
The author of the book under review rightly believes that "the economic problems of the Muslim World cannot be effectively tackled without a thorough knowledge of the Islamic laws, the influence of which upon economic and social policy has sometimes been profound". (p. iv). With this belief in the necessity of a thorough knowledge of Islamic law, the author sets out to "prove, by giving authentic historical data, that there is no so-called Shari'a law (Divine law — sic) in the field of taxation; that the tithe, Kharaj and poll-tax are secular and not religious taxes, and that the institution of waqf has little Qur'anic sanction". (p. iv). Furthermore he thinks that the "Character of Zakat during the time of the Prophet was still vague and it did not represent, properly speaking, a tax demanded by religion" (Ibid).

As the "authentic historical data" provided by the author are only the secondary sources mainly of an obsolete category, such conclusions of the author sound less plausible and will remain suspect for the simple reason that he is not aware of the original sources and also lacks the necessary research tools to tackle such complex problems. It also appears that he is not adequately acquainted with the languages of his area of study.

It must be realized that this is too broad a study to be systematically managed within a single treatise of this nature. The author juxtaposes too many problems as in an encyclopaedia, without tracing their origins and developments and their connections in a coherent and logical way. The author, in general, in a tendentious way tries hard to prove his pre-conceived notions about a particular system of economy on the basis of the Qur'anic verses and the Prophetic traditions. For example, on pages 114-15 he observes:

"Indeed, God has forbidden the least interference with property or, in other words, the desire to take it away from others, for he has said:
And do not be jealous because God has preferred to give some of you more than He has given to others. Men have their share of what they have earned and women have theirs, so ask God to give you of His grace (min faḍlīhi); verily God knows all. Qur'ān (IV. 32)

From these verses the learned economist concludes: "This teaches us that some are favoured over others in matters of property and this should not, therefore, be the source of hostility or envy, for it represents a distribution which has been decreed by a wise and knowing Deity" (pp. 114-15).
This interpretation of the Qur'anic verses in terms of property-ownership is improbable, and utterly wrong. As al-Tabari explains, the verses were revealed in the case of certain women who had asked the Prophet as to why they were not allowed to fight in wars and why they could not inherit as men-folk were allowed to do. The verses declare that both men and women inherit according to their shares specified in the Qur'an. Moreover, al-Tabari also says that the word faḍl here means worship ('ibada), or help of God (tawfīq or maʿāna); it does not mean property or wealth. See al-Tabari, Jāmi' al-Bayān (ed., Maḥmūd Muḥammad Shākir), (Cairo: Dār al-Maʿārif, n.d.), Vol. VIII, pp. 260-268

The conclusion drawn by the author is therefore unwarranted and uncalled for. In his anxious zeal and great unction for advancing his particular standpoint he cites the Qur'anic verses without understanding their contexts.

It may be humbly asked from the learned author who strongly believes in a capitalistic economy, and who has been trained in the true tradition of a positive economist whether he has through his erudite economic scholarship discovered the laws, methods or criteria for attaining an optimum to ensure maximization of economic welfare of the teeming millions, and an efficient and rational production-method and allocation of productive resources in a 'free' economy where distribution of wealth has been 'divinely' decreed. Were he true to his scientific discipline he would have discussed the problem from this point of view and not from a subjective religious angle. The author is an economist well-trained in modern economics and empirical methods of research. He himself says on page 119: "If, however, in the larger national interest, it is decided to nationalise land or place a limitation on ownership, the matter should be decided on its own merits. The policy of dragging in religion and to find excuses for this course of action should be avoided".

That production cannot be evaluated independently of income distribution in a given economy is a simple truth of modern life. Distribution of wealth is a rational and social function of any economic system.

The modern capitalistic economic system in its productive and distributive aspects is characteristic of two broad classes of society: the capitalists, i.e. the owners of the means of production, and the wage labourers who own nothing but sell their labour power in the process of capitalistic production. The given structure of distribution of wealth is determined by the over-all economic structure of the production methods. No textbook of economics tells that any given mode of distribution is divinely ordained. This notion of the author is highly unscientific and apologetic. Dr. Qureshi considers the given system of capitalistic production a divine (or natural law) of social wealth. To correct the prevailing system of economic inequality will, according to Dr. Qureshi, tantamount to destroying the harmony and beauty, the symmetry and order of that system which God and Nature have established in the world.

