



HAL
open science

The Economic Origins of Conscience in Ibn Khaldun's Thought

Ahmed E Souaiaia

► **To cite this version:**

Ahmed E Souaiaia. The Economic Origins of Conscience in Ibn Khaldun's Thought. 2023. hal-03963907v1

HAL Id: hal-03963907

<https://hal.science/hal-03963907v1>

Preprint submitted on 30 Jan 2023 (v1), last revised 12 Oct 2023 (v4)

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Copyright

Introduction

Ibn Khaldun may have been the last Islamic thinker who understood and interpreted the world without any measure of influence from the profusion of Western ideas and events that shaped modern civilization.¹ He was one of the most original and provocative, yet non-consequential, social historians and political thinkers, in large part because he lived at a singular moment in history: at the seam of the Islamic and Western civilizations. As he predicted, Islamic civilization had reached a stage of decline, and there was no single strategic systems thinker who could have reversed the course of its historical trajectory at that point. Therefore, Ibn Khaldun's contribution should not be assessed the same way as Renaissance and Enlightenment thinkers' contributions: by how much influence they had on their contemporary and successive leaders and thinkers. Rather, Ibn Khaldun's contributions ought to be weighed by the quality of knowledge that he passed on and the utility of predictions derived from his knowledge; for he lived on the edge of human transition from one extraordinarily volatile era to another. Moreover, in academia, originality is a modern standard, one that lacks humility one might add; it is not a universal standard that cuts across cultures and times. Ibn Khaldun would have judged his own work and the works of his peers by their depth and breadth of knowledge; an attempt is made here to examine his work from that perspective as well.

Considering the fact that the Renaissance signaled a robust interest in investigating previous cultures' most significant contributions to art, architecture, astronomy, science and literature, and given that Ibn Khaldun, as his work testifies, was engaged in collecting and cataloging human advances in these same areas of knowledge, it is curious that Western Renaissance thinkers did not give his work the same attention or make it the subject of interest in the same way they justified their interest in Greek and Roman cultures. This omission becomes even more curious given the fact that Ibn Khaldun produced his seminal works during the same period when Renaissance thinkers started on their journey of rediscovering the legacy of ancient civilizations, around the 14th century CE.

Later generations of scholars, including Enlightenment thinkers and beyond, did not rectify Renaissance thinkers' exclusion of Ibn Khaldun's work from the processes of exploring ancient classics. It was not until the emergence of Orientalist scholars in the 20th century that thinkers began attempting to translate and engage with Ibn Khaldun's thought.

Still, in the context of modern Western scholarship on the Islamic civilization and the emerging academic area of study broadly known as "Islamic studies," Ibn Khaldun should be the most studied classical Islamic thinker. Yet little consensus—through scholarly assessments of his theoretical framework, and particularly its originality and significance—has emerged about the nature of his work. The few works Orientalist scholars who have produced regarding Ibn Khaldun are more focused on discrediting his thought than on conducting a substantive examination of his work.

For instance, after embarking on review of previous works of scholarship that might have influenced Ibn Khaldun, a twentieth century Orientalist found that Ibn Khaldun's claim to originality is, at best, disappointing. The review's author argued that, notwithstanding any direct link between Ibn Khaldun's work to works of previous thinkers, we should not assume his ideas are his: "In what measure Ibn Khaldun was influenced by the writings of the authors just passed in review, or by others, is hard to determine." Nonetheless, because some of the ideas he touched upon were "widely held (having been effectively treated in Plato's political works) and must have been known to Ibn Khaldun,"² the Orientalist author argues, no measure of originality should be granted to Ibn Khaldun. Some Orientalist scholars are even willing to credit Ibn Khaldun's ideas to 15th-century Fürstenspiegel literature,³ a post-Ibn Khaldun development, rather concede that Ibn Khaldun had contributed original ideas that progressed thinking. In the view of these scholars, what Ibn Khaldun did was cobble together a framework out of "bits and details,"⁴ not produce a coherent, congruent, original work of scholarship.

Secondary literature that engaged with Ibn Khaldun's thought were shallow, uninformed, and rooted in conjectures perhaps due to personal bias or lack of a linguistic capacity and competence that would have allowed their authors to skillfully parse and analyze Ibn Khaldun's complex thinking. By these authors' consistent reference to the translation, it is evident that the secondary literature Orientalists produced relied heavily on the assumptions and conjectures of translators to craft and support their own conjecture-based assessments of Ibn Khaldun's ideas. Economist Joseph J. Spengler, for instance, asserts that it "remains true, however, that [Ibn Khaldun] knew or drew on many sources, among them Fürstenspiegel and administrative writings."⁵ This statement that Ibn Khaldun's source material is uncontested fact—that what he used as sources "remains true"—is not, in itself, a finding based on facts. It comes from on another assumption, which Ibn Khaldun's translator, Franz Rosenthal, proposed:

We should perhaps be justified in assuming that practically every matter of detail found in the *Muqaddimah* was probably not original with Ibn Khaldun, but had been previously expressed elsewhere. Even his characterization of *`asabiyah* as a positive factor in society, or his demand for knowledge of social conditions as prerequisite to the historian's correct evaluation of historical information, although seemingly original ideas, may have been inspired by a source yet to be rediscovered.⁶

Such poor grasp of Ibn Khaldun's nuanced and technical formulation of ideas was evident in the way Orientalist scholars understood and presented their interpretation of Ibn Khaldun's main theory, which in their view is related to the cyclicity of civilization. They opined that "civilization and culture," as Ibn Khaldun presents them, "had moved somewhat cyclically, fluctuating between nomadism and sedentary civilizations."⁷ Moreover, scholars who engaged with the translations of Ibn Khaldun's work saw his ideas as limited and applicable only to the cultures and communities with which he was familiar—those of Spain and North Africa. Some modern

Western scholars explicitly denied that Ibn Khaldun “apprehended or intended so universal a model” based on his “cultural fluctuation”⁸ theory.

