

Adam Smith and Sayyid Qutb:

A comparison of two different worldviews

Kehaan H Manjee

Duke University

Abstract

The “West” and “Militant Islam” have been in conflict with each other because of their different worldviews. Adam Smith and Sayyid Qutb have arguably had tremendous influence on these worldviews i.e. capitalism and Islamic state. Both thinkers provided their prescriptions to improve the condition of their societies, and analyzing these prescriptions helps us understand the differences in these worldviews. I have compared and contrasted their socioeconomic theories, using these two thinkers as proxies for the West and Militant Islam. I have specifically analyzed their prescriptions on three issues: economic inequality, taxation and interest. These key issues provide an insight into the views of the two scholars, and through that, the conflicting worldviews of the West and Militant Islam. On economic inequality, Smith believed that his economic system of natural liberty would lead to universal opulence; in contrast, Qutb argued that only an Islamic system of government could reduce the gap between the rich and the poor. Both thinkers supported taxation: Smith wanted to use it to finance the provision of public goods, security and justice; while Qutb not only wanted to use it to finance government services, but also viewed taxation as a tool for redistribution of wealth in the society. Smith and Qutb disagreed on the issue of interest: Smith supported interest-bearing lending, but argued for the imposition of a ceiling on interest rates; on the contrary, Qutb wanted an outright prohibition on all forms of interest on credit. These similarities and differences in their prescriptions on various issues provide insight into their vision for society. Since their vision and objectives are different, they have competing worldviews, which explains the conflict between the West and Militant Islam.

Keywords: Adam Smith, Sayyid Qutb, Different Worldviews, Capitalism, Islamic State

I. Introduction

The conflict between the “West” and “*Militant Islam*” over the past three decades has stemmed from a clash of two different worldviews. This conflict began as early as 1983¹, when the Islamic Jihad Organization bombed the US Embassy in Beirut, Lebanon. This was one of the hundreds of bombings and suicide attacks that have been carried out by outfits of Militant Islam against the West. The deadliest and most brazen of these was Al-Qaeda’s September 11 attack on the World Trade Center towers in New York City in 2001. America and its Western allies retaliated by invading Afghanistan and Iraq. This was the advent of the ‘War on Terror’² by the Western allies against Militant Islam. The instability caused by these invasions created an opportunity for the rise of the Islamic State³, which has been able to seize control of large parts of Iraq and Syria.

Today, the Islamic State is Militant Islam’s largest and most powerful group and the West’s fiercest enemy. The Islamic State is undoubtedly the face of Militant Islam today, and represents an alternative worldview⁴, which is strikingly different from West’s conception of the World. These competing worldviews or conceptions of societies are in conflict with each other.

¹ On April 18, 1983, the Islamic Jihad Organization bombed the US Embassy in Beirut, Lebanon. This is often considered the first attack by an outfit of Militant Islam against the West, and the starting point of the ongoing conflict that has lasted over three decades.

² The War on Terror, also known as the Global War on Terrorism, refers to the international military campaign that started after the September 11 attacks on the United States. It is involved open and covert military operations, new security legislation, efforts to block the financing of terrorism, and more. [<https://www.globalpolicy.org/war-on-terrorism.html>]

³ The Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIS or ISIL), also known as Daesh, is an Islamic militant movement that has conquered territory in western Iraq and eastern Syria, where it has made a bid to establish a state in territories that encompass some six and a half million residents. [<http://www.cfr.org/iraq/islamic-state/p14811>]

⁴ ISIS wants to establish an Islamic State in the territories that they have captured and occupied, which is very different from capitalist democracy, the political and economic system that governs the West and most other countries. It is important to note that there are different ideologies within Militant Islam, but all of them have been arguably influenced by Qutb’s work.

Although the roots of this conflict between the West and Militant Islam are debated upon by scholars, what is abundantly clear is that the *vision* Militant Islam holds for the society it *desires* to create is strikingly different from the Western society, economically, socially and politically. The goal of this paper is to understand the conflicting worldviews by critically analyzing the works of Adam Smith and Sayyid Qutb., who are used as proxies for these worldviews.

a. Why Adam Smith and Sayyid Qutb?

Human societies are rooted in religious, philosophical, economic, and political ideas which serve as the foundation of our society and inform our worldview. These ideas come from theorists and philosophers – like Aristotle, Plato, Descartes, Locke, Keynes and Marx – who have, throughout human history, analyzed societies around them, examined the human condition and provided prescriptions for improving it.

In this paper I have critically analyzed the works of Adam Smith and Sayyid Qutb because they have arguably had the most impact on the West and Militant Islam, respectively. Therefore, their works can be used as proxies to understand the conflict between the worldviews of the West and Militant Islam.

Adam Smith (1723 – 1790), the Scottish Enlightenment philosopher, is widely described as the ‘father of capitalism’, the economic system which is the fundamental basis of Western society. Smith’s ideas have played a key role in shaping this economic system. Sayyid Qutb (1906 – 1966), the Egyptian Philosopher, is described as “the man whose ideas would shape Al Qaeda”⁵.

⁵ He was dubbed by PBS as “the man whose ideas would shape Al Qaeda”.
[<http://www.pbs.org/weta/crossroads/>]

He is considered the intellectual father of Militant Islam, and is a religious source frequently cited by Islamic terrorists in justifying their actions.⁶

Although Adam Smith and Sayyid Qutb were born almost two centuries and twenty-five hundred miles apart, and lived in very different societies and times, both have had a tremendous lasting impact on the lives of people and their societies, the West and the Islamic, respectively, and for this very reason I have chosen to study them.

b. The Concept of Human Condition

The concept of *human condition* is of utmost importance to this paper because it is the lens through which I evaluate the theories presented by Adam Smith and Sayyid Qutb.

‘Human Condition’ is an all-encompassing term for the characteristics, key events, and situations related to human existence and human experience. This term does not have a specific meaning; rather it refers to a broad idea which embodies human life, human societies and human experience. Theorists and scholars have rarely used this specific phrase in their work, but almost always their work is a discussion on life, societies, and human experience.

I will further illustrate this term using the example of John Locke. In his magnum opus, the *Two Treatises of Government*, John Locke argued that people have certain rights, such as the right to life, liberty, and property, independent of the laws of any particular society. Through a social contract, people conditionally transfer some of their rights to the government to ensure stable and comfortable enjoyment of their lives, liberty and property. Governments exist by the consent of the people, and if they fail to do their job, they can be replaced. This idea of a social contract

⁶ Berman, Ilan. *Winning the Long War: Retaking the Offensive against Radical Islam*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2009. 42

between the citizenry and the state was introduced by Locke and his contemporaries like Hobbes, Grotius and Rousseau during the Enlightenment.⁷

The theory of social contract has laid the ground work for modern day democracy, and is still an implicit contract that a citizen has with his state today. The social contract theory was proposed in response to the problems Locke, Hobbes and Rousseau saw in their societies, namely, authoritarian or monarchical regimes in which citizens had few rights and little say in how they were governed. Therefore, the social contract was essentially a prescription for improving the human condition of the people in the European society at the time. Neither Locke, nor his contemporaries, specifically referred to the term – human condition – in their volumes; rather it was their work itself that impacted the human condition through influencing lives, societies, and sociopolitical order.

c. Discussion of Human Condition in the works of Smith and Qutb

Much like Locke's theory of social contract, the works of Smith and Qutb are prescriptions for improving the human condition.

Adam Smith was foremost a moral philosopher and a social scientist who believed that the economic systems governing the European societies were inefficient. He wanted the markets to run unimpeded, which would make people strive to do better, resulting in the both the society and individuals being prosperous. His prescription for improving the human condition was having a

⁷ Uzgalis, William. "John Locke." Stanford University. 2001. Accessed April 14, 2016. <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/locke/>.

system of natural liberty, where freedom and self-interest would lead to economic and social prosperity.⁸

Sayyid Qutb was at his heart a religious and political theorist. He ardently believed that a return to doctrinal faith – Islam – and its teachings could improve the lives of Muslims in the Egyptian society and across the world. His prescription for improving the human condition was to create a society whose social, economic and political order is governed by Islam.⁹

The prescriptions provided by Adam Smith and Sayyid Qutb were very different even though both desired to make their societies better. To fully understand the conflicting worldviews, we must analyze the two theorists, their ideas, the societies that they lived in and the context in which they wrote their volumes. In the following section, I will explore in depth the life, influences and prescriptions of Adam Smith and Sayyid Qutb.

II. Adam Smith

Adam Smith (1723 – 1790) was a Scottish philosopher, economist and political theorist who provided a new and radical perspective on how human societies should work. Smith argued that freedom and self-interest, guided by an invisible hand, lead to economic prosperity and social harmony.¹⁰ He asserted that as people struck bargains with each other, the nation's resources would be drawn automatically to the ends and purposes that people valued most highly.¹¹ Such an

⁸ Smith, Adam. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. Indianapolis: Liberty Classics, 1981.

⁹ Qutb, Sayyid. *Social Justice in Islam*. Oneonta, NY: Islamic Publications International, 2000.

¹⁰ Smith, Adam. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. Indianapolis: Liberty Classics, 1981.

¹¹ Ibid. I.2.2 (Book.Chapter.Paragraph)

economic system – where there are many buyers and many sellers – competing with one another would result in the most efficient allocation of resources.

Smith's argument at its core was that the economic and social order did not need to be controlled by the Monarch or the State, because a government could never match the value created by unimpeded markets. Economic growth needed to happen organically, as a product of human nature, in a system which is open, competitive and where free exchange can happen. Therefore, he wanted everyone to have the freedom to make choices on their own enlightened self-interest. He asserted that freedom and self-interest would lead people to strive to be the best they can be, which would result in both individuals and the society being happier and prosperous.

Smith called his economic system, governed by economic freedom and self-interest, a System of Natural Liberty and wrote extensively about it in his principal volume *Wealth of Nations*. This economic theory has laid the ground work for modern day capitalism. To fully understand Smith's vision and analyze his economic system, we must also consider the context in which he wrote *Wealth of Nations*. This includes learning about Smith's early life, his education, the economic condition of the time, and most of all the Scottish Enlightenment.

a. Life

Adam Smith was born on June 5, 1723 in Kirkcaldy, a port town on the eastern shore of Scotland. His father, who was the Comptroller and Collector of Customs, died while Smith's mother was pregnant. Smith was educated in a local parish school until 1737, and at the age of fifteen, he was sent to Glasgow University, where he studied moral philosophy under Francis Hutcheson. In 1740, he started attending Balliol College at Oxford University as a Snell exhibitioner, but returned to Scotland a few years later without finishing his degree. In 1748, under the patronage of Lord Kames, Smith started delivering public lecture in Edinburgh on rhetoric and

belles-lettres, but later he took up the subject of “the progress of opulence,”¹² a central theme of his most influential work *Wealth of Nations*.¹³

Through these public lectures, in 1750 he met David Hume, a fellow Scottish economist and philosopher, who became one of Smith’s closest friends. A year later, Smith was appointed Professor of Logic at Glasgow University, in large part due to his relationship with Hume. Later, he transferred to the department of moral philosophy, where he gave lectures on ethics, rhetoric, jurisprudence and political economy. In 1759, he published *Theory of Moral Sentiments*, which embodied his Glasgow lectures on moral philosophy. After the publication of this volume, Smith switched his focus from moral philosophy to jurisprudence and political economy. In the early 1760s, he delivered lectures at the University of Glasgow, and some of his students published notes from these lectures as the *Lectures on Justice, Police, Revenue and Arms*.¹⁴

At the end of 1763, Smith left the University of Glasgow to tutor the young Duke of Buccleuch¹⁵. Over the next few years, he travelled throughout Europe with the Duke and met many great philosophers of the age, including Voltaire and Jean-Jacques Rousseau. After returning home to Kirkcaldy, he devoted much of his time to his magnum opus, *Wealth of Nations*, which was first published in 1776.¹⁶

After the publication of his ground-breaking economic work, Smith moved to Edinburgh to live with his mother, but continued to write. He simultaneously occupied the position of Commissioner of Customs in Scotland. Unfortunately, Smith was unable to finish his works on

¹² Smith, Adam. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. Indianapolis: Liberty Classics, 1981. III.1.1

¹³ Rae, John. *Life of Adam Smith*. New York: Kelley, 1965. 1-20

¹⁴ Ibid. 30-84

¹⁵ This was a position which was both lucrative and respected at the time.

