

Capitalist-Driven Versus Driving Capitalism:

Understanding Reterritorialization of Capitalism and Deterritorialization of Revisionism

S.M.Mehboob ul Hassan Bukhari
mbukhari@uok.edu.pk

Abstract

This paper examines revisionist interpretation of capitalism in postcolonial Pakistan from the philosophical glasses of an eminent late twentieth century French Post-Structuralist Gilles Deleuze. Capitalist machine, Deleuze argues, is the only machine in history that deterritorializes the existing codes and then reterritorializes them with capital. It implies that capitalism extracts profit from all existing forms of life. Using Deleuze's elaboration of reterritorializing capitalism, I will critique Muslim revisionists defending capitalism to be consistent with Islamic law or using capitalism for advancing Islam.

Key Words: Capitalism, Deterritorialization/Reterritorialization, Axiomatics, Codes, Revisionism, South Asian Islam.

Introduction

Capitalism encompasses all forms of life rather than just an economic quarter of life. Capitalism centers on the market which continues to expand its borders to other forms of life. Gibson-Graham calls this "capitalocentric".

The contemporary political economy recognizes that capitalism regulates for ac-

cumulation. Sometime this regulation instigates specialization and reduction of cost of production. Sometimes it expands markets through colonization. Portuguese established coastal colonies in Indian Ocean in the sixteenth century. The British took control over these colonies later and soon they were able to occupy the Indian subcontinent with the establishment of East India Company. In 1857, the British started ruling India directly.

The author is associated with Department of Philosophy, University of Karachi, Pakistan. He presented the first draft of this paper in 1 International Deleuze Studies in Asia Conference held during 30 May-02 June 2013 at Tamkang University, New Taipei City, Taiwan.

The British gave independence to Pakistan in 1947. Gilles Deleuze (1925-1995), a post-structuralist philosopher, argues that capitalism supplants all forms of life for the accumulation of capital. This explanation raises serious implications in the post-colonial Pakistan because it pursues capitalist policies in all its institutions ranging from education to health to law etc.

Role of religion particularly of Islam in post-colonial Pakistan is significant. Revisionist interpretation of Islam appeals to many literate Pakistani Muslims because it purports to satisfy bipolar – dunya and deen – quarters of life of an individual. It insists that Islam suggests falaah for both worlds. It entails that interpretation of Islam must not alienate followers in this world.

Consequently, capitalism – the dominant form of life – challenges revisionists to interpret it and carve their way out accordingly.

For this, Gilles Deleuze's understanding of capitalism, in the view of author, is substantial. He is a European philosopher who has lived capitalism at its center rather than at its periphery – here in post-colonial Pakistan – and has deeper and inside insight of capitalism. Revisionists have lived capitalism at its periphery i.e. in the third world and observed its part. Moreover, Deleuze sees capitalism critically rather than ambitiously.

This paper evaluates revisionist argument through the lens of Gilles Deleuze. The study is divided into four sections. The first section argues that capitalism functions with axiomatics rather than codes. It further illustrates that axiomatics are ceaselessly changing abstract principles. The second section will outline history of capitalism in South Asia. The

third section expounds the revisionist argument in Pakistan. The fourth section critiques the revisionist thesis. This will be followed by a conclusion.

1. Deleuze's Axiomatic Capitalist Machine

Gilles Deleuze published a lot on topics ranging from materialist psychiatry to cartography and nomadology. Capitalism remained a central theme in all his works but he extensively dealt with capitalism in two volumes titled "Anti-Oedipus" and "A Thousand Plateaus" under the subtitle of "Capitalism and Schizophrenia". He co-authored these books with Felix Guattari.

Deleuze argues that capitalism operates through axiomatics instead of the codes. He notes that "the real characteristics of axiomatic that lead us [both Deleuze & Guattari] to say that capitalism and the present day politics are axiomatic in the literal sense" (Deleuze & Guattari 1987, p461).

For better understanding of Deleuze's critique, it is significant to know his metaphysics. Two concepts may help understanding his metaphysics. The first is "Line". He asserts that human beings are composed of "lines". "Whether we are individuals or groups, we are made up of lines and these lines are very varied in nature" (Deleuze & Parnet, 2007, p. 93). There are many kinds of lines like segmentary lines, lines of flight etc. He asserts that segmentary lines are the lines with which traditional theory works under "l'image de la pensée" (the image of thought). Image of thought is a methodology of Western philosophy which, according to Deleuze, per-

petuates identity and represses difference. Traditional theory premised on the image of thought sustains identity and resists change. He declares segmentary lines to be inappropriate to be engaged without rejecting their existence. He only critiques their exclusive right to determine thought and values. Instead, he argues that "Des lignes de fuite" (lines of flight) determine thought and values.