Either because of the flaws in the translation, or because of their failure to appreciate Ibn Khaldun’s careful and deliberate choice of words to discuss technical matters, Orientalist scholars collapse Ibn Khaldun’s categories into a single conceptual framework. They erroneously see his reference to *‘Umran* and *Hadara* as using two different words to refer to the same thing: culture. The cyclical theory, which Orientalists see as the only semi-original idea that Ibn Khaldun contributed, is—in their understandings—rooted in his “concern with ‘civilization’ (*‘Umran*), or culture.”⁹

It is important to note that most secondary works on Ibn Khaldun draw heavily, if not exclusively, from a single translation of *al-Muqaddima*, which has not been significantly revised since it was first published more than half a century ago.¹⁰ At first glance, the lack of other translations of all or parts of *al-Muqaddima* might suggest that Rosenthal’s original translation was adequate and authoritative enough to render producing a new translation redundant and unnecessary. To answer this question, we must review not only the body of secondary literature, but, importantly, the translation of Ibn Khaldun’s *Muqaddima* that non-Arabic literate scholars have used, comment generally on translation as an interpretive activity, and present an alternative translation to the section on economics. Here, the goal is the latter, and to highlight some of Ibn Khaldun’s theoretical ideas, especially those distinguishable from related ideas driving modern institutions and informing the modern discourses in a number of critical areas of public life.

The Meaning and Functions of Translation

Examining the body of secondary literature that introduces and interprets Ibn Khaldun’s economic ideas reveals a curious pattern: The English secondary works that relied exclusively on the English translation share the same understanding, assessment, and critiques; whereas the English secondary works that relied on the Arabic only, or on the English translation and the Arabic works, were divergent and diverse in terms of their understandings, assessments, and critiques of Ibn Khaldun’s ideas. This pattern alone, ironic in its notable unoriginality, was compelling enough for this author to take a closer look at the English translation and compare it to the Arabic text. However, needing to research and answer many serious questions from students about Ibn Khaldun’s idea made it imperative that more primary sources are examined, including the Arabic work—*al-Muqaddima*. In doing so, it was discovered that in addition to substantive differences resulting from the variance among the slightly different manuscripts and/or editions of the Arabic text, there were also serious errors with word choice and, in many cases, missteps with basic understanding of the North African Arabic dialect that influenced Ibn Khaldun’s writing. To illustrate the nature of the problems with Rosenthal’s translation, it suffices to point out just one example.

In Section Nine (*al-fasl al-tasi`*) of Part Five (*al-bab al-khamis*) of Book One (*al-kitab al-awwal*), covering economic themes, Ibn Khaldun defines trade (*tijara*) this way:

*i`lam anna al-tijarata muhawalatu al-kasb bi-tanmiyati al-mali bi-shira`i al-sila`i bi-l-rukhsi wa-bay`iha bi-al-ghala`i ayyama kanati al-sil`atu min daqiqin aw zar`in aw hayawani aw qumash.*¹¹

Here is how Rosenthal translated this passage:

It should be known that commerce means the attempt to make a profit by increasing capital, through buying goods at a low price and selling them at a high price, whether these goods consist of slaves, grain, animals, weapons, or clothing material.

Here is this author's translation:

It should be known that trade is the attempt to earn money by augmenting capital through the buying of merchandise at a cheap price and selling it at an expensive price, whether the merchandise might it be flour, crop, animal, or fabric.

The difference between these translations is not merely disagreement over word choice in the presence of many options from many cognates—like “trade” or “commerce.” Rather, the difference touches on substantive additions and omissions. Unequivocally, in the Arabic text, the list of “goods” (*sila`*) names only four objects. Rosenthal's list consists of five objects. The difference could be attributed to the source upon which Rosenthal relied. However, all available critical editions of the Arabic work were examined by this author and none of them included words for “slaves” or “weapons.” Since the word “slaves” was the first on the list, different editions were consulted to see whether, in any of the Arabic editions, the Arabic word commonly used to denote slave or slaves, *`abd/`abid*, is present. No such words appeared. It is known that the Arabic word *daqiq* looks very similar to the Arabic word *raqiq*. It was possible to suspected, then, that Rosenthal had determined that the Arabic text contained an error, whereby the letter “d” was mistakenly used instead of the letter “r”—since both letters look very similar in Arabic writing. However, even with this logical explanation in mind, a critical question went unanswered: Why would Rosenthal assume that the word *daqiq* was out of place and could not be the word Ibn Khaldun used or intended to use?

The answer to the above question might be found in at least two hypotheses: (1) Rosenthal's lack of appreciation for the distinction between eastern Arabic (east of Egypt) and Western Arabic, or Maghribi Arabic; and (2) personal bias that tainted not only Rosenthal's work, but many works by academicians who became known as Orientalist scholars.