¹⁶ Rae, John. *Life of Adam Smith*. New York: Kelley, 1965. 85-150

subjects like justice and jurisprudence. He believed that these works were not in a sufficiently finished state to be published, and shortly before his death, he instructed his friends to destroy his manuscripts.¹⁷

b. Influences

Adam Smith's work was profoundly influenced by his life, his surroundings and the prevailing intellectual and socioeconomic conditions of the time. The Scottish Enlightenment, his relationship with David Hume and Francis Hutcheson, and the economic systems of the time, arguably had the greatest impact on his work. In the following section, I will discuss these influences briefly, which will help us better understand Smith's prescriptions for the society.

Scottish Enlightenment

The Scottish Enlightenment, which is described by scholars as Scotland's 'Golden Age', was an intellectual movement in the second half of the eighteenth century that ranged across the fields of science, philosophy, economics and politics. It was part of the European Enlightenment – the intellectual movement of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, which advocated the use of reason for humans to understand the universe and improve their own condition.

The Enlightenment began with the scientific revolution of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The "new science progressively undermined not only the ancient geocentric conception of the cosmos, but, with it, the entire set of presuppositions that had served to constrain and guide philosophical inquiry."¹⁸ The Enlightenment thinkers challenged the old and dogmatic ideas, and argued that human reason was the key to knowledge, freedom, equality and

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Bristow, William. "Enlightenment." Stanford University. 2010. Accessed April 14, 2016. <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/enlightenment/>.

happiness. The movement led to advances in almost every field and essentially “swept away the medieval world-view and ushered in our modern western world.”¹⁹

The Scottish Enlightenment was made up of scholars who gathered in Edinburgh in places such as the Select Society and the Poker Club, which were the crucibles from which ideas of the Scottish Enlightenment emerged. Adam Smith, along with David Hume, Francis Hutcheson and Thomas Reid, were some of the towering figures of the Scottish movement. Although this enlightenment movement was part of the much larger European enlightenment, a few things made it different from its cultural counterparts in France and Germany. The Scottish thinkers asserted the fundamental importance of human reason, but they did not reject religion. In fact, Hutcheson and Reid were highly respected figures in both the academy and the church, and combined a commitment to the Christian religion with serious engagement in the newest intellectual inquiries.

Adam Smith was major contributor to the Scottish Enlightenment movement, whose works on understanding the science of human nature and the economy had a lasting impact on his successors across the world. The Enlightenment was characterized by empiricism and reasoning, and like Smith’s work, its goal was to improve the human condition of the society.

The Enlightenment philosophers: Hume and Hutcheson

The Scottish Enlightenment philosophers, who called themselves literati, were a close-knit group who socialized together and regularly met in social clubs to read, critique and debate each other's work. The literati had a great influence on Adam Smith, but two members of this intellectual group had a profound impact on Smith’s work due to their close personal relationship with him –

¹⁹ Ibid.

David Hume and Francis Hutcheson. In the introduction to Smith's *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*, the editors D. D. Raphael and A. L. Macfie write:

“Among contemporary thinkers Hume had the greatest influence on the formation of Smith's ethical theory... Second in order of importance is the influence of Hutcheson, whose teaching directed Smith's general approach to moral philosophy...”²⁰

After returning to Edinburgh from Oxford, Smith developed a close friendship with David Hume. Hume was instrumental in helping Smith secure his position as the Chair of Logic at the University of Glasgow, and he was arguably Smith's most important non-familial relationship throughout his life. Smith had the utmost respect for Hume, who he described in the following words:

“Upon the whole, I have always considered him, both in his lifetime and since his death, as approaching as nearly to the idea of a perfectly wise and virtuous man as perhaps the nature of human frailty will admit.”²¹

Hume's influence on Smith can be seen in his economic theory. The ‘system of natural liberty’ was “based on the idea that commercial society was a form of social contract, a method of controlling human passions in a way that increased output that all might share, regardless of the effect on individuals.”²² This was an idea that Hume had extensively written about in *A Treatise of Human Nature*.

Hume also argued that “self-interest could be channeled profitably only through economic cooperation and competition – making civil society a possibility so long as the rule of law prevailed”. This was a pillar of Smith's thinking as well: he asserted the need for government

²⁰ Smith, Adam, D. D. Raphael, and A. L. Macfie. *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*. Indianapolis: Liberty Classics, 1982.

²¹ Goldberg, Bruce. “Ayn Rand's ‘For the New Intellectual’”. *New Individualist Review* 1 (3): 21.

²² “David Hume: Foundations of the Classical School of Economics.”
<https://www.dallasfed.org/assets/documents/research/ei/ei0301.pdf>.

because instincts may lead people to act against their interests, even though they are driven primarily by those self-interests.²³

Hume died in 1776, the year *Wealth of Nations* was published, but he agreed with most of what Smith had written. It is evident from these examples and the nature of their relationship that Hume had a profound influence on Smith.

Francis Hutcheson was one of the early leaders of the Scottish Enlightenment, who taught Adam Smith at the University of Glasgow. Smith's biographer, W. R. Scott wrote the following about Hutcheson's influence on his pupil:

“When Adam Smith was his student, [Hutcheson] was undoubtedly a very great and a most stimulating teacher. Almost every one of his contemporaries, even when they did not agree with him, acknowledges his influence on the mind and character of the young.”²⁴

In *Wealth of Nations*, Smith's ideas on such as the division of labor and the compatibility of the amount and difficulty of labor with its value are aligned with Hutcheson. Smith was also influenced by his teacher's discussion of cost of goods being dependent on the difficulty of acquiring them and their demand.²⁵ An illustration of this influence can be seen in a well-known passage in the *Wealth of Nations* in which Smith defined animals used in agriculture as productive workers.²⁶ Hutcheson's thesis was similar and he described the importance of animals by writing “by their

²³ Rotwein, Eugene. *The Economic Thought of David Hume*. 1950. 693

²⁴ Scott, W. R. *Adam Smith as Student and Professor*. New York: Kelley, 1965.

²⁵ Hutcheson, Francis. *A System of Moral Philosophy*. New York: A.M. Kelley, 1968. II.10.7

²⁶ “No equal capital puts into motion a greater quantity of productive labor than that of the farmer. Not only his laboring servants, but his laboring cattle, are productive laborers. In agriculture too nature labors along with man; and though her labor costs no expence, its produce has its value, as well as that of the most expensive workmen. . . . The laborers and laboring cattle, therefore, employed in agriculture, not only occasion, like the workmen in manufactures, the reproduction of a value equal to their own consumption, or to the capital which employs them, together with its owner profits; but of a much greater value” [WN, Liberty Classics, 363–64]

assistance men might obtain a great increase of happiness, and be freed from evils much superior to those labors imposed on the beasts”²⁷

Hutcheson exerted considerable influence on Smith’s *Lectures on Justice, Police, Revenue, and Arms* in not only its content but also in his choice of title. Hutcheson in *System* wrote about the aims of polity: sobriety, justice, industry, and fortitude. This resembled closely Smith’s title of his own work discussing similar subjects.²⁸

These examples serve to illustrate that Smith borrowed from both Hutcheson and Hume in forming his own theories. While their influence is apparent, there were also certain occasions when Smith was openly critical of Hume’s and Hutcheson’s theories.²⁹

Prevailing Economic Systems of the Time

The prevailing economic systems of the time – the Mercantile System and the Agricultural System – considerably influenced Smith’s work, specifically his economic “system of natural liberty”, because his economic theory was a response to the prevalent economic practices of the European nations.

²⁷ Hutcheson, Francis. *A System of Moral Philosophy*. New York: A.M. Kelley, 1968.1:312–13

²⁸ Pesciarelli, Enzo. "On Adam Smith's Lectures On Jurisprudence." *Scottish J Political Economy Scottish Journal of Political Economy* 33, no. 1 (1986): 74-85.

²⁹ Example: In *Treatise*, Hume wrote that adherence to the rule of law originated in the self-interest to restrain self-interest [A Treatise of Human Nature III.2.2.13–14]. Smith argued that Hume’s account was too “refined” [TMS II.ii.3.5], and he did not pay enough attention to the “unsocial” passion of “resentment” as well as to the passion of admiration, which have their source in the imagination. In the *Theory of Moral Sentiments*, Smith argued that moral sense without judgment is impossible [TMS VII.3.3.8-9], and sympathy is what allows us to make judgments about ourselves and others. Smith asserted that sympathy is the foundation for moral deliberation, and Hutcheson's system has no room for it.[Pack, Spencer J., and Eric Schliesser. "Smith's Humean Criticism of Hume's Account of the Origin of Justice." *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 44, no. 1 (2006): 47-63.].

Smith coined the term “mercantile system” to describe the economic system that sought to enrich a country by restraining imports and encouraging exports. This system dominated economic thought and policies in Western Europe from the sixteenth to the late eighteenth century. Under this economic system, wealth was considered the same as money i.e. gold or silver. A rich country was one that had a lot of gold and silver. This incentivized heaping up large quantities of money, seeking it out from colonies and preventing money from leaving the country.

Smith illustrated this by using the example of Spaniards. Whenever they discovered a new colony, their first objective was to find gold or silver, and take it back to Spain. As Smith explains: “When those adventurers arrived upon any unknown coast, their first inquiry was always if there was any gold to be found there.”³⁰ Smith thoroughly refuted the mercantilist doctrine, the idea that a nation’s wealth was measured by the size of its treasury. He criticized the mercantilists by demonstrating that free trade benefits both parties. He also argued that specialization through the division of labor allows for economies of scale, which leads to efficiency and growth.

Smith asserted that the mercantilist system benefited the merchants and the producers, while the consumers were harmed:

It cannot be very difficult to determine who have been the contrivers of this whole mercantile system; not the consumers, we may believe, whose interest has been entirely neglected; but the producers, whose interest has been so carefully attended to; and among this latter class our merchants and manufacturers have been by far the principal architects. In the mercantile regulations, which have been taken notice of in this chapter, the interest of our manufacturers has been most peculiarly attended to; and the interest, not so much of the consumers, as that of some other sets of producers, has been sacrificed to it.³¹

³⁰ Smith, Adam. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. Indianapolis: Liberty Classics, 1981. IV.7.17

³¹ Smith, Adam. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. Indianapolis: Liberty Classics, 1981. IV.8.54

Smith was concerned about heavy trade restrictions on various goods because it resulted in the local producers having effective monopolies. Smith believed that if the foreign goods were cheaper than domestic goods, then the capital needs to be diverted to other areas. These trade restrictions were defended by the mercantilists as a tool to prevent an adverse balance of trade. Smith asserted that as long as a country is producing more than it consumes, and it is saving and adding to its capital, such country could import more than it exports, have an adverse trade balance, but still continue to produce surplus and grow richer.

Trade restrictions in place under the mercantilist system were also very inconvenient for the traders. These traders argued that if they were allowed to pay for imports using gold and silver, they could process these imports and export them back generating profits (and as a result helping accumulate more gold and silver). As a result, some nations eased the prohibitions on gold and silver exports.

When the trade barriers were eased, nations started to focus on the balance of foreign trade, which they thought was the measure of their wealth. Domestic trade, which was far more important and accounted for most of the trade, was ignored. Governments claimed that since no money came into or left the country when goods were traded domestically, domestic trade could not make the country richer or poorer.

Smith thought that this preoccupation with foreign trade was a huge mistake because money was just a medium of exchange. It was useful because everyone accepted it, but its real value lied in what it could buy. Since most wealth was created and consumed domestically, Smith argued that cross-border movements of gold and silver could hardly ruin a great nation. The

mercantilist failed to realize that money, in the form of gold and silver, was nothing more than dead capital if trade was not freely allowed.

Smith also discussed another economic system – the agricultural system – at considerable length in the *Wealth of Nations*. In this economic system, the product of land was the sole source of national wealth and income. Since this system had never been adopted by a nation, Smith did not “examine at great length the errors of a system which never has done”³²; instead he presented an outline of “this very ingenious system”³³. Smith wrote that this system divided the society into three “classes”:

“The different orders of people who have ever been supposed to contribute in any respect towards the annual produce of the land and labor of the country, they divide into three classes. The first is the class of the proprietors of land. The second is the class of the cultivators, of farmers and country laborers, whom they honor with the peculiar appellation of the productive class. The third is the class of artificers, manufacturers, and merchants, whom they endeavor to degrade by the humiliating appellation of the barren or unproductive class.”³⁴

Each of these three classes of people had a specific role in the agricultural economic system. The proprietors contributed to national income through the expense they incurred from improving land by building drains and enclosures. The farmers contributed to national income through their expenditures on seed, livestock and the maintenance of farm workers. The manufacturers and merchant did not contribute to the national income because the benefit of their labor was offset by the cost of their wages, materials, and tools. Smith argued that even though they added value to

³² Smith, Adam. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. Indianapolis: Liberty Classics, 1981. IV.9.2

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ Ibid. IV.9.5

what the proprietors and farmers produce, but they consumed the same amount that they contributed, therefore adding no net value.³⁵

Smith saw the manufacturers and merchants as a useful class because if there was perfect liberty in the economic system, there would be more competition between them, which would lower the cost of what they supply. Similarly, the more liberty enjoyed by the other two classes, the greater the surplus that their land would produce, and the more there would be available for the unproductive class. Therefore, according to Smith, the best policy for promoting prosperity in an economic system was one of *natural liberty*.

c. System of Natural Liberty

Smith's system of natural liberty, a laissez faire economic system, was his prescription for improving the economic and social well-being of the society at the time. He argued that when the market is free, resources are always allocated efficiently and individuals will be happier as a result. Smith asserted that the mercantilist policies were designed to benefit the government and the commercial class, and the ordinary citizen was left worse off because of the barriers of trade and monopolization. Laissez-faire economics, on the contrary, would lead to the economic welfare of the entire population.