Line of flight is "even more strange: as if something carried us away, across our segments, but across our threshold, towards a destination which is unknown, not foreseeable, not preexistent" (Deleuze & Parnet, 2007, p. 94). For Deleuze, lines of flight define human beings, societies, the states etc particularly from the perspective what these (human, society, state) could become. For him, the real challenge for today is not to discover but to create. Creativity comes from conceptualization of change, instability, flow etc. His ontology is of the lines of flight, the "pure difference that lies beneath and within the constituted identities of segmentary lines" (May, 2005, p. 137).

The other concept which can expound further Deleuzian ontology is "machine". He assumes that machine is the ontological principle which operates like rhizome. Rhizome is a point of connection which can connect to other machines without any predetermined principle in an unprecedented way. Machines connect ad infinitum with other machines to produce the new. The "breast is a machine that produces milk, and a mouth a machine coupled to it. The mouth of an anorexic wavers between several functions: its possessor is uncertain as to whether it is an eating machine, an anal machine, a talking machine, or

a breathing machine" (Deleuze & Guattari, 2005 (a), p. 1). Deleuze asserts that machines connect in productive ways.

Moreover, human beings are "desiring machines". He vehemently rejects any identity oriented principle to define man and others. Man's potential can only be actualized, Deleuze reasons, if he is thought through "différence". Thus, Deleuze replaces the metaphysics of identity with the metaphysics of difference. He distinguishes his difference from other exponents of difference by claiming that his difference is positive, real and productive.

There are, according to Deleuze, three kinds of social machines. Deleuze and Guattari define social formations by "machinic processes and not by modes of productions" (Deleuze & Guattari, 2005 (b), p. 480). They are Earth machine (la terre), Despotic machine (despote) and Capitalist machine (l'argent). The territorial machine is "the first form of the socius, the machine of the primitive inscription, the "megamachine" that covers a social field" (Deleuze & Guattari, 2005 (a), p. 155). This is a machine which organizes through the codes of lateral alliance like a kinship in which a specific individual belongs to the specific group. Earth machine controls with the rituals of a group which integrates everybody in the group.

Deleuze expounds despotic machine "the megamachine" of the state, a functional pyramid that has the despot at its apex, an immobile motor, with the bureaucratic apparatus as its lateral surface and its transmission gear, and the villagers at its base, serving as its working parts" (Deleuze & Guattari, 2005, p. 212). Primitive lateral alliances are

replaced by the new alliances of the despot and filiations of the deity. He maintains that Earth machine and Despotic machine operate through codes.

These machines are less productive. Capitalist machine can be defined by the general characteristic of decoding of flows. Capitalism “is founded on a generalized decoding of every flow” (Deleuze, 2004, p. 270). Unlike pre-capitalist machines, the general decoding liberates flows. Capitalism is always “expanding its own borders, always finds itself in a situation where it must close off new escape routes at its borders” (Deleuze, 2004).

Deleuze also recognizes the pathological character of capitalism. He contends that slightest operation of capitalism “manifests the dementia of the capitalist system” (Deleuze, 2004, p. 262).

Capitalism expresses its madness, insanity, delirium, schizophrenia in every flow because “everything about capitalism is rational, except capital or capitalism” (Deleuze, 2004, p. 262). Capitalism is an organization of flows which can be understood, taught, learned. Yet “only defined by a particular kind of relationship among irrational factors” (Deleuze, 2004, p. 26). Capitalism, Deleuze observes, is itself irrational. The justification of capitalism only comes from within, from itself. Capitalism can not be justified from out side of it. For this reason, Deleuze defines capitalist machine as immanently driven unlike other machines which are regulated by transcendence. Therefore, Deleuze recognizes the madness of capitalism because it is both rational and irrational at the same time.

Capitalist machine functions through l’axiomatique (axiomtics) instead of codes. Capitalism

does not create any codes. It creates “a kind of accounting, an axiomatics of decoded flows, as the basis of its economy” (Deleuze 2004, p270). Axiomatics are different from codes. He differentiates between the two as “The axiomatic deals directly with purely functional elements and relations whose nature is not specified, and which are immediately realized in highly varied domains simultaneously; codes, on the other hand, are relative to those domains and express specific relations between qualified elements that can not be subsumed by a higher formal unity (overcoding) except by transcendence and in an indirect fashion” (Deleuze & Guattari, 2005 (b), p. 501). Codes are extrinsic whereas axiomatic are intrinsic. Codes rule from outside whereas axiomatic operate from inside. Codes are concrete principles coined to regulate the specific relationship of specific people in a specific society. Like a peasant in the olden times had such a binding to the land and the lord. The peasant’s extended family earns living through that land over the decades or centuries. The land lord had helped them in the need of hour and had been feeding the peasant’s family over the years. Leaving the land and land-lord will be regarded immoral in peasant’s society. Peasant, thus, can not simply leave his land and lord due to already accepted and respected set of obligations.