Many interpreters of and commentators on Ibn Khaldun's work did not pay close attention to the fact that Ibn Khaldun relied on Maghribi Arabic. The word *daqiq* in Arabic may mean fine, detailed, or thin. But none of those words make sense in the context of the passage. However, the word *daqiq* has been used throughout the Maghrib region to refer to ground grain, or flour. Rosenthal, being a classical (rather than Maghribi) Arabic specialist, may not have known this usage.

Western scholars are familiar with the notion that some human beings might be considered "property." Within Western societies, women and slaves have been considered "property." They also understand this to have been the case in some Arab and Islamic societies. The Quran, for instance, refers to enslaved war captives as "what your right hand possessed."¹² It is not farfetched, then, to believe that Ibn Khaldun considered slaves to be a form of goods or merchandise (*sil`a*). He might have. But in this context, he did not. It is far more probable that he meant "flour."

In the same space, Rosenthal understood *kasb* to mean "profit." Ibn Khaldun is very specific and deliberate about the use of the words *kasb* and *rizq*. He coined these words to mean specific things and he used them consistently in specific contexts. Nonetheless, Rosenthal collapses Ibn Khaldun's sentence and the meanings of his words to define trade as the act of profiting from selling goods. Ibn Khaldun defines trade (*tijara*) as a process or scheme of increasing one's wealth (*mal*). There is a clear and significant difference, as it will be explained when Ibn Khaldun's theory on the store of value, virtues of trade, and other matters related to economics are introduced in later parts of this work.

Disagreements over which cognates to use alone is compelling enough to encourage others to propose different translations of the same work. However, these diverging choices in combination with the disagreements involving personal and social bias, the lack of appreciation of the level of influence of Berber languages and cultures on Ibn Khaldun's writing, and the fact of Ibn Khaldun's highly technical language, make it imperative that scholars with diverse expertise and disciplines produce new translations of the work of one of the most important thinkers and record-keepers of the Islamic civilization.

In the end, the connotations of the English words and concepts scholars chose to translate Ibn Khaldun's text was too significant and critical to simply dismiss them as disagreements over word choice. Another reason, corollary to the first reason, is this: If translation is substantively and significantly different from Rosenthal's, and if it is clear that the act of translation is in fact interpretation—rather than unbiased and mechanical rendering of ideas in two different languages—then secondary works based on translations from primary sources should not be treated as equivalent to their corresponding primary sources in an academic context.

Ibn Khaldun's work is both descriptive and prescriptive. For the descriptive portion, Ibn Khaldun seems to have relied on ethnographic observations, archival research,

and archeological artifacts. His prescriptive contribution is driven by deductive and inductive reasoning, data analysis, and the application of Quranic principles as critical instruments of thought and behavior. Taken as a whole, Ibn Khaldun produced a remarkable work of scholarship that is difficult to decipher, insightful in its explanation of events and objects, comprehensive in its coverage, and deeply informative in its record keeping.

Understanding Ibn Khaldun's Approach to Knowledge

Understanding Ibn Khaldun's economics cannot be fully achieved without understanding Ibn Khaldun's conceptualization of civilization and the nature and evolutions of other systems that give rise to human civilizations.¹³ He addressed these issues in Section (*fasl*) 17, which precedes the section on economics.

As the title of the Section asserts, civilization¹⁴ is the creation of the State¹⁵ and the existence and persistence of civilization is directly connected to the State (*dawla*) and to the persistence and longevity of the State. As such, civilization becomes a universal social condition that emerges out of enduring urbanization.¹⁶ Civilization is a stage in human societal development that describes a universal system, not a cultural or communal closed system.

Before going further in our analysis, it should be noted that these terms are highly technical. Ibn Khaldun deliberately selected and coined these specific words to denote distinct concepts, ideas, and systems.¹⁷ Additionally, it is critically important to factor in the influence of Berber languages and North African dialects on the writing style and discourse Ibn Khaldun adopted.

First, Ibn Khaldun was the first to coin the words *Hadara* and *ʿUmran* in reference to two conditions or states of human development. *ʿUmran* is a concept derived from the Arabic word that means, among other things: age, lifecycle, endurance, persistence, and longevity. Ibn Khaldun uses the word *ʿUmran* to refer to groups of human beings settling and occupying a specific space for a continuous period of time. In other words, it is a reference to people living in clusters, for instance large cities, year-round and for multiple generations, that is to say: enduring urban living. Ibn Khaldun qualifies urbanization this way to distinguish it from regions settled by communities who move around depending on the seasons, other natural patterns, and the availability of natural resources. The uninterrupted, persistent living in the same location is carefully signaled by the choice of the Arabic root, *ʿ-m-r*, which suggests the existence of a living being with a natural lifespan (*ʿumr*). This qualification of urbanization as a living, time-bound being becomes useful when Ibn Khaldun proposes his theory of the lifespan of dynasties or political regimes tethered to specific human societies.

Ibn Khaldun holds that the existence of *ʿUmran* is a prerequisite for the emergence of *Hadara*. In this sense, and contrary to what some Orientalist scholars have suggested, Ibn Khaldun does not think that *ʿUmran* and *Hadara* are the same thing. He is explicit in his proposition that, without settled, enduring, populated cities

(*Umran*), there can be no civilization (*Hadara*). Moreover, the rise of a civilization is dependent on the degree of urbanization, to the extent that there exists a threshold that a settled urban area must attain for a civilization to be born. Yet, the variation among human civilizations is limited only by the level of urbanization, which in turn spurs the intense economic activity and production of goods and services.