Smith's system of natural liberty was one in which "Every man, as long as he does not violate the laws of justice, is left perfectly free to pursue his own interest his own way, and to bring both his industry and capital into competition with those of any other man, or order of men." Smith believed that in the absence of barriers of trade, people are left free to pursue their own interests, and to bring their capital and labor into competition with others. Capital and labor flow into their

³⁵ Ibid. IV.9

most efficient uses – as if directed there by an invisible hand – and the state is not required to supervise economic activity. He further explains:

“All systems either of preference or of restraint, therefore, being thus completely taken away, the obvious and simple system of natural liberty establishes itself of its own accord... The sovereign is completely discharged from a duty, in the attempting to perform which he must always be exposed to innumerable delusions, and for the proper performance of which no human wisdom or knowledge could ever be sufficient; the duty of superintending the industry of private people, and of directing it towards the employments most suitable to the interest of the society.”³⁶

Smith realized that the market could not provide everything for the society, and the government had a critical role in ensuring that the markets function properly. Smith wrote:

“According to the system of natural liberty, the sovereign has only three duties to attend to; three duties of great importance, indeed, but plain and intelligible to common understandings: first, the duty of protecting the society from violence and invasion of other independent societies; secondly, the duty of protecting, as far as possible, every member of the society from the injustice or oppression of every other member of it, or the duty of establishing an exact administration of justice; and, thirdly, the duty of erecting and maintaining certain public works and certain public institutions which it can never be for the interest of any individual, or small number of individuals, to erect and maintain; because the profit could never repay the expence to any individual or small number of individuals, though it may frequently do much more than repay it to a great society.”³⁷

In essence the government had to provide defense, justice and public goods to the citizens in the system of natural liberty.

Smith asserted that the government had the duty to protect its citizens from violence and invasion. Since it was the manufacturing age (and the beginning of the Industrial Revolution), if people left their jobs to defend their nation, they would not be able to maintain themselves. The

³⁶ Ibid. IV.9.51

³⁷ Ibid.

military equipment had also become more complex, and required a specialist force. For these reasons, he believed the defense of advanced nations had to be financed by the state.

Justice was very important for Smith. Throughout *Lectures on Jurisprudence* and the *Theory of Moral Sentiments*, he asserted that a fair and effective system of justice is an essential condition for economic growth. He wrote that justice is “the main pillar” upholding the “edifice” of society and it “raises and supports” the “immense fabric of human society”³⁸. Smith knew that without justice, the human condition could never be improved under his system of natural liberty.

Smith differentiated between two types of justice in his works: distributive justice and commutative justice. Distributive justice is concerned with a fair distribution of resources within a society. It is what ensures that poor have access to a satisfactory level of goods and services. Distributive justice also encompasses the equality of economic opportunity and the equality of economic result. Although Smith considered distributive justice to be “loose and unaccurate”³⁹, but he believed that neglecting it “exposes the commonwealth to many gross disorders and shocking enormities”⁴⁰ Smith was clearly concerned about equity in the society. He explicitly stated that wages below the level needed for maintenance (i.e. subsistence wages) are not “consistent with common humanity”⁴¹. His concern for universal opulence was a concern for distributive justice. Smith seeks to foster equality of opportunity, and for this very reason he wanted the state to provide education for all.

³⁸ Smith, Adam, D. D. Raphael, and A. L. Macfie. *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*. Indianapolis: Liberty Classics, 1982. 86

³⁹ Fleischacker, Samuel. *On Adam Smith's Wealth of Nations: A Philosophical Companion*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2004. 149

⁴⁰ Smith, Adam. *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*. Indianapolis: Liberty Classics, 1982. 81.

⁴¹ Smith, Adam. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. Indianapolis: Liberty Classics, 1981. 60.

Commutative justice is concerned with redress of harm. Smith argued that there was a need for the formal administration of commutative justice because of the existence of property, which was the “grand fund of all disputes”⁴². Since there are clear potential gains from theft, the ambition of the rich, or the desire for ease and enjoyment amongst the poor, can lead to private property being invaded. Therefore, the state must have mechanisms to prevent and compensate harm. He asserted that a magistracy and civil government must be established to preserve order and justice. Smith also believed that commutative justice was something that could be easily enforced by the state because it can be done “with exact precision.”⁴³

Provision of public works (or public goods) was another duty of the State according to Smith. It included services like education, and goods such as roads, bridges and street lamps. Smith recognized the utmost importance of education. He said that specialization can have harmful effects on the individual despite its clear benefits. The person who spends years performing the same operation has no opportunity for innovative thinking. He claimed that unless the government took steps to prevent it, the laboring poor will become mentally “torpor”. Therefore, he wanted the government to invest in the education of the young by establishing schools and making attendance mandatory. He used the example of the Greek and the Romans to illustrate his point. These ancient societies had instituted gymnasia for the young and appointed teachers. He believed that education would benefit the society by fostering innovation and promoting good order. Other public goods such as bridges and roads were also necessary, in this case for facilitating commerce. Smith laid

⁴² Smith, Adam, Ronald L. Meek, D. D. Raphael, and Peter Stein. *Lectures on Jurisprudence*. Indianapolis: Liberty Classics, 1982. 208.

⁴³ Fleischacker, Samuel. *On Adam Smith's Wealth of Nations: A Philosophical Companion*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2004. 149.

out a detailed plan to finance these public goods through the imposition of tolls and taxes on the general populous.⁴⁴

The core of Smith's thesis, on which the system of natural liberty is based, is the natural tendency of people to act in their own enlightened self-interest. Smith explained this in the following words:

“It is not from the benevolence of the butcher, the brewer, or the baker that we expect our dinner, but from their regard to their own interest.”⁴⁵

The butcher does not supply meat because of his good-hearted intentions, but because he profits by selling meat. If the meat he sells is of poor quality, the customers won't come back, and he will not make a profit. Hence, it was in his self-interest to sell good meat at a price that customers are willing to pay, so that both parties benefit in every transaction. If the butcher tries to charge higher prices or sells poor quality meat, the customer can always go to another butcher. The competition essentially keeps him in check. If competition was not enough, and the butcher tries to take advantage of the customers, the government was there to enforce laws.⁴⁶

The complimentary forces of self-interest and competition acted as an “invisible hand”. While neither the producers nor the consumers act with the intent of serving the needs of others or society, they nevertheless do serve these needs. Smith describes this in his own words:

“by directing that industry in such a manner as its produce may be of the greatest value, he intends only his own gain, and he is in this, as in many other cases, led by an invisible hand to promote an end which was no part of his intention.”⁴⁷

⁴⁴ Smith, Adam. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. Indianapolis: Liberty Classics, 1981. V.1.77 - 84

⁴⁵ Ibid. I.2.2

⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷ Ibid. IV.2.9

The free market and the invisible hand lead to the optimal allocation of resources which brings about prosperity and universal opulence with very little effort from a nation's government.

Adam Smith believed that a system of natural liberty was the best way to spur economic growth, which would improve the European societies. Fundamental to his system of natural liberty was maintenance of justice, which he described as “the first and chief design of every system of government”⁴⁸ and which is why he tasks the civil magistrate with the duty of not only “restraining injustice” but also “promoting prosperity of the common wealth.”⁴⁹ It is evident from his economic system that freedom and self-interest are the key to the system of natural liberty, and without these two principal values, efficient allocation of resources may never happen.

Adam Smith’s *Wealth of Nations* and more specifically his economic system of natural liberty, the idea of the invisible hand, enlightened self-interest and division of labor, have had a tremendous impact on our society. The publication of this volume marked the birth of modern capitalism as well as economics. Smith’s system of natural liberty was arguably the most important contribution to the sociopolitical and economic system that governs our society today.

III. Sayyid Qutb

Sayyid Qutb (1906 – 1966) was an Egyptian scholar and Islamic theorist who is considered one of the most radical Islamic thinkers of the 20th century. He fervently believed that Islam should govern the social, economic and political order of the society, to improve the human condition and purge ills of society. His works like *Al-Adala al-Ijtima'iyya fi'l-Islam* (Social Justice in Islam), *Ma'alim fi'l-Tariq* (Milestones), and *Fi Zilal al-Qur'an* (In the Shade of the Quran), have

⁴⁸ Smith, Adam, Ronald L. Meek, D. D. Raphael, and Peter Stein. *Lectures on Jurisprudence*. Indianapolis: Liberty Classics, 1982. 5.

⁴⁹ Smith, Adam. *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*. Indianapolis: Liberty Classics, 1982. 81.

influenced leaders of militant Islam and have helped shape their vision. Hence, it would be to describe him as the intellectual father and “philosopher of Islamic Terror”.⁵⁰

Qutb’s radical views were shaped by the society around him, which he described as *jahili*.⁵¹ He asserted that “Islam knows only two kinds of societies, the Islamic and the jahili.”⁵² To him, Islam represented pure truth, whereas, the jahili society had “deviant and barbaric qualities” and was the most “self-indulgent, individualistic, crime-infested, and oppressive social order ruled by tyrants who brutally abuse their subjects and unjustly govern according to their own whims and self-interests”⁵³. His greatest fear was Muslims societies, including his own country – Egypt, would come under complete influence of the *jahiliyyah*.

To fully understand Qutb’s vision for society, we must understand the context in which he wrote his major works. This includes learning about Qutb’s early life, his education, the economic conditions of the Egyptian society and other influences on him.

a. Qutb’s Early Life

Sayyid Qutb was born in 1906 in the village of Musha in the Asyut province of Egypt. His father, Haji Ibrahim Qutb, was a prominent landowner and a member of village elite who traced his ancestry to India. Qutb had two brothers and three sisters, of whom he was the eldest. Although his family was modern and secular, Qutb received both a secular and a religious education⁵⁴ during

⁵⁰ Berman, Paul. "The Philosopher of Islamic Terror." The New York Times. 2003.

⁵¹ Jahili or Jahiliyyah, meaning ignorance, is used to refer to the pre-Islamic period. Sayyid Qutb interpreted jahiliyyah as the domination of humans over humans, rather than submission of humans to God. The term denotes any government system, ideology, or institution based on values other than those referring to God. [Oxford Dictionary of Islam].

⁵² Qutb, Sayyid. *Milestones*. 2006. 93.

⁵³ Halverson, Jeffrey et al. *Master Narratives of Islamist Extremism*. 2011. 42.

⁵⁴ This included memorization of the Quran.

his childhood. When Qutb turned thirteen, he went to Cairo for his secondary education and entered the Dar-ul-uloom. There he received an education in sciences and humanities, but also in Arabic and Islamic studies. During his early years in Cairo, he was influenced by Western ideas prevalent in his school and among some Egyptian intellectuals.⁵⁵

From 1929 to 1933, Qutb studied at Cairo University, where he earned a Bachelor's Degree in Education. After finishing College, he joined the Ministry of Education. For the first three years, he taught at the Dar-ul-uloom, and later he became an inspector of schools. At this time, Qutb devoted himself to literature as an author and critic, and wrote novels and book reviews.⁵⁶

In 1948, Qutb went to the United States on a government scholarship to study the educational system. He received a Master's degree from Colorado State College of Education (now the University of Northern Colorado). During the two years he spent in America, Qutb visited several different institutions, including Wilson Teachers' College in DC and Stanford University. He traveled extensively throughout the States, visiting most major cities. He also spent some time in Europe on his return journey.⁵⁷

This two-year period in his life was pivotal – he had a negative impression of Western society, which he found to be materialistic, corrupt and unjust. What troubled him the most was the disrespect shown to Arabs and Muslims in general in America, and the broad support of Israel. Most scholars claim that this period was when Qutb transformed from a secular nationalist poet, critic and author to a radical Islamic scholar. During his stay in America, Qutb published his first major theoretical work *Social Justice in Islam*, which reflects his critical attitude towards the West.