Axiomatics are intrinsically different from the codes. Axiomatics are abstract regulatory principles to control all the interactions of diverse people and things. An important aspect is that axiomatics function regardless of the person, relation, time and the place of the person in the society. A modern capitalist

man is not obliged to any specific employer, any nature of work, any high position in the society. He can freely decide to leave one place and join another without being obliged to any binding regulation.

Both the codes and the axiomatics are controlling. However, the form of control is different. Codes regulate the interactions from transcendence i.e. from above and out side of the flow whereas axiomatics rule from “imminence” i.e. from within the flow. Therefore axiomatic are more oppressive than the codes. Axiomatic’s control is deeper as well as it keeps its subject ignorant of the control. Codes regulate with respect to the people according to their place in the society, the relationship but axiomatics are blind regulatory mechanisms. Axiomatics regulate people regardless of their class, gender, race etc. Codes are concrete thus they can be replaced by other codes. However, this is not the case with axiomatics. Axiomatics are abstract, they can take any form. Axiomatics change with the time, people, and circumstances. They do not have any stable principles and fixed nature which endures for a long time. Therefore axiomatics continuously replace themselves with other axiomatics due to decoding and deterritorialization in capitalism. Nonetheless, axiomatics cannot be traced back as principles. If, for the sake of argument, they are traced, they do not have any significance because they instrumentally served in the past and now they may be outdated.

Déterritorializing ability of capitalist machine is positive because it prevents bodies from the regulation of codes. This decoding operates imminently. There is no external or transcendent body who decodes in capi-

talism. Deleuze contends that capitalist machine has provided comparatively more freedom than the earth and despotic machines. However, déterritorialization is always accompanied by reterritorialization. Axiomatics begin to reterritorialize capitalist territories with the exchange value and Oedipus etc. For Deleuze, reterritorialization becomes problematic when it resists any further déterritorialisation. Here capitalism becomes schizophrenic.

Déterritorialization is highly valuable for Deleuze, because déterritorialization allows human beings to expand freedom and eliminate the regulatory codes enmeshed in capitalism. Deleuze suggests capitalism to continue the process of déterritorialization via world market which will eventually bring about more freedom in the post-capitalist society.

2. Capitalism in South Asia

I will contextualize revisionism in the debate initiated long before post-colonial Pakistan as a nation-state emerged on the map of the world.

Muslims in the sub-continent interacted capitalism for the first time via British imperialism. Some Muslims during British imperialism realized that there is no way out of capitalism, though then capitalism was less hegemonic and regulating. Colonial experience transformed all quarters of Muslim life particularly their religious lives. The capitalist development and progress in terms of power started challenging the relevance of Islam as a complete way of life. The seriousness of the problem can be displayed from the perception of Syed Ahmed Khan (1917-1998) who

contends that the British arrival (imperialism) may be a blessing in disguise for Muslims in the subcontinent. The British arrival accompanied by a bourgeoisie life style, fast means of communication and transportations, highly sophisticated weapons, powerful army has introduced the controlling nature of science and technology, however, it was deemed as blessings of science.

Capitalist development was thought to create unprecedented power. Mughals could not counter the British invasion due to lack of (capitalist) development in all walks of life particularly in warfare. For him, capitalist development is the result of modern science that is the difference between two civilizations i.e. Islamic and Western. Interestingly, he perceives modern science as a value-neutral epistemology. Syed Ahmed Khan, thus, notes "the well being of the people of India, especially the Muslims lies in leading a quiet life under the benign rule of the British Government" (Brown, 2004, p. 204). The epistemological absence of scientific narrative in Islam, Syed Ahmed Khan identifies, is the reason of the defeat of Muslims in the subcontinent.

He insists to unlock "authentic Islam" by reinterpreting it according to the need of the hour. For him, the colonialism is an opportunity to revisit and subject the conventional interpretation (tradition) of Islam from scientific perspective.

After the failure of 1857 war, Syed Ahmed Khan's desire to restore the "authentic Islam" i.e. that justifies the capitalist development gained momentum. For that he "came into contact increasingly with European missionaries and scholars, and partly under the in-

fluence of these encounters he began to question hadith arguing that the Quran alone could be fully trusted to communicate the prophet's legacy" (Brown, 2004, p 204). He introduces a maxim for the restoration of authentic Islam as "Islam is nature and nature is Islam". He goes on to argue that the word of God must not contradict the work of God. If it does, it entails that the word of God must be misunderstood. For him the work of God is the nature which has only been discovered objectively by the laws of modern science. Therefore his "authentic Islam" seems to be compatible with the modern science.