Lastly, a third determinant system must be present to enable the emergence of a civilization: the State.¹⁸ The State, according to Ibn Khaldun, is a necessary but not sufficient exclusive factor that must be present for a human civilization to exist and thrive. The State must exist because it is the force that can secure, redistribute, and grow wealth (*amwal*). Here, too, Ibn Khaldun distinguishes between a political power holder, like an individual king or a clan, and the political governing institution. In the paradigm Ibn Khaldun proposed, the triad that makes human civilization possible consists of these elements: enduring urban centers, a diversified workforce, and a powerful State. He summarized this paradigm this way: “Power and State produce the market of the world.”¹⁹

The system that we can envision here, based on Ibn Khaldun’s conceptual framework, is one in which *work* becomes the only store of value, represented by the temporal intensity (time) and level of diversification and sophistication of work (skill; expertise). The stability and endurance of urbanization depend on the ability of the State to secure the space (market) within which, and the instruments (currency) with which, goods and services are produced and traded. Here, the significance of the idea that work, not money, is the only store of value cannot be overstated. The implication of this view is that work becomes a unit, a metric for measuring the value of goods and services, not price in terms of money.

Ibn Khaldun was not satisfied with simply identifying the three elements that connect the social systems that produce human civilization. He went further to suggest that zeal²⁰ fulfils its mission when individuals obtain political power, and that rural living evolves to create the conditions that would enable a civilization to thrive.²¹ Therefore, the same way the individual human being goes through a determinate lifecycle that peaks at forty years; each human civilization, too, has a lifecycle. What he seems to suggest by this analysis is that set goals, be they set by nature or by culture, predetermine the span of the lifecycle of human existence, be it the biological individual, the person, or the social being of the civilization. As a general rule, he suggests that once a being attains their ultimate goal, they predetermine for themselves the span of their lifecycle, its peak, and its phase of decline. Human civilization is the ultimate goal beyond which there is no other goal.²² Therefore, civilization marks the peak of the trajectory of the collective human lifecycle.

What Ibn Khaldun is suggesting here is this: Human beings,²³ individually and collectively, are outcomes of a network of self-regulating systems. Once they subject themselves to the forces of the various systems that power their individual and collective selves to achieve their respective goal (*ghaya*), they are bound to become

outcomes, in and of themselves, of the systems they design and deploy to govern their lifestyles.

The connection between the collective and the individual, as Ibn Khaldun sees it, is remarkable. Since the prerequisites of attaining civilizational status are diversified work in a highly competitive environment of settled and enduring urban centers,²⁴ the virtues of each activity must be imprinted on the individual human being involved in that specific activity, rendering him an obedient object of the various systems that govern his behavior. Ibn Khaldun ends up tethering human behavior, which is deeply shaped by one's activities for making a living, to human conscience.

With the connections that Ibn Khaldun makes between urbanization, diversified work, and human temperament,²⁵ he allows us, his readers, to move freely between the moral and the social, between the social and the psychological, and between the material and the emotional forms of existence, showing both interconnectedness and individuality. In other words, we can bypass the idea of whether humans are intrinsically anything—good, bad, courageous, brave, etc.—in favor of understanding that each human being, at their core, is the outcome of their social and environmental systems. Ibn Khaldun unpacks this fluid transition between the social, the psychological, and the moral in human beings in more detail in the section on economic life.

Another important idea that provides more critical context for Ibn Khaldun's theory on civilization is his assertion that the evolution of a human culture to attain the status of a civilization does not represent a virtuous evolution whereby humans attain moral good through the way they conduct their individual and collective life. For, although he theorizes that intense urbanization necessarily leads to a more complete civilization,²⁶ he nonetheless cautions that the completeness of a civilization is often accompanied by increased power in the hands of the State. And because powerful states tend to impose higher taxes to meet increased expenditures, the increased taxation leads to increased prices of goods and services, which leads to inflation. This course of events is often irreversible according to Ibn Khaldun, because in enduring, settled urban settings, human beings become bound by the systems—cultural and societal, conceptual and practical—that they designed and by which they live,²⁷ rendering them incapable of altering their behaviors, including their spending behavior. As such, civilization is always marked by excess.²⁸ Excess, in the view of Ibn Khaldun, compromises the integrity²⁹ of the overall system that sustains humans as individuals and as a collective. With disintegration, corruption, exploitation, and dislocation overtaking human values and directing behavior, civilization, in the opinion of Ibn Khaldun, emerges as an immoral, non-virtuous stage of the life of the collective.

The goal of urbanization (*al-`umran*) is civilization (*al-hadara*); excess (*taraf*) is a likely outcome of civilization; when urbanization achieves its goal—building a civilization, urbanization turns into corruption (*fasad*)... indeed, the ethic gained from civilization through the pursuit of excess is exactly corruption (*`ayn al-fasad*) for the human being is a human being (*insan*) if and only if he is able to balance securing that

which benefits him and repelling that which harms him while maintaining upright ethics (*istiḡamati khuluḡihi*).³⁰

It should be clear by now why understanding the meaning and functions of civilization, urbanization, and political power, as Ibn Khaldun imagines them, is essential for understanding the economic life of humans regardless of the environment in which they conduct their productive and consumptive activities—be it an urban setting, the precursor to civilizational rise; or in a rural setting, the precursor to urbanization. With these ideas in mind, we shall now focus on several key ideas derived from *al-Muḡaddima*'s section on economics and economic life.