⁵⁵ Calvert, John. *Sayyid Qutb and the Origins of Radical Islamism*. Columbia University Press, 2009. 25-82

⁵⁶ Ibid.

⁵⁷ Ibid. 103-152

Upon his return to Egypt, he joined the Muslim Brotherhood and became an active member of the organization.⁵⁸ In 1954, he became the editor of the society's newspaper, but just two months later, the newspaper was closed by the Egyptian President Gamal Abdel Nasser because of its opposition to the Anglo-Egyptian pact.

In 1952, Gamal Abdel Nasser, a member of the Free Officers Movement, had led a coup d'état to overthrow the pro-Western monarchical regime. At the time of the coup, the Brotherhood has enjoyed a close relationship with the new government, and many members of the Brotherhood expected Nasser to establish an Islamic government in Egypt. Their relationship soured when it became clear that the nationalist ideology of Nasser was incompatible with the Islamism of the Brotherhood. In 1954, when a member of the Muslim Brotherhood attempted to assassinate President Nasser, there was complete rupture in their relationship. Thousands of members were arrested, six were executed and the society was declared illegal.

Sayyid Qutb was among those arrested and was sentenced to 15 years of rigorous imprisonment. This experience was extremely difficult for Qutb because he was “a generally sickly man who suffered from a number of afflictions”⁵⁹ and played a significant role in his radicalism. It is also alleged that he was tortured during his imprisonment. However, he continued to write in jail, and this is when he completed *In the Shadow of the Quran*, his influential commentary on the Quran.⁶⁰

⁵⁸ He was also a member of its guidance council, which was the highest branch of the organization.

⁵⁹ "Sayyid Qutb. The Columbia Encyclopedia, 6th Ed.. 2016.
http://www.encyclopedia.com/topic/Sayyid_Qutb.aspx.

⁶⁰ Calvert, John. *Sayyid Qutb and the Origins of Radical Islamism*. Columbia University Press, 2009.

Qutb was released from prison in 1964 because of an appeal by the Iraqi President Abdul Salam Arif to President Nasser. Even after being freed, Qutb continued to work to establish an Islamic regime. As a result, he was arrested again year later, on a charge of attempting to overthrow the Egyptian government by force. The basis of the charge was his last book, *Milestones*, which sanctioned force as a means to bring about an Islamic revolution to transform society. In August 1966, Sayyid Qutb was sentenced to death by an Egyptian military tribunal, and the sentence was carried out shortly after.⁶¹

b. Influences on Qutb and his transformation

Muslim Brotherhood

The Muslim Brotherhood⁶² was a prominent Islamic organization in Egypt founded by Hassan Al-Banna in 1929. It had numerous followers and it wielded a considerable political influence in Egyptian politics. Qutb began to take interest in the teachings of the Muslim Brotherhood even before his journey to the United States. Upon his return from the States, Qutb officially joined the Brotherhood and became a member of its highest governing body, the Guidance Council.

In 1949, one of its members assassinated the Egyptian prime minister. As a result, the organization was banned and many of its members were arrested. In 1952 however, the coup d'état of the Free Officers overthrew the Egyptian monarchy, and the members of the Brotherhood were

⁶¹ Ibid.

⁶² Borgeson, Kevin, and Robin Valeri. *Terrorism in America*. Sudbury, MA: Jones and Bartlett, 2009. 23

released from prison. A new leader was chosen to replace Hassan al-Banna (who was killed in the violence of 1949) and Sayyid Qutb emerged as one of the foremost figures.⁶³

Qutb's membership in this organization influenced him considerably primarily because he surrounded himself with people who want to establish an Islamist regime in Egypt, and wanted Islam to govern the socio, political and economic order of their society.

Family

Another important influence on Qutb was his family. Qutb's family was part of the village elite, but their economic condition had deteriorated. Due to his limited advancement within the Education Ministry, Qutb was unable to help them. Then in October 1940, Qutb's mother, Fatima, passed away. His father had died the year he had graduated from school, in 1933, and since that time, his mother had been the bedrock of the family. Her death was an emotional shock for him and he felt disconnected and lost. Since Qutb was not married, he had few sources of emotional support. Qutb's mother had instilled in him a strong sense of purpose, and her death made him reexamine his life. He became alienated with the intellectual and literary scene in Cairo, which he thought was immoral and "images of an untainted Musha and a decadent Cairo both pointed him more and more in the direction of his religion."⁶⁴ These personal difficulties, coupled with the political forces and the economic condition pushed him to become a radical Islamic scholar.⁶⁵

World War II and Economic Depression

⁶³ Calvert, John. *Sayyid Qutb and the Origins of Radical Islamism*. Columbia University Press, 2009.

⁶⁴ Toth, James. *Sayyid Qutb: The Life and Legacy of a Radical Islamic Intellectual*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013. 37

⁶⁵ It is important to note that Qutb's brother, Muhammad Qutb, followed his footsteps, and eventually became the teacher and mentor of Osama Bin Laden.

The Second World War, its aftermath and the economic depression of the 1930s considerably influenced Qutb's life and his world view. The depression had a devastating effect on the Egyptian economy. The inequality within the society had become more visible, as many people were left in financial ruin, including Qutb's own family. When the depression was ending, the specter of Second World War was rising in Europe. Qutb knew that this was bound to affect Egypt. As the war started, both Qutb and the country fell into despair and depression.

The wartime economy, failed government reforms, and social alienation spurred Qutb's new interest in Quranic studies and renewed religiosity. "These feelings were supplemented by his own residual religiosity from his childhood, and his dissatisfaction with, and resentment of, the privileged cosmopolitan values of urbane Cairo."⁶⁶ Qutb found "solace... by delving deeper into understanding his religion" and "the Quran became a reassuring shelter".⁶⁷

By the end of the war, Qutb had risen to become one of the most established literary critics in Cairo. He continued to write short novelettes like *The Bewitched City* and *Thorns* in which he addressed political issues. In his writings, he addressed issues of "political decadence and social injustice more frequently from an Islamic vantage point."⁶⁸

When the atrocities of World War II in Europe came to light, Qutb and his colleagues became more critical of the West. The martial law that had prevented the publication of opposition pieces had been lifted by October 1945. Writings critical of the West and the oppressive regime began to rise considerably.

Qutb's Transformation

⁶⁶ Ibid. 38

⁶⁷ Ibid.

⁶⁸ Ibid. 43

In light of the events discussed earlier, Qutb's transition from a modern and secular scholar to a radical Islamist is not surprising. Qutb had memorized the entire Quran during childhood, so there was a residual religiosity in him. For almost a decade after he first arrived in Cairo, Qutb had been a secular literary critic, who demonstrated tolerance and open-mindedness. Political and historical events, combined with his personal life may well have pushed him further, deeper, and quicker along this path. By the late 1940s, Qutb "appears to have moved from a Muslim secularist position in the 1930s to a moderate radical Islamism in the late 1940s."⁶⁹

In the 1940s, Qutb began to seriously study the Qur'an and Islam. In his writings he started taking a moral and anti-imperialist position, and was critical of corruption in government, the entertainment industry, and even the religious clerics. Qutb's attacks on the West came from a religious standpoint. As Europe's barbarism (e.g. the Holocaust, concentration camps, and fire bombings) were revealed through the media, Qutb became even more critical. He blamed the government and politicians for the social ills of the society; and for collaborating and cooperating with the British during the war. He now "sought a religious politics that aimed to change reality in accordance with the basis of the religious and ideological principles of the sacred texts".⁷⁰

This resulted in his moderate Islamist treatise, *Social Justice in Islam*, which was published shortly before he left for America in November 1948. At this time, Qutb was still a moderate, who advocated educational methods for reform of the society. The turning point was his visit to the United States which hardened his Islamism, and eventually led him to promoting militant and revolutionary tactics.

⁶⁹ Abu-Rabi', Ibrahim M. *Intellectual Origins of Islamic Resurgence in the Modern Arab World*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1996. 109

⁷⁰ Toth, James. *Sayyid Qutb: The Life and Legacy of a Radical Islamic Intellectual*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013. 44

Qutb concluded from his experiences that the only solution to the problems Egypt faced was to reject outside influences and rely instead on Islam to establish a society that was free from the ills that plagued the Western world, a society that was moral and socially just. He spent a considerable part of his life developing many facets of this Islamic system, from 1933 when he graduated from Dar al-uloom to 1966 when he was executed for treason.

c. Sayyid Qutb's Socioeconomic Theory

In the 1940s, Qutb began to see Islam as a holistic and totalizing institution.⁷¹ Qutb turned his back “on what he saw as the religious, cultural, and intellectual imperialism of the West and adopted, instead, an Islamist position without borrowings, without hesitation, and without apologies”⁷². Qutb “advocated a strong socio-political role for Islam not just in the Muslim world, but as a universally positive and rational system of thought, belief, and practice.” He argued that “Islamism was a viable rival to Western modernity – which some, including Qutb, viewed as essentially Protestant Christianity enforced through imperialism.”⁷³ Qutb saw the roots of “Egypt’s evil” in the influence of the West, and therefore, called for “a new and fresh interpretation of Islamic law that echoed the very first generation of the faithful.”

Qutb characterized the Western society as jahili⁷⁴, stating “Islam knows only two kinds of societies, the Islamic and the jahili.”⁷⁵ He argued that these societies were jahili because they are

⁷¹ As opposed to just a religion in the strict Western sense.

⁷² Toth, James. *Sayyid Qutb: The Life and Legacy of a Radical Islamic Intellectual*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013. 5

⁷³ Ibid. 6

⁷⁴ *Jahili* or *Jahiliyyah*, meaning ignorance, is used to refer to the pre-Islamic period. Sayyid Qutb interpreted jahiliyyah as the domination of humans over humans, rather than submission of humans to God. The term denotes any government system, ideology, or institution based on values other than those referring to God. [Oxford Dictionary of Islam].

⁷⁵ Qutb, Sayyid. *Milestones*. Islamic Book Service, 2006. 93

organized on the basis of man-made laws instead of God's Law (Shariah⁷⁶). His characterization of the West as jahili, was central to his argument that Islam should govern the society's socio-economic and political order.

Qutb argued that materialism was a central element of a *jahiliyyah* society. He wrote that "because material production is considered to be more important, more valuable and more honorable than the development of human character"⁷⁷ by the West, genuine human progress is impossible. Materialism had shaped the values of this society, and as a result "the humanity of man can hardly find a place to develop." Qutb contended that "only Islamic values and morals, Islamic teachings and safeguards, are worthy of mankind, and from this unchanging and true measure of human progress, Islam is the real civilization and Islamic society is truly civilized."⁷⁸

He also claimed that the jahili societies have malicious intentions towards Islam and the Muslims. He asserted that *jahiliyyah* aspires to enslave mankind and explicitly warned that by remaining a part of the jahili society, the believers will become slaves:

"Jahiliyyah wants to find an excuse to reject the Divine system and to perpetuate slavery of one man over another. It desires to turn away the power of Muslims from the work of establishing the Divinely-ordained way of life in order that they may not go beyond the stage of belief to the stage of a dynamic movement. It wants to distort the very nature of this method"⁷⁹

⁷⁶ Sharia is the fundamental religious concept of Islam, namely its law, systematized during the 2nd and 3rd centuries of the Muslim era (8th–9th centuries ce). Total and unqualified submission to the will of Allah (God) is the fundamental tenet of Islam: Islamic law is therefore the expression of Allah's command for Muslim society and, in application, constitutes a system of duties that are incumbent upon a Muslim by virtue of his religious belief. The law constitutes a divinely ordained path of conduct that guides Muslims toward a practical expression of religious conviction in this world and the goal of divine favour in the world to come.
[<http://www.britannica.com/topic/Shariah>]

⁷⁷ Qutb, Sayyid. *Milestones*. Islamic Book Service, 2006. 98

⁷⁸ Qutb, Sayyid. *Milestones*. Islamic Book Service, 2006. 99

⁷⁹ Ibid. 42

Through these words, he not only established that slavery was inevitable, but also the active intention of *jahiliyyah*. Qutb asserted that no man who lives in a society that requires submission to man-made laws can be truly free because this makes men slaves to other men. According to his description of slavery, many believers were already enslaved because even the Muslim societies were governed by man-made laws. He argued that “in a society in which some people are lords who legislate and some others are slaves who obey them, then there is no freedom in the real sense, nor dignity for each other and every individual.”⁸⁰ Therefore, most believers are already slaves and will remain subjugated as long as they continue to live in the ignorance of jahili society. Qutb’s message in a sense was a message of freedom – he wrote that Islam’s purpose was “to free those people who wish to be freed from enslavement to men.”⁸¹

Qutb presented a prescription to this problem: he argued that a return to the basic tenets of Islam was the only way to be truly free. He emphasized the role of Islam in governing the sociopolitical and economic order. He wanted Islam to form an “over-arching umbrella that covers all of society much like European society had been blanketed by Catholicism before social life was compartmentalized by the Reformation and the Enlightenment.”⁸² Qutb saw “Islam as a harmonious and integrated system that emanates from both God’s oneness and God’s dominion” and his goal was “to repair the ruptures in society that had resulted in apostasy, alienation, and decadence, and to establish a balanced and cohesive system based on the universal principles of Islam.”⁸³

⁸⁰ Ibid. 94-95

⁸¹ Ibid. 56

⁸² Toth, James. *Sayyid Qutb: The Life and Legacy of a Radical Islamic Intellectual*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013. 6

⁸³ Ibid.

