-Ghazali and Ibn Tufayl, and with the ecstatic love of God portrayed by Augustine in the *Confessions*. If these authors were to meet each other, like Asal and Hayy ibn Yaqzan, do you think they would agree that each was speaking about the same state though from different perspectives?

5. "In general, then, the prophets (Peace be upon them!) are the physicians for treating the maladies of hearts. By its activity reason is useful simply to acquaint us with this fact, to bear witness to prophecy by giving assent to its reality, to certify its own blindness to perceiving what the 'eye' of prophecy perceives, and to take us by our hands and turn us over to the prophets as blind men are handed over to guides and as troubled sick men are handed over to sympathetic physicians. To this point reason can proceed and advance, but it is far removed from anything beyond that except for understanding what the physician prescribes. These, then, are the insights we gained with a necessity analogous to indirect vision during the period of our solitude and seclusion." After a semester reading different Christian and Muslim authors writing of the relation between reason and faith, what do you think?