Although Ibn Khaldun discusses, in fewer details, themes that are connected to economic life throughout the various sections and chapters of *al-Muḡaddima*, it is in Chapter 1 of Book 5 that he focuses specifically on economic topics including subsistence, building wealth, work, investment, capital, types of work, and related subjects. The highlights of his key ideas, therefore, come from this particular section of Ibn Khaldun's *Muḡaddima*.³¹

Ibn Khaldun lays out the framework within which his analysis of economics takes place. He generalizes that God created all that is on Earth and made it available to all human beings, who are the collective beneficiaries. However, when something is obtained (*hasala; husul*) by the hand (*yad*)³² of one person, it becomes prohibited for another person to possess it except through exchange for something of close value (*iwad*). From this framework, key features of economic Islamic theories, as Muslim scholars including Ibn Khaldun promulgate, emerge to the foreground.

First, according to Ibn Khaldun, all that is on Earth is made by an external force, God. All that is made by the external force is a communal³³ resource for all people. Individual human beings may possess³⁴ some of these otherwise communal resources through work (*amal*). Once a person gains possession of something through work, it becomes proscribed for someone else to claim it except through an exchange. This exchange could include an instrument that serves as a store of value (*dhakhira, qinya*), such as gold and silver, which are also created or provided by an external force—God. In Ibn Khaldun's paradigm, these are foundational elements that inform economic life.

Second, since all these elements are internally shared resources that an external force (God) has provided, the only individual element that can be claimed by every person as intrinsically their own, and that can determine a person's social and economic weight, is *work*. As such, according to Ibn Khaldun, all systems of assessment and measurement of economic input and output must use work as their foundational unit—for nothing has a value without work. Aware of this extraordinary generalization, Ibn Khaldun explains that some work is obvious, especially among artisans and craftspersons. But even things of value whose existence may not immediately appear to be the outcome of human work, are in fact so; they are just not as obvious to the casual observer.

For this definition of work to hold, Ibn Khaldun distinguishes between two outcomes of work. Subsistence (*rizq*) is any outcome of work that results in providing human beings with necessities including food, clothing, shelter, and other goods and services that sustain and preserve the well-being of the human being. Ibn Khaldun argues that on the surface, securing (*husul*) some of these basic needs, like food from plants that grow due to natural processes like rain and sunlight, may not require work. In reality, he adds, such natural interventions go in tandem with human labor (*mu`in*), for a person must still exert some effort, or work, to process the product and consume it. Securing *rizq* (*tahsil al-rizq*) can occur through a number of systems: fishing and hunting (*istiyad*), taxation-based income that the State provides (*jibaya*), domestication (*tadjin*) of animals, or cultivation of plants (*falahan*).

The second outcome of work is earnings, income, or earned income (*kasb*). *Kasb*, for him, is all that is acquired (*mutamallak*) through one's work and one's power (*sa`y, qudra*) and that is above and beyond one's *rizq*. *Kasb* can be achieved through direct³⁵ human work, through crafting and skilled labor (*sana`i*), or through trade (*tijara*). Ibn Khaldun does not see any other legitimate paths for subsistence or for earned income.

It is a mistake to assume that Ibn Khaldun thought that *rizq* (subsistence) can be derived only from some basic activities like hunting, fishing, and farming. The inclusion of taxation as a source for subsistence connects subsistence to all other activities that result in *kasb* (earned income). Since the State often acts through levying taxes and fees on all economic activities to predetermine the political economy of the nation, Ibn Khaldun envisions *rizq* to be a base income that every human being must secure regardless of their ability or disability, regardless of their skill, and regardless of their access to capital. If a person is able to work, they will be able to provide subsistence for themselves and for those under their care. If they are unable to work, then it is the responsibility of the State, through taxation, to provide for those who cannot provide subsistence for themselves and for those under their responsibility. In this paradigm, the State is under the obligation to provide that base level of income, *rizq*, and is under the prohibition of not taxing basic income (*rizq*). This distinction is important within the context of modern taxation regimes that tax on income, which stands in contrast to Islamic taxation systems that effect wealth but not exclusively income.

This framing of work as a central currency allows Ibn Khaldun to proceed to categorize and catalog the types of work humans perform for both subsistence and for building wealth. In this context, he coins the word *sina`a* (pl. *sana`i*) to refer to all activities that would allow one to make a living (*rizq*) or to build wealth (*kasb*). It is in this context, then, that Ibn Khaldun makes the remarkable claim that what a person does for a living will decide what kind of a person, ethically and morally speaking, that person would be or is. Ibn Khaldun holds that without work, humans are unable to access and consume the resources God provides. Therefore, any attempt to generate income without work is necessarily exploitative and leads to harming the integrity of systems (*fasad*) that sustain human beings.