Qutb argued that a key characteristic in the Islamic society was social justice, something that did not exist in the West because of its materialistic philosophy of life. Qutb called upon the Muslims to examine Islam's comprehensive philosophy of the universe, life and humankind. In his view, a clear understanding of the universe, and the harmony between the cosmos and life, would lead Muslims to a deep appreciation of Islam as a religion of unity, encompassing all elements of life. Qutb stated:

“Islam is the religion of unity. It is the unity of all existence; inanimate, plant, animal and human... Islam finds unity in planets when following their eternal law as well as in souls when responding to their natural inclinations to acquire knowledge and implement justice.”⁸⁴

Islam is based on the principle of the tawhid⁸⁵ or oneness of God. Therefore, Qutb argued that to achieve social justice, understanding the concept of tawhid was necessary. According to him, the principle of understanding the tawhid of God did not just require knowing the phrase “there is not god but God”⁸⁶ in one's heart, but required the submission of the whole life of the individual to God. It required all human affairs, including the economic, ethical, political and social system to be derived and shaped by Islam. He stated that when people “are freed from submission to their fellow man and their own desires” a system emerges “that upholds justice in accordance with God's command and establishes social justice in the name of God alone and not in any other form.”⁸⁷

Qutb believed that it was the religious duty of Muslims to derive their values, legislations and morals from the oneness of God. He wanted all institutions, economic and political, to be

⁸⁴ Qutb, Sayyid. *Islam and Universal Peace*. Indianapolis: American Trust Publications, 1977. 5

⁸⁵ Tawhid, which means the oneness of God, is the indivisible oneness concept of monotheism in Islam. Tawhid is the religion's most fundamental concept and holds that God is One and Single. [Wikipedia]

⁸⁶ This phrase is the Shahada, which means testimonial. It is an Islamic creed declaring belief in the oneness of God and the acceptance of Muhammad as God's prophet. [Wikipedia]

⁸⁷ Qutb, Sayyid. *Social Justice in Islam*. Oneonta, NY: Islamic Publications International, 2000.

based on the principles of Islam. For Qutb, it was what distinguished Islamic societies from the *jahiliyyah* societies, that were based on man-made laws instead of God's law. Creating a society independent of God, was a breach of tawhid (oneness of God), which was the center of justice.

Sayyid Qutb's writings, especially his conception of an Islamic system, have had a tremendous impact on modern Islamic fundamentalism. Qutb is credited as "the real founder of Islamic fundamentalism in the Sunni world".⁸⁸ His writings distort Islam and encourage Muslims to "separate themselves from mainstream society and engage in violent jihad."⁸⁹ The Muslim Brotherhood, Al Qaeda and the Islamic State have been influenced by Qutb's ideology in advocating violence against societies that are in a state of *Jahiliyyah* (Apostasy). His book *Milestones* has become a manifesto for Islamic Militants seeking to free Muslims from Jahiliyyah and to establish *Divine Law* to bring about man's submission to God. Therefore, it would be fitting to say that Sayyid Qutb has been the single greatest intellectual and ideological influence on Militant Islam.

IV. Contrasting the views of Smith and Qutb

It is evident from the previous two chapters that Adam Smith and Sayyid Qutb are writing in very different times, and responding to different issues that shaped their respective societies. Smith wrote his magnum opus at the height of the Scottish Enlightenment, arguing for a system of natural liberty to govern the political and economic order. On the other hand, Qutb advocated a return to doctrinal belief – Islam – in the aftermath of the Great Depression, the breakdown of the very system Smith advocated for, and the Second World War. Naturally, they have strikingly

⁸⁸ Armstrong, Karen. *Islam: A Short History*. New York: Modern Library, 2000. 169

⁸⁹ Ibid.

different prescriptions for improving the human condition of their societies and achieving socioeconomic prosperity.

These prescriptions, as we previously discussed, have had a profound impact on their respective societies. I will examine the views of Adam Smith and Sayyid Qutb on economic inequality, taxation and interest; three issues that they have addressed in their work, which have shaped their prescriptions and can be compared and contrasted on their own merits. This will provide us a means to develop broader insight into the conflicting worldviews of the West and Militant Islam.

a. Economic Inequality

Both Adam Smith and Sayyid Qutb were concerned about economic Inequality in their respective societies. Smith observed that the mercantile system benefited the commercial class, while the ordinary citizens and laborers were generally left worse off. He argued that the system of natural liberty would ensure socioeconomic prosperity for all. Qutb observed that there was an increasing gap between the wealthy and the destitute in Egypt, especially in the aftermath of the Second World War. He believed that it was a result of individualism promoted by Western capitalism, and the growing failure of the rich to take responsibility for the wellbeing of the poor. Both have addressed these issues in their prescriptions, and it can be argued that reducing economic inequality was central to both of their proposed economic systems.

Smith's views

Smith believed that under the economic system of natural liberty and through division of labor, there will be increase in overall productivity, prosperity and “opulence” of societies over time. He specifically asserted that the benefits of this increasing prosperity will be spread throughout the society. He explains:

“It is the great multiplication of the productions of all the different arts, in consequence of the division of labor, which occasions, in a well-governed society that universal opulence which extends itself to the lowest ranks of the people.”

Although he conceded that the distribution would be unequal, he expected the standard of living of the poor would increase steadily under an unfettered free market through what he described as the “natural progress of opulence.” In fact, this very idea, that a system of natural liberty leads to the society as a whole being better off, is one of the strongest justifications of Adam Smith’s market system.⁹⁰ Smith knew that the sociopolitical and economic system that governs a society must ensure the wellbeing of everyone and not just a certain class of people. Smith writes:

“No society can surely be flourishing and happy, of which the far greater part of the members are poor and miserable”⁹¹

Smith argued in favor of universal opulence extending to the “lowest ranks of the people” by citing historical examples and elaborating on his economic theory. He believed that under the system of natural liberty, with division of labor and people acting in their own self-interest, in the long-run, the great majority of the population will naturally become wage-laborers, or will be dependent on wage-laborers.

Therefore, most people will earn a living by selling their labor as a commodity, instead of selling a product. Like every other commodity, labor too has a price (or value) determined by the market in the long run. As a result of this, the standard of living of the vast majority of the population, or universal opulence as Smith called it, would depend on the price of labor (i.e. wages).

⁹⁰ Smith, Adam. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. Indianapolis: Liberty Classics, 1981. 22-24, 95-96.

⁹¹ Ibid. 96

Smith likened labor to other commodities, so he argued that labor too was “naturally regulated.”⁹² Labor has both a “natural” price and a market price. In the long run, market forces push the market price of a commodity toward its natural price. At any given moment, however, the market price of a commodity may fluctuate above or below its natural price, but the natural price is “the central price to which the prices of all commodities are continually gravitating”⁹³ as long as the market is allowed to operate without interference or distortion. Essentially, the natural price corresponds to the normal cost of producing the commodity. If more efficient production techniques are used and there are technological improvements, commodities will be produced at lower cost, and its natural price will go down or vice-versa. Therefore, the “natural” price of labor in a society at a given moment is determined by the overall cost necessary to produce laborers and to maintain their capacity to produce goods i.e. their subsistence wage.

Smith acknowledged that under this theory, there was a possibility that wages would settle at the natural rate of labor, which is at the subsistence level. However, he asserted that there are “certain circumstances” that allow the normal rate of wages to go “considerably above that rate.”⁹⁴ He also argued that these “circumstances” would be fairly common, and elaborated on them. He explained that labor will command a higher price whenever the demand for labor outstrips the supply of labor, which would likely happen in periods of continuous economic growth. The process that would drive this growth is capital accumulation (a key part of his system of natural liberty). Every unit increase of capital would lead to an increase in the demand for labor. This

⁹² Smith, Adam. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. Indianapolis: Liberty Classics, 1981. 72

⁹³ Ibid. 73

⁹⁴ Smith, Adam. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. Indianapolis: Liberty Classics, 1981. 85-86

would lead to the actual market price of labor being above its natural price, not temporarily, but continuously and in a systematic way.⁹⁵

It would be in the self-interest of the capitalist to keep the market wage closer to the subsistence level, and he may try to do that as Smith conceded; but he also argued that the capitalist would be in competition with capitalists who also want to hire workers. Given that labor is scarce relative to capital, the workers would be paid wages above the subsistence level because it is in the capitalist's interest to hire additional labor to put capital to productive and profitable use.

Smith's vision for the socioeconomic development of society was dependent on the theory of the market as a self-regulating system. He believed that if markets were allowed to operate unhindered, it would "naturally" lead to optimal allocation of economic resources, which would promote ever-increasing growth in productivity, efficiency and overall wealth.

Smith's market system is coordinated by the mechanism of prices. Hence, the market delivers optimal results only when the actual market prices of commodities conform to their "natural" prices. When there is any interference with the natural market process to distort prices, sub-optimal results are produced. One of Smith's primary justifications for this market system, universal opulence, is dependent on the price of labor diverging from its natural price. Additionally, scholars have argued over the last two centuries that Smith's optimistic conclusion of ever-increasing overall wealth and universal opulence was not plausible.⁹⁶ They have argued that the "natural" operation of the market system does not automatically or necessarily spread the material benefits around to the workers and steadily increase their standard of living. Some even argued

⁹⁵ Ibid. 86-89, 99-104.

⁹⁶ Harris, Donald J.. 1975. "The Theory of Economic Growth: A Critique and Reformulation". *The American Economic Review* 65 (2). American Economic Association: 329–37.

that it could not do this at all, except perhaps only temporarily. These scholars include Smith's own followers and disciples within the tradition of classic political economy like Malthus, and also critics of the market system and of Smith's theory like Marx and his followers.

Smith's theory, in essence, was correct. It is widely accepted today that in at least certain circumstances, a capitalist market economy generates steady long-term economic growth, that spreads the benefits through most of the population, producing broad and ever-increasing overall wealth, with occasional interruptions.⁹⁷ However, the extent to which universal opulence happens and the factors that lead to it are still heavily contested.

Qutb's views

Like Smith, Sayyid Qutb was also concerned with economic inequality in his society. In the aftermath of the Great Depression, and the Second World War, Egypt's economic condition was deteriorating. As a result of strikes, assassinations and political instability, investments were sluggish and prices rose dramatically.⁹⁸ Qutb's writings and prescriptions illustrate his concern about economic inequality.

Qutb's understanding of Islam was different from other religious scholars of his time who reinforced the socioeconomic status quo. He argued that in a just society, the rich should not be excessively wealthy, and the poor should not be extremely poor. In Islam, he argued, the poor are the responsibility of the community, and the society has a collective duty to ensure that no one

⁹⁷ A number of theories have been proposed regarding these occasional interruptions. These include secular stagnation, debt overhang, supply-side headwinds, savings glut, liquidity trap. These theories essentially illustrate that growth cannot happen forever in a linear manner, like Smith had predicted; instead, interruptions will always happen.
[larrysummers.com/2016/02/17/the-age-of-secular-stagnation/]

⁹⁸ Toth, James. *Sayyid Qutb: The Life and Legacy of a Radical Islamic Intellectual*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013. 180

goes hungry or homeless.⁹⁹ He further explained that the accumulation of wealth by the rich, and the lack of it among the poor, generates divisions and creates the forces for corruption, resentment, and hatred.¹⁰⁰ Qutb believed that extravagance and luxury would lead to wickedness. He was outraged by the wealth of the elite and the monarchy, when many people did not have the resources to fulfill the basic necessities. He criticized monopolies, corruption, wastefulness, dishonesty and usury – all of which he blamed for dire poverty in his society. To further support his argument, Qutb asserted that the Prophet of Islam, Muhammad, described houses of luxury as temples of Satan because of the corruption and temptation found in them. He quoted the Quran: “How many towns have We destroyed which were insolent because of their prosperity?”¹⁰¹ Qutb’s prescription to this problem was a return to the tenets of Islam, to God’s Law, in order to reinstate harmony and moderation between the rich and the poor.¹⁰²

His visit to America and Europe led him to conclude that the Western societies had become impersonal, and he sensed a class hostility between the wealthy and the poor. Qutb wanted to bring back the “more convivial relationship of yesteryear.” He pushed against what he saw as excessive individualization and materialism in the West. This position resonated loudly among his followers, since Egypt “still valorized community and collective identity.”