Modern science accompanied by capitalist development has seriously challenged Indian Muslims who have responded to it differently. Their responses may be classified as modernism, traditionism, revisionism and orthodox. This classification is neither strict nor exclusive.

Overlapping from one category to another is also possible. Islamic Modernist response like that of Syed Ahmed Khan seeks to reconcile Islam with capitalism by de-legitimizing Islamic history.

Traditionists have engaged in the preservation of Islamic laws (Jurisprudence) and rites and rituals. Orthodox has refuted capitalist life form and sought to replace capitalism with Islam.

Interestingly, one feature appears to be common among all above mentioned responses i.e. all of them purported to unfold true Islam of the antiquity. However, the methods are different.

Afghani relies upon the rational discourse of the philosophers whereas Syed Ahmed Khan takes the Muatazilite course of meta-

phorical interpretation of Quran. Modernists want to become part of global modernity. They argue to reinterpret Islam according to the presumptions of enlightenment. They are skeptic about Islamic history. Modernists maintain that complete reinterpretation of Islam is required to cope up the challenge which can only be met by de-legitimizing Islamic history and institutions. Islamic modernists construe Muslims' defeat at the hands of the British as an epistemological failure of Islam. They deem Enlightenment values as universal, rational and perfect.

Traditionists see preservation of Islamic rites and rituals meaningful. Traditionists and Orthodox remain loyal to Islamic epistemology along with Islamic history. They take Islamic history as legitimate. They are suspicious of capitalism. They endeavor to preserve Islamic rites and rituals by teaching and researching following the footsteps of "Aslaf". Ironically, the underlying presumption of all responses seems to equate correct understanding of Islam with its socio-political dominance.

The revisionist response lies in between the modernists and the traditionists. Modernists aim to reform Islam by reinterpreting Islamic history so that Islam is brought into line with the age.

Traditionists practice Islam of the antiquity in capitalist society. However, revisionists seek to practice Islam of the antiquity but validate at the same time that capitalist values are intrinsically consistent with Islam. They argue that capitalist codes and Islamic codes are the two sides of the same coin. Revisionists purport to show value neutral capitalist „codes" of development in the Islamic history.

3. Revisionism in Pakistan

Revisionism has become popular and legitimate interpretation of Islam in modern Pakistan. Its impact can be illustrated from the fact that modern text books of different sciences for schools and colleges endorse revisionist interpretation. Government of Pakistan publishes revisionists' designed text books narrate history of modern science to have sprung from classical Islamic history. They purport to link modern science with Ibn-ul-Haiteham, Musa Khwarzami, Fakharuddin Razi etc. In this way, revisionist perspective imposes the legitimacy of capitalist discourse through the vehicle of education.

Revisionism refers to intellectuals who "accept capitalism as a rational and natural order and attempt to find room for the practice of Islamic teachings within global capitalist order" (Ansari & Arshad, 2006, p. 69). Revisionists accept global capitalist order as rational and natural.

However, they identify many capitalist practices incompatible with Islam. Revisionists suggest reformation in some un-Islamic capitalist practices like transaction forms and procedures. They see transcendence from capitalism as untenable. Reformation, they believe, allows them to survive in capitalism as a Muslim. In other words, capitalism is erroneous for Muslims but unavoidable, therefore, some reforms may allow Muslims to be better fit in it.

Some of the exponents of revisionism in south Asia are Allama Iqbal (1976-1938), Professor Khurshid Ahmed, Mufti Taqi Usmani etc. However, Allama's Iqbal's key work "The Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam" happens to influence both the revisionists

and Modernists. In addition, Moulana Abul A'la Maududi (1903-1979) may be categorized as a revivalist in his early life whereas in later life, he can be catalogued as a revisionist. Therefore, these names should not absolutely suggest their binding and irrevocable classification against their described trends of thought.

It is worthwhile to note that there are two observable strands in revisionist camp in Pakistan. On the one hand, some revisionists reject Islam to be a complete system like Taqi Usmani, on the other hand, revisionists like professor Khurshid Ahmed seriously intend to draw a compatibility between capitalism and Islam. However, both of these strands converge on seeing the possibility of the reconciliation between Islam and capitalism.

Revisionists reconcile Islam and capitalism by arguing that modern science is a value neutral epistemology and technology is the materialization of scientific laws. In this way, Revisionist scholarship divorce modern science and technology from its historical context. For them, renaissance and modernism seem to be natural rather than historical. Interestingly, they trace the origin of modern science in Muslim's classical history. They disagree with the modernist Muslim intelligentsia to reject Islamic history entirely. For them, capitalism and Islam can reconcile without rejecting Islamic history. Islamic history is filled with numerous examples for the dedication of scientific and technological research.

