*The Idea of the State in Ibn Khaldun and a Comparative Study in the Context of the Debate 'Is the State a Means or an End?': (Ibn Khaldun-Aristotle-Thomas Hobbes)

İbn Haldun'da Devlet Düşüncesi ve "Devlet Araç mı, Amaç mı?" Tartışması Bağlamında Mukayeseli Bir Değerlendirme: (İbn Haldun -Aristoteles-Thomas Hobbes)

Oğuz Özcan
İstanbul University, Turkey

Abstract: Ibn Khaldun, who is one of the most important figures for 14th century Islamic thought, has constructed a system that is different from the approaches of his contemporaries in the world of Eastern thought and defined his field as the field of Umran (Ilm-i Umran). The thinker constructed a cyclical philosophy of history centered on human and social life by analyzing the general trends of historical events and social relations to reach general governing rules concerning the relation between system and element. built on this Umran science he also conceptualization each of the elements in question. In order to understand Ibn Khaldun's system of thought in general and his state philosophy in particular, as he treats the state and society as two different structures in accordance with the current sociological approach and defines the formation process of both in sociological terms, it is necessary to briefly review some of the basic concepts used by the state and determined some main elements.

In the first part of our work in this framework, explanations were given to explain the concepts of Umran, Asabiyet, Bedouin and Hadarism, Riyaset and Mülk (State) which constitutes Ibn Khaldun's thought. In terms of Ibn Khaldun's political thought, we are trying to understand the role of life, people's anticipation and the solidarity that leads to the emergence of the political appearance and functions of the social organization, which is at the center of state philosophy. Ibn Khaldun's system of thought regards the elements of the state mechanism and the general functioning of people as an inevitable consequence of living together to meet some of their needs, and this influences ways of thinking about the progress of the state.

Following the state philosophy of Ibn Khaldun, we have examined the state philosophy of Aristotle and Thomas Hobbes in order to be able to develop a comparative approach to the controversial

---

issue of "State: Means or End?" Together with the views of the two thinkers, we included a comparative assessment of this problem. Finally, we tried to share an evaluation of how we discussed and assessed the issues during the article as a conclusion.

Keywords: Ibn Khaldun, Muqaddimah, Politics, Political Thought, State Philosophy

Öz: 14. Yüzyıl İslam düşünce sisteminin önemli simalarından olan İbn Haldun, gerek Batı gerekse Doğu düşün dünyasında kendi çağdaşlarının yaklaşımlarından farklılaşarak kendi tanımlamasıyla Umran İlmi (İlm-i Umran) adını verdiği bir sistem inşa etmiştir. Tarihi olayları ve toplumsal ilişkilerin genel eğilimlerini çözümleyerek sistem-parça ilişkisi içerisinde genel geçer kurallara ulaşarak insan ve toplumsal yaşam merkezli döngüsel bir tarih felsefesi kurgulamış olan düşünür, kendisinden önce hiçbir yerde rastlanmamış olan bu Umran İlmi'nin üzerine inşa edildiği parçaların kavramsallaştırmasını da yine kendisi yapmıştır.

Güncel sosyolojik yaklaşıma uygun olarak devlet ve cemiyeti farklı iki yapı olarak ele alan ve her ikisinin oluşum sürecini de yine sosyolojik verilerle tanımlayan İbn Haldun'un gerek genel düşünce sisteminin anlaşılması gerekse özelde devlet felsefesinin kavranabilmesi için onun kullandığı bazı temel kavramların kısaca gözden geçirilmesi ve ana unsurlarının belirlenmesi gerekmektedir.

Bu çerçevede çalışmamızın ilk bölümünde İbn Haldun'un düşüncelerini inşa ettiği Umran, Asabiyet, Bedevilik ve Hadarilik, Riyaset ve Mülk (Devlet) kavramlarını anlamaya yönelik açıklamalara yer verilmiştir. Düşünürün siyaset düşüncesiyle devlet felsefesinin merkezinde yer alan insan ve onu edimlerine bağlı olarak toplumsal örgütlenmenin siyasal görünüm ve fonksiyonlarının ortaya çıkmasında toplu halde yaşam, insanların beklentileri ve bunlara yön veren asabiyet olgularının oynadığı rolü anlamaya çalışıyoruz. Bazı ihtiyaçlarını karşılamak için insanın birlikte yaşamasının kaçınılmaz sonucu olarak ortaya çıkan devlet mekanizmasının unsurları ve genel işleyişi ile ilgili İbn Haldun'un düşünce sistemini anlamaya çalıştığımız satırların ardında da devletin aşamaları, gelişimi ve ömrünün nihayete ermesi ile ilgili düşüncelere yer verilmiştir.