⁹⁹ Ibid. 181

¹⁰⁰ Qutb, Sayyid, and William E. Shepard. *Sayyid Qutb and Islamic Activism: A Translation and Critical Analysis of Social Justice in Islam*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996. 132; This is a concern shared by some western economists, who have argued that conspicuous consumption for example, is undesirable because it may indicate a high level of inequality and can lead to negative externalities.

¹⁰¹ Holy Quran (28:58).

¹⁰² Qutb, Sayyid. *Social Justice in Islam*. Oneonta, NY: Islamic Publications International, 2000. 150-155

Qutb saw Islam as the only means to establishing a socially and economically just society. Qutb argued that “Islam aims for a golden mean.” In essence, Islam equally “proscribes opulence and destitution; it admonishes waste and avarice, and at the same time stinginess and abstinence.”¹⁰³ Accumulation of excessive wealth, profligacy and concentration of power in the hands of oligopolies and monopolies had led to the misery and the suffering of the poor. Since Islam rejects these practices, while the modern state protects them, it led to injustice that had to be overthrown through jihad and replaced by an Islamic state grounded in God’s authority.¹⁰⁴ The Islam “Qutb promoted seeks... to rid itself of colonial influence, and to reassert Islam’s traditional moderation of wealth and poverty, seen as valuable and ethical, not peculiar and atavistic.”¹⁰⁵

Qutb’s concern for economic inequality and moderation was once shared by Christianity as well. Western Christianity also discouraged extreme wealth and poverty, which it described as righteous Christian behavior. Other religions, like Judaism, Hinduism and Buddhism, also encourage a moderate gap between the very wealth and the poor. It was not until the sixteenth century reformation that wealth was seen as a sign of God’s grace. John Calvin and other like-minded Protestant Reformation thinkers argued that more wealth meant more grace from God.¹⁰⁶ This essentially changed the values of the Church, and as a consequence, the values of church-going citizens. Qutb argued that Islam continues to advocate for moderation. He was essentially preaching the Islam that “harkens back to a time when extremes were discouraged worldwide.”¹⁰⁷

¹⁰³ Toth, James. *Sayyid Qutb: The Life and Legacy of a Radical Islamic Intellectual*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013. 182

¹⁰⁴ Qutb, Sayyid. *Social Justice in Islam*. Oneonta, NY: Islamic Publications International, 2000. 153-160

¹⁰⁵ Toth, James. *Sayyid Qutb: The Life and Legacy of a Radical Islamic Intellectual*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013. 182).

¹⁰⁶ Weber, Max. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. New York: Scribner, 1958.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid. 182

Christianity couldn't play the same role as Islam, because after the Enlightenment, the economic and political order of the State was not governed by religion anymore.

At the same time, Qutb "disagreed with Calvin's asceticism"; he instead believed that if resources permitted, the society should consume more, because in his view, Islam expected its followers to concern themselves with both material and spiritual well-being. Calvin believed that "the material is spiritual". In Islam, however, the two are seen as antithetical. If there is an extreme increase of material wealth in Islam, then emphasis on spirituality alone is not enough. The person is obliged to provide for his community and support those who lack the same resources.

According to Qutb, Islam did not put undue burden on earning income or creating wealth; its goal was only to ensure that wealth and income was created through moral and legal means. Islam prohibits illegal practices such as corruption, fraud and dishonesty, and other economic practices that cause undue misery on citizens. Just as wealthy are not allowed to charge interest, form monopolies, or cheat workers, the poor must not engage in thievery or begging. Qutb asserted that Islam hates poverty, and he wanted people to have material stability:

"When men have only the bare necessities of life, they cannot gain any respite from labor in which to satisfy these spiritual yearnings or these intellectual capacities; then they have been robbed of their nobility and are reduced to the level of animals... Man can never achieve any of this so long as his whole life must be spent in the pursuit of his daily bread."¹⁰⁸

Islam, Qutb believed, would ensure socioeconomic equality to establish a just society by redistribution of income and wealth through three mechanisms: *Zakat* (Obligatory Taxation), *Sadaqa* (Charity), and Inheritance. He believed that these three practices were crucial for limiting

¹⁰⁸ Qutb, Sayyid. *Social Justice in Islam*. Oneonta, NY: Islamic Publications International, 2000. 164

the divide between the rich and the poor, and would function to ensure that social justice is established.

Analysis of Smith's and Qutb's views

Economic inequality concerned both scholars because they lived in a time when there was great disparity between the rich and the poor.¹⁰⁹ The mercantile system benefited a select group of people, the producers who ran monopolies and oligopolies, while the ordinary citizen, the consumer, had to pay higher prices for goods and services. Smith wanted an economic system that would lead to prosperity for all, including “the lowest ranks of people.” During the mid-twentieth century, Qutb observed that while the monarchy and the wealthy Egyptians enjoyed extravagance and luxury, a large part of society was destitute. He argued that this created a class division in society, which diminished community solidarity, a core principle in Islam.

Smith argued that his economic system of natural liberty would lead to universal opulence. He asserted that investment of capital would lead to increased demand for labor, which would drive up the wages. This theory depended upon economic growth, which he foresaw happening under his economic system. Qutb observed the impact of Smith's free market, and criticized the individualism and materialism it had promoted in the West. Qutb argued that only Islam “aims to establish a golden mean”, and a sociopolitical and economic system governed by Islam alone could achieve social justice. He claimed that tools such as taxation and charity help establish a society where there is universal opulence.

¹⁰⁹ Although there has always been economic inequality throughout human history, during the enlightenment inequality emerged as a social concern that was seen as violating the norm of human equality. During Qutb's time, a large portion of the population was living under poverty, and he considered the widening gap between the rich and the poor to be problematic and incompatible with the teachings of Islam.

Although there is a clear disagreement between Smith and Qutb in the method they want to use in reducing the disparity between the rich and the poor, to create a more economically equal society, their goals were entirely different. Smith's goal was to increase the wealth of a nation; he believed that the free market would lead to universal opulence, while also increasing the wealth of the entire country. Qutb's primary objective was to establish social justice in society, and he argued that only Islam and its tenets, which included taxation and charity, could help achieve that.

b. Taxation

Taxation is another important part of the prescriptions provided by both Adam Smith and Sayyid Qutb. Smith argued that taxation was necessary for the provision of certain public works, such as education, roads, and bridges. Financing public goods played a key role in ensuring economic growth, which was essential for broad-based socioeconomic prosperity in the society. Sayyid Qutb had similar ideas; he also wanted to use taxation to pay for public goods, but in addition, taxation was to be used as a tool to redistribute wealth from the rich to the poor and create a more economically just society. These slightly differing, yet similar views on the purpose of taxation has a lot to do with how the two theorists want to improve the condition of their societies. Smith, a proponent of a free market, believed that unimpeded markets lead to universal opulence, making everyone better off (through the mechanism discussed in the previous section). Whereas, Qutb believed that a free market created a lot of disparity between the rich and the poor, and therefore, an additional mechanism – taxation – was necessary to ensure economic justice.

Smith's views

Adam Smith explicitly states in *The Wealth of Nations* that the state must use revenue to defray the costs incurred in the provision of public works. Smith explains:

“The revenue which must defray, not only the expense of defending the society and of supporting the dignity of the chief magistrate, but all the other necessary expenses of government for which the constitution of the state has not provided any particular revenue, may be drawn either, first, from some fund which peculiarly belongs to the sovereign or commonwealth, and which is independent of the revenue of the people; or, secondly, from the revenue of the people.”¹¹⁰

He mentions two primary mechanisms to pay for the expenses incurred by the state: profit generated from a fund that belongs to the state and collection of revenue (taxes) from the people. The profits generated from public stock or public land, which is the first mechanism to pay for expenses, depends on the wealth of the state. Countries that have a large public stock or own significant amounts of land, would be able to cover their expenses using the rent or profit generated from this fund. States that don't have large coffers will need to rely on the second mechanism, which is to collect revenue from the people i.e. through taxation. Smith describes in detail how different sources of private revenue – rent, profit and wages - must be taxed differently. He also lays down four maxims of in regards to taxes.

Smith's first maxim deals with the equity of the tax burden among different members of society. Smith likens the expenses of government to that of a mutual private property; hence, payment should be in accordance with each owner's interest in the property. He writes:

“The subjects of every state ought to contribute towards the support of the government, as nearly as possible, in proportion to their respective abilities; that is, in proportion to the revenue which they respectively enjoy under the protection of the state. The expense of government to the individuals of a great nation is like the expense of management to the joint tenants of a great estate, who are all obliged to contribute in proportion to their respective interests in the estate.”¹¹¹

¹¹⁰ Smith, Adam. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. Indianapolis: Liberty Classics, 1981. V. 2

¹¹¹ Ibid. V.2.25

This idea closely relates to Locke's "protecting life, liberty and property". In essence, Smith argued that people with more property must pay more for its protection. Today, this is known as the "ability to pay" principle i.e. an individual's contribution to the government is in proportion to his earnings. This maxim laid the groundwork for progressive income taxation policies which are the norm throughout much of the world today.

Even though Smith wants to levy taxes in accordance with the individual's ability to pay i.e. his income or wealth, he argued against imposing taxes on wages. Smith's theory was that since wages are at the subsistence level, employers will have to raise wages to allow the laborers to pay taxes. Since the employers will have to take the burden of wage taxes, they are larger than they seem. He illustrated this by presenting an example: If there is 20 percent tax on 10 shillings of work, the laborer will pay 2 shillings in taxes. Since the employer will have to give the laborer a raise to ensure the take home wage remains the same, he needs to pay the laborer 12 shillings and 6 pence, which is 25 percent more. What was supposed to be a 20 percent tax is, in fact, a 25 percent tax, and this is why Smith argued that wage taxes could be damaging to the market system.

Adam Smith, instead, favored the collection of land-value taxes, which was different from the property taxes collected in Great Britain at the time. The land-value tax, was levied on land that was kept idle, so it encouraged the property owner to invest in their properties, as opposed to penalizing them in the form of higher taxation, which was a common occurrence at the time. Another form of taxes that Smith approved was user tax i.e. tolls. Although Smith is generally against taxes on necessities, he believed that these taxes place the burden of taxation on exactly the people who use the service. He explains:

"When the carriages which pass over a highway or a bridge, and the lighters which sail upon a navigable canal, pay toll in proportion to their weight or their tonnage, they pay for the maintenance of those public works exactly in proportion to the wear and tear which

they occasion of them. It seems scarce possible to invent a more equitable way of maintaining such works.”¹¹²

Adam Smith’s second taxation maxim was concerned with the collection of taxation, rather than the distribution of its burden. He wanted the process of tax collection to be transparent and explicit, so citizens were aware of how, when and where to pay taxes, as well how these taxes were to be used. He also wanted to cut red tape, bureaucracy and corruption in the collection of taxation. Smith writes:

“The tax which each individual is bound to pay ought to be certain, and not arbitrary. The time of payment, the manner of payment, the quantity to be paid, ought all to be clear and plain to the contributor, and to every other person... The uncertainty of taxation encourages the insolence and favours the corruption of an order of men who are naturally unpopular, even where they are neither insolent nor corrupt.”¹¹³

Smith’s third maxim on taxation dealt with administration of tax collection. He wanted to prevent undue burden of taxation on contributors, and believed that “tax ought to be levied at the time, or in the manner, in which it is most likely to be convenient for the contributor to pay it.” He illustrated this by using the example of tax on renting houses or land: “A tax upon the rent of land or of houses, payable at the same term at which such rents are usually paid, is levied at the time when it is most likely to be convenient for the contributor to pay; or, when he is most likely to have wherewithal to pay...”