In this section, as is the case in all of his work, Ibn Khaldun combines a remarkable understanding of the professions and activities he describes with a sharp mind that enables him to prescribe provocative and intriguing theories and explanations. A good translation that attempts to match Ibn Khaldun's appreciation of the use of language to inform and intrigue should do his work on economics justice. Here it would suffice to highlight what might be some of his consequential ideas.

His insistence that human beings are the product of what they do should be subject of critical examination for scholars from a number of disciplines today, especially given the dominance of some philosophical and scientific approaches that do not share that point of view.

Another aspect of Ibn Khaldun's thought seemingly absent from modern scholars' critical analyses of his work is his approach as a systems thinker. The idea that all events are outcomes of systems, and that human beings are subject to natural systems as well as to additional systems that they design themselves and apply to their lives, is compelling and deeply original when taken in the context of Islamic thought and beyond during that time. His notion that systems imprint their outcomes on their subjects is fascinating for many reasons.

For instance, thinking in terms of systems as understood by Ibn Khaldun would suggest, among other things, that it is not important or useful to think that people are not smart and dumb because they are created so. Rather, it is more constructive, according to Ibn Khaldun, to think that people are smart, dumb, deceitful, hypocritical, courageous, cowardly, noble, meek, humble, or any other characteristic through their *sina`a*. The things human beings do in life over a long period of time require of them certain behavioral traits, and the habits that make them successful in their line of work also imprint on them the traits built from those habits. In other words, what one does for a profession or vocation rewrites one's conscience and sense of self.

What Ibn Khaldun is suggesting, through this connection of all the systems that act on the human being, is that the material world is ultimately connected to the human mind to a degree that the human soul carries the influences of lived experience beyond their material existence. He posits that fragments of human work live in the memory of the collective, with the power to influence the cultures and conditions of future generations. He used the idea of the persistence of lived experience in the form of a spiritual "haunting" power when he explained the consequences of exploitative trade practices that manipulate peoples' access to basic needs.

Also of significance is Ibn Khaldun's vision of the State as an institution and a determinant system that has the power, and often the will, to override market-based systems and rules, to promote one form of trade over another. Specifically, he held that the State is the determinant system when it comes to creating and sustaining crafts because it can create demand. It can fund the learning and transfer of crafts, and it can fund the markets for the products of such crafts. If the State wishes to terminate or devalue a craft and its product it can do so, even if demand is there.

Markets alone cannot create demand unless the State wills it. This stream of thought is not only intriguing in its own historical and cultural contexts, but also relevant given the competing visions in the modern area of political economy.

Conclusions

As a systems thinker, Ibn Khaldun believed deeply that knowledge is an accretive, accumulated body of information. In this way he differs from modern scholars, for whom originality of thought is more valuable—even an obsessive priority—over accumulated knowledge. Ibn Khaldun was well aware that the knowledge he acquired was the providence of generations of scholars and thinkers that preceded him. As a product of modern scholars, perhaps responding to modern scholarship, this author may have indirectly emphasized the fact that Ibn Khaldun was an original thinker more than Ibn Khaldun would have cared to believe of himself. Perhaps our modern boilerplate scientific method that requires a literature review section before producing our own analysis is what compels us to theorize and comment on earlier scholars' original thought. It should not be the point of discussion here. What should be promoted is for modern scholars to examine Ibn Khaldun's contributions on the basis of their own merit and as presented in their original language.

This essay is not intended to be a substitute for direct engagement with Ibn Khaldun's thought in translation or in its original language. It is intended to encourage other researchers and scholars from other disciplines to take a fresh look at the Ibn Khaldun's work in its own context and with open minds—minds free from the limitations of our cultural and professional biases. Such renewed attention would require us to consider the fact that it is difficult, but possible, to see and access that which our “work” allows us to read and think, and that we are, after all, the products of the systems that govern our *sina`a*—one of Ibn Khaldun's theories that connects our material world to our conscience.

Endnotes

¹ By the close of 1900 CE, scholars had cited Ibn Khaldun about 50 times. However, most entries were references to historical events mentioned in Ibn Khaldun's work. Prior to the 20th century, no major work engaged with his theoretical contribution. Since the start of the 20th century, on the other hand, scholars have referenced Ibn Khaldun about 9,000 times. In contrast: Thomas Aquinas has been cited about 90,000 times; René Descartes, 50,000; Immanuel Kant, 80,000; and Emile Durkheim, to whom Ibn Khaldun is often compared, 45,000 scholarly references.

² Spengler, J. J. (1964), "Economic Thought of Islam: Ibn Khaldun." *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 6(3), 268–306; pp. 283.

³ Spengler; 283.

⁴ Spengler; 283.

⁵ Spengler; 283.

⁶ From Franz Rosenthal's commentary on *al-Muqaddima*; a fuller quote than the one cited by Spengler, 283.

⁷ Spengler; 289.

⁸ Spengler; 289.

⁹ Spengler; 294; See also Dale, Stephen Frederic (2006), "Ibn Khaldun: The Last Greek and the First Annaliste Historian." *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, vol. 38, no. 3, pp. 431–51; Gibb, H. A. R. (1933), "The Islamic Background of Ibn Khaldūn's Political Theory." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies*, University of London, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 23–31; Rosen, Lawrence (2005), "Theorizing from within: Ibn Khaldun and His Political Culture." *Contemporary Sociology*, vol. 34, no. 6, pp. 596–99; Jean David C. Boulakia. "Ibn Khaldūn: A Fourteenth-Century Economist." *Journal of Political Economy*, vol. 79, no. 5, 1971, pp. 1105–18; Gellner, Ernest (1975), "Cohesion and Identity: The Maghreb from Ibn Khaldun to Emile Durkheim." *Government and Opposition*, vol. 10, no. 2, 203–18; and de Muijnck, Sam, et al. (2021), "History of Economic Thought & Methods." *Economy Studies: A Guide to Rethinking Economics Education*, Amsterdam University Press, 187–99.