Unfortunately, revisionists argue, Muslims during Mughal rule engaged in internal conflicts and failed to dedicate for scientific research. Muslims, then, in general remained

backward during eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. They remained backward both in hard and human sciences.

To counter this, revisionists suggest Islamization of sciences. Consequently, many Islamic sciences emerged in twentieth century like Islamic Economics, Islamic Sociology etc to allow Muslims' adaptation with capitalist institutions. Islamic economics displays an attempt to validate capitalist ethics and institutions. By the same token, construing Islamic constitutionalism by Moulana Abul A'la Maududi (1903-1979) and Islamic Sociology by Ali Shariati (1933-1977) represent revisionist tendencies. All of these endeavors accommodate Islamic societies in the global capitalist order.

This study will focus only on the argument of Islamic economics as a justification of capitalist development. Islamic economics seems to function within neo-classical paradigm in which policies are validated to maximize utility within Shariah constraints. The Shariah compliant economy may appear to be limiting the production; however, revisionists argue that these constraints are more productive in the long run. They also foresee, as a fruitful consequence, that *riba* will be eliminated and *zakat* will be introduced in the global economy. Revisionists in general critique that capitalism has not been able to strike the balance between freedom and equality in the world. They believe that if Shariah constraints are introduced in the modern economics, it will grow the global economy unprecedentedly. Interestingly, Shariah constraints are regarded as a means to achieve the reforms in capitalism.

Revisionists blame western historians to

have ignored the significant contribution of Muslim thinkers in the history of economic thought. They argue that the recorded history has been biased to acknowledge Muslim contribution. Historians have discovered 500 years gap between Greco-Roman and Modern contribution to the economic thought. J.A. Schumpeter (1883-1950), the most influential economist of twentieth century, has named this gape. "Great Gape". Dr. Sabahudin Azmi writes "Schumpeterian. "Great Gape" thesis implies, nothing was said, written, or practiced which had any relevance to economics. The theory has also been accepted by almost by all writers on the subject as it has been a set practice to leave these centuries blank while writing the history of economic thought. The implication of the "Great Gape" thesis is that this era of European "Dark Ages" was a universal phenomenon" (Azmi, 2002, p. 12). Azmi vehemently refutes this impression and argues with reference to Todd Lowry (1992) that "there are [were] many Arab Islamic scholars whom western historians of thought have tended to ignore despite evidence that their ideas were known by the leading scholastics in Europe" (Azmi, 2002, p. 12)

The Islamization of capitalist institutions and ethics can be shown in the work of Taqi Usmani. He has written many books but one stands out which vividly elucidates revisionist argument. The title of the book is "Islam aur Jadeed Tijarat-o-Maeshat" (Islam and Modern Economics and Finance) published in 1991. He describes the purpose of writing this book is "to provide Ulama (Islamic scholars) and Fuqaha (Islamic Jurists) with a knowledge of modern economic and commercial

concepts so that they can issue fatawa (religious verdicts) on economic and commercial issues" (Usmani, 1991, p. 6). The receptivity and popularity of this slim text can be recognized that it has been incorporated as a key text to be taught in the higher level (*darja takhasus*) students in many Sunni (both Deobandi, Bareilvi) madaris (seminaries) all over Pakistan, Bangladesh and India.

Taqi Usmani explicitly endorses natural philosophy of political economy. Usmani regards capitalism as a natural and rational order "the basic philosophy underlying capitalism is correct in that it identifies the laws of supply and demand and the profit motive as the mechanism for addressing the fundamental economic problem of scarcity because this reflects natural human properties" (Ibid, p. 35). For him, the most fundamental problem of humanity is economic scarcity which can effectively be dealt with the laws and methodology of natural philosophy.

Usmani retreats from the universality claim of Islam and argues that "Islam does not possess an economic system of its own. Islam endorses market forces. Islam fully endorses the profit motive as a basis of human behavior" (Usmani, 1991, p. 38-39). For him, the profit motive and all market forces are natural. He seems to follow Syed Ahmed's dictum "God is nature and Nature is God". He strongly disagrees with his counterpart traditionist Ulama and contends that Shariah has not given any mandatory orders to prioritize *al-aakhira* (hereafter) over *ad-dunya* (the world). Instead, he emphasizes that Quran urges Muslims to balance between the worldly life and hereafter. Allocation of resources, thus, may be determined by the

motive of profit and the well being of the society. In this way, Usmani endorses all capitalist values (value of autonomy, progress can be achieved through market etc) already proposed by Enlightenment thinkers like John Locke (1632-1704), Adam Smith (1723-1790) and subsequently by many European thinkers.