Smith’s fourth maxim is perhaps the most important. He wanted to ensure that taxes collect just enough revenue for government expenses without incurring large administration costs, or changes in behavior that would sacrifice economic growth. He explains:

¹¹²Smith, Adam. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. Indianapolis: Liberty Classics, 1981. V.1.74

¹¹³ Ibid. V.2.26

“Every tax ought to be so contrived as both to take out and to keep out of the pockets of the people as little as possible over and above what it brings into the public treasury of the state.”

He discusses four possible inefficiencies in the collection of taxes which could have a detrimental effect on tax collection; these include high administration costs, forgone growth, high tax evasion penalties, and arbitrary auditing. Smith’s objective was to ensure that there was no undue burden on the collection of taxes, that the collection process is efficient and that it encouraged economic growth instead of curtailing it.

Qutb’s views

In the Islamic system, Qutb argued that *Zakat*, which is an obligatory tax for all Muslims who meet the necessary criteria, was a means to ensure the general prosperity of the community. In Islam the poor have the right to a reasonable standard of living, Qutb argued, so Muslims are obligated to pay this tax to limit the gap between the rich and the poor.

In Islam, *Zakat* is the most important element in regards to poverty and wealth; it is an essential element of redistribution of income and wealth, and creating a socially just society.¹¹⁴ It is also one of the five pillars of faith, and therefore it is obligatory for all Muslims who have a certain amount of wealth and income to donate two-and-a-half percent of their income and assets annually.¹¹⁵ He also encouraged the wealthiest to give *Sadaqa* or voluntary charity. *Sadaqa* serves as an additional mechanism for redistribution; and combined with *Zakat*, they form the “social taxes” that Qutb wanted to levy in the Islamic state he sought to create. The poor and the destitute

¹¹⁴ Qutb, Sayyid. *Social Justice in Islam*. Oneonta, NY: Islamic Publications International, 2000. 153-160

¹¹⁵ Including monetary profits, crops, livestock, real estate, mining, and petroleum.

are generally eligible to receive these contributions.¹¹⁶ Zakat is ordinarily collected through mosques, or government agencies; the alms are then distributed to the poor. Alternatively, individuals can donate directly to those in need.

Qutb wanted people to feel obliged to give zakat from their faith and conscience. He reasoned that giving alms to the poor was a sign of compassion and kindness; and he considered the act of tithing an act of worship. Qutb also strongly encouraged people to give voluntary charity, or Sadaqa; he believed that this charity was in essence a loan made to God, which would cleanse one's soul, and whose repayment would happen on Judgment Day.¹¹⁷

Taxation and charity, according to Qutb, demonstrated that individuals must care and take responsibility for the entire community. During his life, he saw Egyptians neglect Zakat and Sadaqa, which angered him, because it simultaneously led to the unrestricted accumulation of wealth and the destitution of a large segment of the population. He wrote “the true image of *zakat* has faded from our consciousness and from the consciousness of the wretched generations that have not seen the system of Islam applied in the real world.”¹¹⁸ With increased adoption of western culture, he observed the sense of community weakening. He wanted Zakat to be collected more strictly, and even forcefully if people refused to give, because it was necessary for the proper functioning of the Islamic state he envisioned to create.¹¹⁹

¹¹⁶ It can also be given to debtors, recent converts, freed slaves, travelers, the sick, and the mujahidin.

¹¹⁷ Qutb, Sayyid, and William E. Shepard. *Sayyid Qutb and Islamic Activism: A Translation and Critical Analysis of Social Justice in Islam*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996. 99

¹¹⁸ Ibid. 167

¹¹⁹ Tawney, R. H. *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism; a Historical Study* .. New York: Harcourt, Brace and, 1926. 251–270.; Toth, James. *Sayyid Qutb: The Life and Legacy of a Radical Islamic Intellectual*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013. 187

James Toth, an Islamic scholar, argued that “this kind of stinginess comes in part from the Calvinist teachings where poverty is the absence of God’s blessings and, therefore, represents the Unsaved who are then treated with contempt.”¹²⁰ In Protestantism, the cause of poverty is the victim himself. Therefore, charity can be humiliating “and lead to resentment or resignation.”¹²¹ During the Reformation, the Protestants moved away from the Catholic approach¹²² adopted the Calvinist approach and denied charity to avoid interfering with God’s preordained path. Hence, poverty was seen as an opportunity “to demonstrate either God’s blessing—by extracting oneself from penury—or else His damnation—by confirming sloth and indifference.”

For Qutb, the collection of taxes and alms were more than a method to redistribute income; it reflected the broader idea of social justice in Islam. He stressed that although taxation and charity are obligatory, every individual in Islam should strive to live by his own labor; the community would provide support only if the individual is unable to provide for himself.

Analysis of Smith’s and Qutb’s views

Both Smith and Qutb supported the collection of taxes. Smith wanted to use the tax revenue to finance government expenditure, specifically the provision of services that he outlined in his system of natural liberty, justice, security and public goods. Although Qutb wanted to use the tax revenue to pay for public goods, he believed that taxation and charity serve as tools to redistribute income and wealth.

Adam Smith believed that a free market would lead to universal opulence, therefore there was no need to redistribute income or wealth. Unlike Qutb, Smith argued that accumulation of

¹²⁰ Toth, James. *Sayyid Qutb: The Life and Legacy of a Radical Islamic Intellectual*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013. 185

¹²¹ Ibid.

¹²² That charity is what good Christians are supposed to give to help the poor.

capital leads to investment, which increases demand for labor; this, in turn, should increase the level of wages. Thus, Smith's economic system is dependent on capital being deployed to facilitate commerce and trade, to increase the overall wealth of the nation. Qutb provided his prescription almost two hundred years after Smith, and he observed that the unhindered free market had benefited the rich, while the poor were left destitute. He argued that only through mandatory taxes and charity, could limited the gap between the wealthy and the poor.

Smith's outline of the principles of taxation illustrate his belief in the wealthy paying their fair share of taxes. This is something that Qutb believed in as well; since rate of taxation in Islam is fixed at two-and-a-half percent, he strongly encouraged people to give additional charity, which he likened to a loan made to God. But, all in all, Smith only saw taxes as a tool to collect revenue to pay for services, while Qutb saw taxation as means to establish social justice in society. Justice is much more central in Qutb's calculus, whereas Smith thought it would generally be a natural byproduct of growth.

c. Interest (Usury)

This is another common issue that both Adam Smith and Sayyid Qutb addressed in their prescriptions. Smith supported charging interest on loans, which he believed was necessary to incentivize people to provide credit and to prevent an illegal credit market. Qutb, like most Islamic scholars believed that charging interest was immoral and against the tenets of Islam. He strongly condemned the practice because he believed it provided a mechanism for the wealthy to exploit the poor.

Smith's views on Interest

Like other economic thinkers of his time, Adam Smith believed that interest payments were necessary to conduct commerce. In the *Wealth of Nations*, Smith stated: “In some countries the interest of money has been prohibited by law. But as something can every-where be made by the use of money, something ought every-where to be paid for the use of it.” Smith made the argument that if usury is outlawed, the rate of borrowing would only increase. He explains:

“This regulation, instead of preventing, has been found from experience to increase the evil of usury; the debtor being obliged to pay, not only for the use of the money, but for the risk which his creditor runs by accepting a compensation for that use. He is obliged, if one may say so, to insure his creditor from the penalties of usury.”¹²³

Although Smith was a strong proponent of the free market, he did not believe that the reach of the invisible hand should extend to the credit market. Smith made a case for limiting interest rates on loans to a rate that was above the lowest market rate; he was worried about usury, and argued that a ceiling on interest rate was necessary to prevent “the extortion of usury.” He further discuss how the legal maximum should be set:

“This rate ought always to be somewhat above the lowest market price, or the price which is commonly paid for the use of money by those who can give the most undoubted security. If this legal rate should be fixed below the lowest market rate, the effects of this fixation must be nearly the same as those of a total prohibition of interest. The creditor will not lend his money for less than the use of it is worth, and the debtor must pay him for the risk which he runs by accepting the full value of that use. If it is fixed precisely at the lowest market price, it ruins with honest people, who respect the laws of their country, the credit of all those who cannot give the very best security, and obliges them to have recourse to exorbitant usurers.”¹²⁴

Smith knew that complete prohibition of interest on lending would produce higher interest rates than those in an unregulated loan market, but he supported usury laws because he asserted that the overall demand for loans derived from two distinct sources: low-risk borrowers who wanted to use

¹²³ Smith, Adam. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. Indianapolis: Liberty Classics, 1981. 339

¹²⁴ Ibid. II.4.14

loans to conduct commerce and generate profits that would likely be socially beneficial as well as “prodigals and projectors” who Smith thought were likely to invest in risky, speculative or unproductive enterprises. According to Smith, the latter type of borrowers would be willing to pay a much higher rate of interest than would borrowers in the former group. Therefore, if the legal maximum interest rate was set at a level greatly exceeding the lowest market rate, “the greater part of the money which was to be lent, would be lent to prodigals and projectors, who alone would be willing to give this high interest.”¹²⁵ Smith suggests that while some projectors may invest in profitable enterprises, the “chimerical projectors, the drawers and re-drawers of circulating bills of exchange, who would employ... money in extravagant undertakings, which... would never repay the expence which they had really cost.”¹²⁶ Smith was essentially concerned about speculators and projectors, who would outbid “sober people” without a ceiling on the interest rate. And as a result “a great part of the capital of the country” would be thrown into those hands “which were most likely to waste and destroy it.” A ceiling on the interest rate, in contrast, would guarantee the safety of lenders’ money and ensure the capital is “thrown into the hands in which it is most likely to be employed with advantage.”

In essence, Smith realized that that different loans have different degrees of risk associated with them; since lenders require a risk premium (which increases with the degree of risk associated with the loan) a rate ceiling only slightly above the market rate for safest loans would result in lenders not being able to receive the full risk premium. He argued that they would be unwilling to make high-risk loans, and as a result, the capital will only be employed to support commerce or trade that leads to economic prosperity and increase the wealth of nations.

¹²⁵ Ibid. II.4.15

¹²⁶ Ibid. II.2.77

Qutb's views

In Islam, usury, or *riba*, is prohibited; the prohibition on interest is derived from the concept of “vice-regency”¹²⁷ and the fundamental belief that all worldly possessions come from God. Therefore, wealth that is obtained without an individual’s own labor and at the expense of people in the community is considered immoral and an unjust extraction of wealth.

Qutb described usury as “the opposite of zakat”. “If *zakat*, *sadaqa*, and inheritance reflect the righteousness of Islam, then usury or *riba* reflects the ruthlessness and decay of *jahiliyyah* society.”¹²⁸ Qutb argued that while zakat moderated the disparity between the wealthy and the destitute, usury made lenders richer and borrowers poorer. Usury was a way of exploiting the borrower, Qutb explained, and it created divisions and conflict in society.

Qutb wrote about *Ribawi* (usurious) societies, where he argued that “bank interest not only thrives but where it has so infected the economic system that the freedom to grow, acquire, and consume is absolute, without moral or religious restrictions.” For Qutb, this was a jahili society, which was an individualistic and alienated society, where everyone was on their own. By contrast, the true Islamic societies were those where individuals gave taxes and charity, and there was a sense of solidarity.

Although usury is forbidden in Islam, it is common practice for people to engage in the practice of buying low and selling high (*riba al-fadl*, or arbitrage). Most Islamic scholars allowed this type of usury, but Qutb rejected this along with the traditional compound interest, because he believed that arbitrage would eventually lead to lending on compound interest. For Qutb, usury

¹²⁷ Concept in Islam that essentially means that Man has been created to be the vice-regent of God on earth

¹²⁸ Toth, James. *Sayyid Qutb: The Life and Legacy of a Radical Islamic Intellectual*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013. 187

meant individualism, the opposite of what Islam preached, and a path to the destruction of community.¹²⁹ He argued that usury led to corruption and greed; and encouraged people to obtain wealth through any means necessary, and consume extravagantly. “This creates a system,” he wrote, “that crushes humanity completely.” Qutb believed that individuals who engaged in usury and put material wealth on par with God, were the lowest and most despised of creatures of God.¹³⁰

Qutb supported the lending of money, but asserted that loans should be interest-free; he considered it an obligation of the wealthy to be generous, and likened this practice to charity. Qutb also maintained that money could be lent for production and consumption of goods and services, but he argued that in accordance with Islamic law, the repayment should be based on the profit or loss of the enterprise. This essentially meant using the *mudaraba* contract (a limited-partnership agreement), in which both parties, the lenders and the borrowers agree to share the profit or the loss; this transfers the risk and the reward to the lender, instead of providing a guaranteed income from the transaction.¹³¹ Qutb believed that such an arrangement would maintain harmony between the lender and the borrower.