Such fallacious conclusions in the book under review can be multiplied. The fact is that instead of making an objective and scientific study of the problem of maxi-
mization of welfare in an Islamic economy—whether planned or run under free-market conditions—and constructing probable hypotheses and testing them in the light of his evidence, the author simply takes many things for granted and does not care to criticize his own assumptions. This has resulted in many inaccurate and misleading generalizations and misinterpretations. The original sources have not been used adequately. This fact makes the author depend too much on the unreliable secondary sources many of which have become obsolete for research purposes.

During the last many years the study of the Islamic theories of taxation and land-tenure has developed with rapid speed. The researches of Frede Lokkegaard, Werner Schmucker, Albrecht Noth, E. Pröbster, Ḥifṣur Raḥmān Seoharwi, Shams al-Ḥaq Afghānī, Muhammad Ṭasīn and others have greatly increased our knowledge of this subject. Any author who is not aware of the latest discoveries and consequently selects some problems in this area is likely to run the risk that a particular standpoint, theory or position was abandoned long ago.

Discussing the concept of land-tenure in Islam Dr. Qureshi declares that there is no limit to private property (p. 115). He is astonished to see that “men should make laws which God have not seen fit to make and that they should impose upon themselves things which God has thought best not to impose. Islamic law has not subjected private property to any limit which may not be exceeded by the owner, nor has it made it obligatory for an owner to give up that which he is unable to cultivate himself for free distribution to the indigent or for sale to others. (p. 115).

This conclusion is based on his assumption that share-cropping and lease of land was allowed by Islam. In fact, the laws of tenancy were developed by the Fuqahā'; they were in the main a result of social and economic reality. Share-cropping was prohibited by the Prophet. As the investigations of the reviewer show a gradual development, in the legal doctrine of Muzāra'a can be discerned in the theories of Abū Ḥanīfa, Mālik, Shāfi‘ī, Ibn Ḥanbal, Abū Yūsuf, Ibn Ḥazm, Ibn Taymiya and the later Fuqahā’. (See his book Landlord and Peasant in Early Islam, Islamabad, 1977).

On pages 101-102 while discussing the case of Khaybar as a normative model of share-cropping, the author does not take into his consideration another alternative hypothesis that the Khaybarites were not share-croppers but tributaries and semi-serfs—for this is based on abundant evidence available in the early sources. The question is not of finding a self-evident truth, whether a particular hypothesis is true or false. The crucial test is to prove that a certain theory has a greater probability than the others. The Prophet has categorically banned all aleatory land-tenancies of the genus of muḥāqala, mukhābara and muzāra'a and had declared Jihād against them. The difference between all of them, as rightly pointed out by such eminent Fuqahā’ as Abū Ḥanīfa, Mālik and Shāfi‘ī, is of degree and not of kind. The earlier Prophetic traditions amply corroborate this.

On the problem of Fay', the author has not consulted the recent works on this
The sections of the book dealing with the problems of Kararāj and Waqf (pp. 121-188) are very comprehensive and throw ample light on the complex issues of waqf and land taxes. The section on "Usufructuary Rights in Land" (pp. 189-209) is a commendable effort. However, the chapter on the "Ottoman Land Laws" (pp. 210-248) has no logical or organic relationship with the other chapters. Dr. Qureshi's treatment of the Ottoman system of Zi'āmets and Timār is interesting and illuminating. He observes that the Ottoman military tenures were of two types: Zi'āmet grants and Timār grants and the holders were called Sipāhts. Under the Turks, Dr. Qureshi observes, "the conquered territory, we notice, was not given as 'ushtet land but was granted under a tenure conveying a much more limited right, and this although the granters were true Muslims. This would account for the small amount of mulk (private) land in the Ottoman Empire. (p. 141). This was also true in the early history of Islam when conquered lands were made collective property of the Umma. This is the chief characteristic of the economic scheme envisaged by Islam.

A glossary of technical terms and a select bibliography would have enhanced the usefulness of the work.

Translation of Arabic and Islamic names and terms is not uniform and it does not conform to the scholarly standards. Even proper names are misspelt. For example, on page 18, line 11, 'Zafar' instead of Zufar; p. 84, line 19, Bani Nadir, instead of Bani Nadir; p. 151, line 12, mukakarah, instead of mukhabarah; same page, line 20, mukabarah, instead of mukhabara. Many typographical and transliteration mistakes mar the book. Over-all presentation of the material is not satisfactory. Nonetheless, the work is a welcome addition to the literature on "Islamic Economics". The beginners must be wary of the sweeping conclusions and untested assumptions of the author.
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