Usmani predicates his revisionist account on the presumed natural law of limited resources and unlimited wants. He writes "all economic thinking accepts that resources are limited and human needs are unlimited and the central question is how to fulfill unlimited needs with limited resources" (Usmani, 1991, p. 19). He further claims "there are many natural laws operative in the universe which always produces similar results – one such natural law is the law of supply and demand (Usmani, 1991, p. 22). The laws of demand and supply are believed to be natural laws. Interestingly enough, Usmani seems to presume that every natural is rational and every rational is self-evident.

He argues "economic problems should mainly be solved by the laws of demand and supply (but) the operation of the profit motive should be limited by considerations of halal (permissible) and haram (impermissible), (refusal) to constrain individual profit (with reference to) halal and haram renders the natural laws of supply and demand non operational" (Usmani, 1991, p. 37). Here Usmani appears to subject individual's profit to Shariah injunctions that only halal profit may keep the natural laws of economy working for the welfare of the global economy. These restrictions will be productive in the long run.

Usmani asserts that if individual's profit

is not Shariah complaint i.e. filtered through halal and haram distinction, it will ruin the global capitalist economy. He believes, following Smith, profit motive of individual will naturally bring about welfare in the society. He notes "although every individual works for his own profit, the natural laws of supply and demand force him to fulfill the needs of the society" (Usmani, 1991,, p. 23).

Usmani argues that Shariah is the need of capitalism to eradicate monopoly. He makes it clear that the rulings of Shariah are not a limit to the productivity of capitalism; it will enhance and expand the productivity. He writes "taking account of Shariah sanctioned halal and haram injunctions leads to strengthening of the forces of demand and supply and to the eradication of monopoly with capitalist markets" (Usmani, 1991, p. 46-47).

Usmani endeavors to show the strength and productivity of Shariah complaint economy through Islamic banking. The successful project of Islamic banking across the globe shows the validity of this argument. He himself is the Chief Shariah consultant of an Islamic bank "Meezan Bank" which has many branches across Pakistan. The success of Meezan Bank, argues Usmani, in the competitive environment objectively proves the strength of revisionist argument.

Islamic banking along with other projects like Islamic Takaful (Insurance) etc demonstrates the revisionist mindset. Islamic economics instrumentizes Shariah for the growth and development of capitalism. Usmani seems to endorse Smithian assumptions:

- Scarcity of resources and unlimitedness of wants
- Laws of demand and supply are natural

- Social interests can be served by self-interestedness of individuals

Scarcity of resources and unlimitedness of wants laws of demand and supply are natural Social interests can be served by self-interestedness of individuals following Smithian justification of capitalism, revisionists like Taqi Usmani will naturally end up just critiquing monopoly (an internal problem of capitalism). This version of revisionism ignores the reinforcing mechanism of capitalism which stabilizes identity, marginalizes its "other" and perpetuates hierarchy.

Professor Khurshid Ahmed (1932-todate) represents another strand of revisionism in south Asia. He explores the sharing principles (Codes in Deleuzean Vocabulary) between capitalism and Islam. He argues "Islamic economic development is rooted in the values embedded in Quran and Sunnah" (Ahmed, 1979, p. 226). Islam seeks to "promote economic development as a constituent of human development" (Ahmed, 1979, p. 230). Economic growth, Khurshid Ahmed supposes, aims human development. Quran describes two conceptions of human development i.e. tazkiah and falah. He interprets these two values as "purification and growth" (Ahmed, 1979, p. 231) respectively.

These two values provide the *raison d'être* of human development and growth. In this way, Khurshid Ahmed displays the rationale of capitalist growth in holy Quran. He goes on to claim that Quran and prophetic traditions bestow the guiding codes for the human (capitalist) development. He regrets what Muslims were supposed to discover with the help of divine text, Europeans had explored in the sixteenth century.

He expounds the conception of develop-

ment as a "value oriented activity devoted to the optimization of human well being" (Ahmed, 1979, p. 231). He underlines two core principles of development in Islam; firstly "the optimal utilization of resources and secondly their equitable use and distribution. Development means moral and material development of individual and society leading to maximization of socio-economic welfare" (Ahmed, 1979, p. 232). Thus, Islam endorses material development; however, this, Khurshid Ahmed suggests, should be accompanied by moral development. Material growth along with moral development will guarantee the socio-economic welfare of the society.

Interestingly, Khurshid Ahmed seems to emphasize more on material growth which will eventually pave the way for moral and spiritual development. He recognizes the significance of social justice in capitalist development. He argues, Islam's main concern is in encouraging economic development with social justice" (Ahmed, 1979, p. 226).