¹⁰ Franz Rosenthal's English translation with the title, *The Muqaddimah: An Introduction to History*, was first published by Pantheon Books as part of the Bollingen Series in 1958.

¹¹ The Arabic Text (Ibn Khaldūn. *al-Muqaddima*, (Morocco: Khizanat Ibn Khaldun--Bayt al-funun wa-l-`ulum wa-l-adab, 2005); referenced, after this instance, as *al-Muqaddima*):

اعلم أن التجارة محاولة الكسب بتتمية المال بشراء السلع بالرخص و بيعها بالغلاء أيام كانت السلعة من دقيق أو زرع أو حيوان أو فماش.

¹² *ma malakat aymanukum*.

¹³ Bakar, Osman (2017), "Towards A New Science of Civilization. A Synthetic Study of the Philosophical Views of al-Farabi, Ibn Khaldun, Arnold Toynbee, and Samuel Huntington." *Synthesis Philosophica* 31.2, 311-33.

¹⁴ *al-Hadara*.

¹⁵ *al-Dawla*.

¹⁶ *al-`Umran*.

¹⁷ Because Ibn Khaldun is deliberate in his choice of technical terms, and because he coins words that have multiple meanings and implications, some words ought not be translated but instead remain as Arabic words, notwithstanding potential for breaking the reading flow when foreign words are truncated within the text of the narrative. This decision became more appealing when I examined other translations and noticed that the word choice for the translation of certain words was either influenced by personal bias or by the failure to find an English word that is as encompassing and inclusive as the original Arabic. The words *sina`a* and *muru'a*, for instance, are good examples of the inefficiency and inappropriateness of the words craft and manliness, which were used by other translators, including Rosenthal.

¹⁸ *al-Dawla*.

¹⁹ "*al-sultan wa-l-dawla souq al-`alam*." *al-Muqaddima*, 2:223.

²⁰ *`asabiyya*.

²¹ “*al-hadara ghaya li-l-badawa.*” *al-Muqaddima*, 2:226.

²² “*ghaya la mazid wara’aha.*” *al-Muqaddima*, 2:226.

²³ *al-insan.*

²⁴ *mata kana al-`umranu akthar, kanati al-hadaratu akmal. al-Muqaddima*, 2:227.

²⁵ Keep in mind that Ibn Khaldun held that what humans do, as work, imprints certain traits, ethics, and habits on their soul (*tatalawwan al-nafs min tilka al-`awa’id bi-alwanin kathira*).

²⁶ *mata kana al-`umranu akthar, kanati al-hadaratu akmal. al-Muqaddima*, 2:227.

²⁷ “*la yajiduna walijajatan `an dhalika lima malakahum min asri al-`awa’idi wa-ta`atiha.*”

²⁸ *Taraf.*

²⁹ *Fasad*, is the concept Ibn Khaldun uses to connect corruption of any system when it is deployed in a way or for a purpose it was not intended for.

³⁰ *al-Muqaddima*, 2:229.

³¹ For reference to specific sections of the Arabic text, see Ibn Khaldūn (2005), *al-Muqaddima*, Morocco: Khizanat Ibn Khaldun--Bayt al-funun wa-l-`ulum wa-l-adab, 2:243.

³² The use of the word *yad* (hand) should not be overlooked or downplayed as a rhetorical, figurative, or linguistic instrument. Given the presence of the same term in the Quranic text, which informed the development of Islamic law, *yad* must mean more than ownership. It must mean, among other things, as Ibn Khaldun suggests, ownership through a particular activity, work, in which a person must utilize their hands for the *husul* to be realized, not any other instrument of acquiring property.

³³ It is communal as signaled by his use of the word *mushtaraka*.

³⁴ The conceptual transfer of ownership is called *husul*.

³⁵ Ibn Khaldun explicitly states that *kasb* is through (direct) human work, which can be contrasted to indirect human work in which humans exploits animals or other human beings to do work for them.