Today, of course, usury or charging interest on loans is common practice throughout the Muslim world. Qutb would undoubtedly consider it a *jahiliyyah* practice, but the economic systems of these countries are dependent on borrowing from creditors who charge interest. However, the Islamic banking sector, which does not charge traditional compound interest, is also flourishing

¹²⁹ Carré, Olivier. *Mysticism and Politics: A Critical Reading of Fi Zilal Al-Qur'an by Sayyid Qutb (1906-1966)*. Leiden: Brill, 2003. 217

¹³⁰ Qutb, Sayyid, and William E. Shepard. *Sayyid Qutb and Islamic Activism: A Translation and Critical Analysis of Social Justice in Islam*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996. 148.

¹³¹ El-Gamal, Mahmoud A. *Islamic Finance: Law, Economics, and Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

today in most of the Muslim world, which has demonstrated that economic activities can be carried out without engaging in usury.

Analysis of Smith's and Qutb's view

It is clear that Smith and Qutb are in complete disagreement about charging interest on loans. During the Enlightenment, most scholars argued in support of interest on loans, and most countries lifted their prohibition on usury as a result. Smith agreed with this policy, because he believed that prohibiting interest on loans would create a black market for credit. Individuals and enterprises would always seek credit for production or consumption purposes, and they would have to resort to borrowing illegally at much higher rates. Instead, Smith proposed legalizing traditional compound interest loans, but placing a ceiling on the maximum interest that could be charged. In Britain's case, he suggested a five percent interest rate would be "as proper as any"¹³². Interest, Smith argued, was necessary for people to put capital to use in order to facilitate commerce and trade, which would lead to an increase in the nation's overall wealth and "universal opulence".

Qutb shared the same view on usury as Muslim thinkers and Christian thinkers of medieval Europe. He wanted usury to be completely prohibited. His argument was, in part, driven by religion: he considered charging interest as immoral, because it meant earning income without one's own labor or enterprise. Unlike trade or agriculture, he argued, lending money neither created value¹³³,

¹³² Smith, Adam. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. Indianapolis: Liberty Classics, 1981. II.4.14

¹³³ Smith and Qutb had different definitions of value. Smith would argue that collecting interest creates value because that capital can be invested in helping to grow the wealth of nations. Qutb believed that wealth created through usury did not add any value to society. There are limitations to Qutb's definitions, but his views were influenced by and are based on the Divine Law i.e. Islam.

nor did it require lenders to take risk. The second part of his argument was that it worsens economic inequality, so the rich get richer, while the poor get poorer.

Smith argued that an illegal credit market would be created if interest on loans was banned outright. However, Smith's proposed ceiling on interest rates would destroy the legal credit market for high risk loans. These high risk borrowers, who are willing to pay high interest rates, would now resort to illegal sources of credit. Hence, Smith's argument for in favor of interest could be made against his proposed ceiling. Qutb's prescription would lead to the very outcome Smith feared. An outright ban on interest would result in an illegal credit market, where interest rate would be higher. Qutb did not consider the fact that when a lender makes a loan, he has to substitute his present spending power for future spending power, for which he should be compensated. Additionally, every loan has some degree of risk associated with it, and for a lender to break even on a basket of loans, he must charge interest on the loan to at least cover his expected losses. The lender must also be compensated for inflation.

Qutb's argument on prohibition of interest was not based on rigorous empirical theory; instead, he wanted the wealthy to provide loans to borrowers from the goodness of their heart, to support their society and increase community solidarity. Unfortunately, this argument falls short; in fact, interest-bearing credit is common place in the entire Muslim world.¹³⁴ Smith had similar concerns about the exploitation of people through high interest loans, but he also knew that the credit market would never provide interest free loans. Hence, he wanted to implement usury laws to ensure that exuberant interest rates are not charged on loans to facilitate commerce.

¹³⁴ However, over the past few decades, Islamic banking has flourished in some parts of the Muslim world, which provides an alternative to interest bearing loans, but this still hasn't replaced traditional compound interest in banking entirely.

V. Conclusion

The previous four chapters have clearly illustrated the similarities and differences in the prescriptions provided by Adam Smith and Sayyid Qutb to improve the human condition. The similarities in their concerns, and prescriptions to address those issues, demonstrate that both thinkers are more alike than previously thought. The differences in their prescriptions explicitly show that Smith and Qutb disagree on certain issues. Although these differences can be attributed to their different life experiences and different philosophies, it explains the different worldviews of the West and Militant Islam.

Adam Smith believed in laissez faire economics, arguing that a free market left to its own devices produces the most efficient allocation of resources. Through division of labor and people acting in their own enlightened self interest, this economic system of natural liberty increases productivity and prosperity. Smith argued that this economic system would benefit even the “lowest ranks of people” and create broad-based or “universal opulence.”

Smith’s prescriptions also included specific duties for the government. This included the provision of justice, security and public goods, because he knew that a free market will not provide these services on its own. He argued for government intervention “especially when the object is to reduce poverty” and “when the regulation, therefore, is in support of the workman, it is always just and equitable.”¹³⁵ He also supported the collection of taxes to finance the services provided by the state, supported interest-bearing loans to facilitate commerce and trade, and imposed a ceiling on the interest rate to prevent exploitation of borrowers.

¹³⁵ Smith, Adam. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. Indianapolis: Liberty Classics, 1981. I.10.121

Smith undoubtedly laid the groundwork for Capitalism¹³⁶, the economic system that governs our society today. He pioneered the concept of the free-market and the invisible hand that leads to the optimal allocation of resources, which is the core principle of market capitalism. Smith's maxims of taxation have influenced the tax policies throughout the world; ensuring equity in burden of taxation is one of Smith's many prescriptions that have been embraced. Some economies have even adopted Smith's idea of placing a ceiling on interest rate to prevent the exploitation of borrowers by regulating the credit market. Therefore, it would be reasonable to say that Adam Smith's prescriptions are a proxy for the Western worldview.

In contrast, Qutb ardently wanted to establish an Islamic state in Egypt, and as a result, he called upon his countrymen to return to the tenets of Islam. Qutb saw the West as a corrupting influence on the Egyptian society, and believed that Islam is the only appropriate sociopolitical and economic system which ensures social justice. An Islamic state, he argued, would establish a society that is free from the materialism and individualism, and which promotes a sense of community among the citizens.

Qutb believed that Islamic tenets like Zakat (taxation) and Sadaqa (charity) could be used to reduce economic inequality. He asserted that these tenets make individuals take responsibility of the society as a whole; and provides everyone with material stability so that "men... can gain respite from labor... to satisfy these spiritual yearnings or... their intellectual capacities."¹³⁷ Qutb

¹³⁶ Capitalism, in its current form, has arguably moved away from what Smith had envisioned, but he still remains an appropriate proxy or representative of the idea of capitalism. This is because the fundamental objective of capitalism today is still the same i.e. economic growth and increasing the wealth of nations.

¹³⁷ Qutb, Sayyid. *Social Justice in Islam*. Oneonta, NY: Islamic Publications International, 2000. 164

supported the prohibition of usury because he believed it led to the exploitation of the poor. He also argued that it helped the rich get richer without any labor or enterprise, which Islam despised.

Qutb has undoubtedly had a profound impact on the Muslim world. He is recognized as the most important Islamic thinker of the twentieth century, and his works are widely read throughout the Islamic world¹³⁸. His prescription for creating a sociopolitical and economic system governed by the tenets of Islam, is widely cited by Islamic movements as an alternate to western capitalist democracy. Qutb has also tremendously influenced leaders of radical Islamic movements, including Ayman al-Zawahiri, the current leader of Al-Qaeda.¹³⁹ Hence, Sayyid Qutb's prescriptions can be used as a proxy for the Militant Islam worldview.

Smith would have naturally disagreed with many of Qutb's prescriptions; he strongly believed that free markets would establish a productive and prosperous society for everyone. "Universal opulence", he argued, was a derivative of unimpeded free markets. Although Qutb's worldview is different, he did not completely disapprove of Capitalism; instead, he opposed the unrestrained accumulation of capital and unlimited profits, when a large part of society lived in misery and poverty as a result. He argued for a productive use of capital and for compassionate constraint on capitalist operations. He proposed a model of social democracy that placed limits and restrictions on the free market; one which reflected the unified relationship between God and human beings. In essence, Qutb placed a greater importance on community solidarity and divine harmony over profits and material wealth. He believed that the economy is not separate from the rest of social life, but is integrated and must be regulated by God's law. In Islam, he argued, the

¹³⁸ *Milestone, In the Shadow of the Quran and Social Justice in Islam* are his most popular works.

¹³⁹ Wright, Lawrence. *The Looming Tower: Al-Qaeda and the Road to 9/11*. New York: Knopf, 2006.; Qutb's brother, Muhammad Qutb, was a teacher of Al-Qaeda's founder Osama bin Laden.

economic and spiritual values mutually influence one another, unlike in the West where they are disconnected domains.

From this analysis, it is clear that Smith and Qutb share certain beliefs; but, it is also very apparent that they have very different visions for the society they would like to create. Smith essentially wanted to create a socioeconomic system that is governed by the free market. The primary objective of his economic system was to increase the wealth of nation, and he also argued that it was also the only way to achieve universal opulence. Qutb observed the detrimental affects of the capitalist economy of Egypt and the West, on a large part of his society, so he argued for the establishment of a socio-political and economic system governed by Islam to achieve social justice. In essence, Smith supports economic justice through the market, while Qutb (primarily) wants economic and social justice, through the Islamic economy. The differences in their visions and objectives exemplify the different worldviews of the West and Militant Islam, and the conflict between them.

VI. Bibliography

Abu-Rabi', Ibrahim M. *Intellectual Origins of Islamic Resurgence in the Modern Arab World*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1996.

Armstrong, Karen. *Islam: A Short History*. New York: Modern Library, 2000.

Berman, Ilan. *Winning the Long War: Retaking the Offensive against Radical Islam*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2009.

Berman, Paul. "The Philosopher of Islamic Terror." *The New York Times*. 2003. Accessed April 14, 2016. <http://www.nytimes.com/2003/03/23/magazine/the-philosopher-of-islamic-terror.html?pagewanted=all>.

Borgeson, Kevin, and Robin Valeri. *Terrorism in America*. Sudbury, MA: Jones and Bartlett, 2009.

Bristow, William. "Enlightenment." *Stanford University*. 2010. Accessed April 14, 2016.

<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/enlightenment/>.

Calvert, John. *Sayyid Qutb and the Origins of Radical Islamism*. Columbia University Press, 2009.

Fleischacker, Samuel. *On Adam Smith's Wealth of Nations: A Philosophical Companion*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2004.

Hutcheson, Francis. *A System of Moral Philosophy*. New York: A.M. Kelley, 1968.

Locke, John. *Two Treatises of Government*. Watchmaker Publishing, 2011.

Pack, Spencer J., and Eric Schliesser. "Smith's Humean Criticism of Hume's Account of the Origin of Justice." *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 44, no. 1 (2006): 47-63.

Pesciarelli, Enzo. "On Adam Smith's Lectures On Jurisprudence." *Scottish J Political Economy* *Scottish Journal of Political Economy* 33, no. 1 (1986): 74-85.

Qutb, Sayyid. *Islam and Universal Peace*. Indianapolis: American Trust Publications, 1977.

Qutb, Sayyid, and William E. Shepard. *Sayyid Qutb and Islamic Activism: A Translation and Critical Analysis of Social Justice in Islam*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996.

Qutb, Sayyid. *Social Justice in Islam*. Oneonta, NY: Islamic Publications International, 2000.

Qutb, Sayyid. *Milestones*. Islamic Book Service, 2006.

Rae, John. *Life of Adam Smith*. New York: Kelley, 1965.

Rotwein, Eugene. *The Economic Thought of David Hume*. 1950.

Smith, Adam. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. Indianapolis: Liberty Classics, 1981.

Smith, Adam, D. D. Raphael, and A. L. Macfie. *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*. Indianapolis: Liberty Classics, 1982.

Smith, Adam, Ronald L. Meek, D. D. Raphael, and Peter Stein. *Lectures on Jurisprudence*. Indianapolis: Liberty Classics, 1982.

Tawney, R. H. *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism; a Historical Study ..* New York: Harcourt, Brace and, 1926.

Toth, James. *Sayyid Qutb: The Life and Legacy of a Radical Islamic Intellectual*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Uzgalis, William. "John Locke." Stanford University. 2001. Accessed April 14, 2016.
<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/locke/>.

Wright, Lawrence. *The Looming Tower: Al-Qaeda and the Road to 9/11*. New York: Knopf, 2006.