Muslim revisionist scholarship has confronted with the problem of the justification of development which it resolves by harmonizing Shariah with global capitalist order. For that, they need to revisit and reinterpret Islamic history. Capitalist rationality is recognized absolute and natural. Ironically, both strands of revisionism seem to ignore "What is" does not imply "What ought to be". Taqi Usmani endeavors to filter capitalist values and institutions through Islamic ethics which amounts to be Islamization of capitalism. Shariah compliant behavior becomes good only if it satisfies Islamic laws to be halal (permissible). In other words, Usmani seeks to deterritorialize capitalism through Islamic Shariah. In addition, Khurshid Ahmed's at-

tempt to find the codes of productivity and growth amounts to distort both Islamic and European histories. This amply shows belated consciousness of postcolonial intelligentsia in the face of capitalism.

Revisionist endeavor to trace the codes of development in Islamic history as well as to filter capitalist values through Shariah needs critical assessment.

4. Analysis

Capitalism double movement deterritorializes the existing values and principles and reterritorializes them with capital. Therefore, capitalism has no one rule or form. Anything that could accumulate capital is channelized immediately. It can be exemplified by the fact that capitalism has changed its rules and forms consistently across history. One rule in specific time and space for the accumulation of capital may be a limit to capital accumulation at another time and place. Capitalism is constant decoding which means capitalism continuously changes its form, rules and organization. It is a flow, mutation, metamorphosis, transformation. Nineteenth century capitalism, Deleuze contends, was determined by “concentration, for production and for property” (Deleuze, 1995, p. 180).

For that, capitalism invented new structure for capital accumulation that was factory “a space of enclosure, the capitalist being the owner of the means of production but also progressively, the owner of other spaces conceived through analogy (the worker’s familial house, the school)” (Deleuze, 1995, p. 179). Markets, then, used to be regulated “sometimes by specialization, sometimes by colonizations, sometimes by lowering the cost

of production.” (Deleuze, 1995, p. 181). For market control, human beings require training and discipline.

Capitalism, in 19th century, popularizes ideas of appropriate training. Many institutions and training centers are opened to facilitate discipline for the control of the market. Now capitalism is not “involved in production....it no longer buys raw materials and no longer sells the finished products; it buys the finished products or assembles parts. What it wants to sell is services but it wants to buy is stocks” (Deleuze, 1995, p. 181). Consequently, it has erected a different structure that is corporation instead of a factory. The corporation is not controlled by the owner but “coded figures-deformable and transformable-of a single corporation that now has only stockholders” (Deleuze, 1995, p. 181). Markets are controlled with different rules. Training and discipline has become useless. To control market, fixing the exchange rate is imperative. Rather than specialization of production, “transformation of the product” (Deleuze, 1995, p. 181) is required to conquer the market in present form of capitalism. Deleuze contends that new form of capitalism will replace the previous form. This is decoding or deterritorialization, the fundamental operative principle of capitalism.

Rules or codes, according to Deleuze, functioning in one form of capitalism are replaced by other rules. Interestingly, these rules are no longer concrete rules or “codes” but are axioms: the abstract principles specially coined to serve immediate interest of capital accumulation in one setting. Axioms entail that they will constantly be transformed in new settings. Thus, capitalism operates with axioms.

Revisionist thesis is, therefore, incorrect under this understanding because capitalism has no universal laws grounded for the welfare of humanity in general. Capitalism is impersonal. It does not work for the welfare of humanity but is “defined by a cruelty having no parallel in the primitive system of cruelty, and by a terror having no parallel in the despotic regime of terror” (Deleuze & Guattari, 2005 (a), p. 408). This shows the madness and imminence of capitalism.

Every form or axiom of capitalism is explainable rationally within the borders of capitalist field but the very rationality of capitalism is inexplicable. Rationality of capital cannot be explained rationally. Revisionists, thus, erroneously understand capitalism as absolutely rational and sane.

Capitalism digests even heterogeneous flows like folk cultures such as Sind Festival 2014 which has ended up in the accumulation of capital. Widespread hunger in Sind has led many to die, but capitalism accumulates on it by selling the pictures widely shared across the globe by running advertising along with it. Media has run many prime time shows on the site, representing local pains and atrocities in exchange of business – obsession of increase in rating – etc. Revisionist account of capitalism seems to be uncritical. They take capitalism to be a-historical and absolutely good. Problems in capitalism are associated with bad or inappropriate intents of political administration. Introduction of Shariah complaint measures, in production and marketing will bring justice in capitalism. Deleuze’s approach challenges that too. Fixing the capitalist flows with Shariah complaint measures will double the poison that is to say fixing and

determining capitalist flows with any specific flows will hamper capitalist machine. This is the reason that global capitalism is ready to incorporate Islamic contribution in it but it resists to transform entire market into Islamic market. Revisionists quest for a space in global capitalist world embodied in Islamic Economics seems to be adventurous because that will mean déterritorialisation of Islam with capitalism. In other words, revisionist endeavor denotes capitalization of Islam that is to say the distortion of Islamic history.