Select Bibliography and Primary Sources

- Alferai, Ahmed, and Michael Brun (1994), "Ibn Khaldun: Dynastic Change and its Economic Consequences." *Arab Studies Quarterly* 16, no. 2, 73-86.
- Baali, Fuad (1988), *Society, State, and Urbanism: Ibn Khaldun's Sociological Thought*. Albany: State University of New York.
- Bucholc, Marta (2022), "Ludwik Gumpłowicz (1897–1898), Ibn Khaldun: An Arab Sociologist of the 14th Century." *Journal of Historical Sociology* 35, no. 3, 320-32.
- Choudhury, Masudul Alam (2003), "The World-system According to Ibn Khaldun's Prolegomena Comparatively Viewed." In *The Islamic World-System*, 141-68. New York: Routledge.
- Dhaouadi, Mahmoud (2008), "The Forgotten Concept of Human Nature in Khaldunian Studies." *Asian Journal of Social Science* 36, no. ¾, 571–89.
- Durani, Farah and Ishtiaq Qureshi (2016), "A Historical Analysis of the Theories of Money." *International Journal of Business & Economic Development* 4, no. 1, 71-84.
- Handoko, Luqman Hakim (2020), "History of Islamic Economic Thought: A Content Analysis." *Library Philosophy and Practice*, 1-13.
- Ibn Khaldūn (2005), *al-Muqaddimat*. Morocco: al-Dar al-Bayda, Khizanat Ibn Khaldun--Bayt al-funun wa-l-`ulum wa-l-adab.
- Ibn Khaldūn (1950), *An Arab Philosophy of History; Selections from the Prolegomena of Ibn Khaldun of Tunis*. Translated by Charles Issawi. First ed. London: Murray.
- Ibn Khaldūn. *Muqaddema* (1932), Translated by Abuzaid 'Abdur Raḥman. 4th ed. Lahore: Kārkhāna-i-vatan, SAMP Early 20th-century Indian Books Project; Item 50233.
- Ibn Khaldūn (1900), *Muqaddimat Al-'Allāmah Ibn Khaldūn*. Lebanon: Al-Matba'ah Al-Adabīyah.
- Ilgaroğlu, Muhammet Caner (2019), "Money-Hedonism from Ibn Khaldūn's Notion of Morality." *Cumhuriyet İlahiyat Dergisi* 23 no. 3, 1331-347.
- Juwaydī, Darwīsh (1995), *Muqaddimat Ibn Khaldūn/Ta'līf 'Abd Al-Raḥmān Ibn Muḥammad Ibn Khaldūn; Taḥqīq Darwīsh Al-Juwaydī; Al-Ṭab'ah* First ed. Ṣaydā: Al-Maktabah Al-'Aṣrīyah.
- Kayapinar, M. Akif (2019), "Ibn Khaldūn's Notion of 'Umrān: An Alternative Unit of Analysis for Contemporary Politics?" *Philosophy East & West* 69 no. 3, 698-720.

- Khalid, Haniza (2015), "The Role of Institutions in Driving Economic Change: Comparing the Thoughts of Ibn Khaldun and Douglass C. North." *Intellectual Discourse* 23 no. 2, 177.
- Kilincoglu, Deniz T (2017), "Islamic Economics in the Late Ottoman Empire: Menâpirzâde Nuri Bey's Mebâhis-i İlm-i Servet." *The European Journal of the History of Economic Thought* 24 no. 3, 528-54.
- Macdonald, Duncan Black (1948), *A Selection from the Prolegomena of Ibn Khaldûn / with Notes and an English-German Glossary*. Leiden: Late E. J. Brill, Semitic Study Series no. 4.
- Martensson, Ulrika (2011), "Introduction: 'Materialist' Approaches to Islamic History." *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 54 no. 2, 117-31.
- Mouhammed, Adil H (2007), "On Ibn Khaldun's Contribution to Heterodox Political Economy." *History of Economics Review* 46, 89-105.
- Mouhammed, Adil H (2007), "On Ibn Khaldun's Contribution to Heterodox Political Economy." *History of Economics Review* 46, 89-105.
- Mouhammed, Adil H (2008), "On Ibn Khaldun's Critique of the Market Economy with some Lessons to the Arab World." *Journal of Third World Studies* 25 no. 2, 207-26.
- Pasha, Mustapha Kamal (2018), "Ibn Khaldun and the Wealth of Civilizations." In *Routledge Handbook of Ethics and International Relations*, 554-64. First ed. New York: Routledge.
- Puente-Ajovin, Miguel (2013), "Ibn Jaldún: Pensamiento Económico En El S. XIV." *IDEAS Working Paper Series from RePEc*.
- Rizkiah, Siti Kholifatul, and Abdelkader Chachi (2020), "The Relevance of Ibn Khaldun's Economic Thought in the Contemporary World." *Türkiye İslam İktisadi Dergisi* 7 no. 2, 70-90.
- Rosenthal, Franz (1967), *The Muqaddimah: An Introduction to History/Ibn Khaldûn*. Translated from the Arabic by Franz Rosenthal, Abridged and Edited by N. J. Dawood. London: Routledge & K. Paul, in Association with Secker and Warburg.
- Rosenthal, Franz (1967), *The Muqaddimah: An Introduction to History / Ibn Khaldûn*; Translated from the Arabic by Franz Rosenthal. Second Edition, with Corrections and Augmented Bibliography; Princeton, N.J.: Princeton UP.
- Sunar, Lütfi, and Faruk Yaslıçimen (2008), "The Possibilities of New Perspectives for Social Sciences: An Analysis Based on Ibn Khaldun's Theory of 'Umrân.'" *Asian Journal of Social Science* 36 no. ¾, 408-33.
- Surdon, Georges (1951), *Recueil De Textes De Sociologie Et De Droit Public Musulman Contenus Dans Les "Prolégomènes" D'Ibn Khaldouîn / Choisis Et Traduits Par*

Georges Surdon Et Léon Bercher. Algeria: Université Institut D'études Supérieures Islamiques.

Uddin, Mohammad Burhan, and Afandi Awang Hamat (2019), "Ibn Khaldun's Economic Thought: A Role Model for Sukuk Market." *İbn Haldun Çalışmaları Dergisi* 4 no. 2, 213-31.