Capitalism is also a fascist form of life. Exchange with capital has become a norm in capitalist world. Every single act is calculated in capital accumulation. Michel Foucault (1926-1984) identifies that Deleuze’s works particularly *Anti-Oedipus* (1972) is against fascism “not only historical fascism, the fascism of Hitler and Mussolini- which was able to mobilize and the use of desire of the masses so effectively –but also the fascism in us all, in our heads and in our everyday behavior, the fascism that causes us to love power, to desire the very thing that dominates and exploits us” (Deleuze & Guattari, 2005 (a), p. xv). Fascism, Foucault articulates, “to desire the very thing that dominates and exploits” (Ibid) is capitalism. Capitalism controls the behavior of human beings for capital accumulation undermining all other forms of life inferior to capital accumulation.

Revisionism approaches capitalism uncritically. It fails to recognize fascism embedded in capitalism. Instead it erroneously supposes capitalism to be a fair form of life. Capitalism is absolute decoding and deterritorialization. Capitalism decodes its “other”, in this case it is Islam, and recodes it with capitalist axioms.

Islamic Economics, Islamic Insurance, Islamic Banking etc serve capitalist interests. Capitalism extracts capital from periphery that is third world and distributes it in the center that is the first world. Consequently, revisionism leads to the capitalization of Islam, that is to say, Islam serves to capitalist interests rather than Islamization of capitalism.

nize the dynamics of capitalism. Revisionist intelligentsia mistakenly takes capitalism a-historical and natural. It overlooks capitalist metaphysics, morality and its historical emergence on Western European horizon. For this reason, it is justified, on the given analysis, to conclude that revisionism is capitalist driven and capitalism is driving revisionism.

5. Conclusion

The above analysis shows that contemporary revisionist argument to accommodate capitalism in Islam or to reconcile Islam with capitalism is inconsistent as it fails to recog-

References

- Ahmed, K. (1979). *Economic Development in An Islamic Framework*. In K. Ahmed, & Z. Ansari (Eds.), *Islamic Perspectives* (pp. 223-240). Jeddah: Saudi publishing House.
- Ansari, J. A., & Arshad, S. Z. (2006). *Business Ethics in Pakistan*. Karachi, Pakistan: Royal Book Company.
- Azmi, S. (2002). *Islamic Economics*. New Delhi, India: Goodward Books.
- Belsey, C. (2002). *Post Structuralism: A Very Short Introduction*. U.S.A: Oxford University Press.
- Benard, C. (2003). *Civil Democratic Islam*. Santa Monica: RAND.
- Brown, D. (2004). *A New Introduction to Islam*. U.K: Blackwell Publishing.
- Deleuze, G. (1995). *Negotiations, 1972-1990*. (M. Joughin, Trans.) New York: Columbia University Press.
- Deleuze, G. (2004). *Desert Islands and Other Texts 1953-1974*. (D. Lapoujade, Ed., & M. Taormina, Trans.) New York, U.S.A: Columbia University .
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (2005 (a)). *Anti Oedipus (First South Asian ed.)*. (R. Hurley, M. Seem, & H. R. Lane, Trans.) Chennai, India: Viva Books Private Limited.
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (2005 (b)). *A Thousand Plateaus (First South Asian ed.)*. (B. Massumi, Trans.) Chennai, India: Viva Books Private Limited.
- Deleuze, G., & Parnet, C. (2007). *Dialogues II (First South Asian ed.)*. (H. Tomlinson, & B. Habberjam, Trans.) Chennai, India: Viva Books Private Limited.
- Gutting, G. (2001). *French Philosophy in the Twentieth Century*. U.S.A: Cambridge University Press.
- May, T. (2005). *Gilles Deleuze*. Cambridge , U.K: Cambridge University Press .
- Rahman, T. (2004). *Denizens of Alien Worlds*. Karachi: Oxford University Press Pakistan.
- Usmani, T. (1991). *Islam aur Jadeed Tijarat o Maeshat*. Karachi, Pakistan: Darul Uloom Korangi.
- Wicks, R. (2003). *Modern French Philosophy*. London: One World Oxford.
- Zourabichvili, F. (2003). *La Vocabulaire de Deleuze*. Paris: Ellipses.