İbn Haldun'un devlet felsefesinin ardından günümüz açısından da hala tartışma konusu olan "Devlet Araç mı, Amaç mı?" sorunsalı üzerine mukayeseli bir yaklaşım geliştirebilmek için Aristoteles ve Thomas Hobbes'un devlet felsefesini inceleme konusu yaptık. İki düşünürün görüşleriyle birlikte bu sorunsala yönelik karşılaştırmalı bir değerlendirme içeren bölümümüzü kaleme aldık. Son olarak da sonuç yerine bir değerlendirme yazısı ile makale boyunca tartıştığımız konuların bizim tarafımızdan nasıl değerlendirildiğini paylaşmaya çalıştık.

***Anahtar Kelimeler:** İbn Haldun, Mukaddime, Siyaset, Siyaset Düşüncesi, Devlet Felsefesi*

Introduction

Like all the organizations in which humans feature, the organization that is defined as the state has always come into conflict with different structures in its historical

journey. Within this history according to various social and economic necessities, though the basic functions are not changed, some differences are observed in the structure of the state itself regarding the relationships between people.

By defining the phenomenon of power, this phenomenon can be embodied in a specific hierarchical view to find a living space for itself, the level of the relationship between these needs and the necessities of society and the other acts that the state has introduced through its own characteristics always been interesting for thinkers of political philosophy.

In this framework, political philosophers, have kept alive the effort to read in a certain objectivity the historical development of the story of the family of humanity, in terms of societies, states, economic relations, and the attachment of people to these phenomena within a certain paradigm. This article seeks in part to answer the 'means or end?' problem, which is a basic question that is frequently asked in this explanatory effort.

The search that begins with the question of why the so-called "state" is needed is often an important clue to observations and studies on societies. In addition to the search for guidance in social phenomena and events, there will also be views based on the divine bases of the state and the source of power, such as the Church institution, which is trying to win itself in the face of political power in the Middle Ages Europe. According to the view that explains the state and power through the Church, which is a reflection of God's will and the earth "The source of all power is God". As a matter of fact, the view that explains the state and power in divine terms is not only something that applies to Medieval Europe. It is also possible to find similar reflections of the ideas in this framework among the ideas of the oriental thinkers. But among the reasons that played an important role behind the most refined thought in this direction to be found in medieval European state doctrine concerns the struggle for authority between the Church and the monarch.

We are looking for answers to some questions about the state, and will first examine the general philosophy of Ibn Khaldun, one of the most important thinkers of 14th century Islamic thought, and the theory of the state. The struggle for power in the western world between the church and political power[1] with its various extensions

---

[1] Göze, ibid, p:78–82

were dogmas limit people's lives, and inquisition courts used as an effective means of oppression; in a period when the political and administrative rights within the feudal institution treated people are as property and turned them is a matter of heritage,[2] Ibn Khaldun made an effort to make observations based on social events and make a model based on this.

Likewise, Ibn Khaldun emphasizes the importance of causality in the face of traditional history narration. In order for the cause-and-effect relationship to be established in a correct way, he states those who deal with this science should have knowledge about the nature of politics and assets,[3] saying that "... the correspondence between the present situation and the casual and historical situation or the difference between the two, the cause of the correspondence or difference must be considered,"[4] and emphasized the fact that information in conformity with the general laws that have been obtained are considered to be authentic and those that contradict these laws are not taken into consideration.[5]

Despite the change of actors, as a reflection of the immutability of the human factor and the spatial factor that causes the events, we encounter a cyclical understanding of history repeated by our thinker.[6] According to Ibn Khaldun, to examine and understand the human communities and the civilization they are in (hope and indifference / civilization), it is imperative that the causes of the events leading to human society are resolved.[7]

Whether from the developments in the contemporary Western system of thought or from the basic paradigms of the Eastern thought communities, Ibn Khaldun defines societies and historical actors in the context of cause-effect relations, and independently constructs human and society in an organic structure. This method is a contemporary method of evaluating a form that can try to put a certain theoretical

---

[2] Age, p:71

[3] İbn Haldun, Mukaddime, (Edt. Süleyman Uludağ), Dergah Yayınları, İstanbul, 2007, I.Cilt, s:189

[4] ibid p:189

[5] ibid, p:189

[6] Cited by , Ahmet Albayrak, "Bir Medeniyet Kuramcısı Olarak İbn Haldun", <http://kutuphane.uludag.edu.tr/PDF/ilh/2000-9(9)/htmpdf/M-33.pdf> (d.o.a :24.04.2009), Uludağ Üniversitesi, İlahiyat Fakültesi, 2000, p:3

[7] Hilmi Ziya Ülken, İslam Felsefesi-Eski Yunan'dan Çağdaş Düşünceye Doğru, Ülken Yayınları, İstanbul, 1983, p: 230

framework. The wars, intrigues and recurring confrontations he faced when examining history "led Ibn Khaldun, who wanted to reach an enlightened view, to check the inconsistency of historical approaches by generalizing the recurrent phenomena and establishing links between various categories of coincidence. This led him to a general conception of history, an analysis social and political structures, and examination of the evolution of these structures."[8]

In this work on the development of the state and this fictional organization, there are two other great thinkers whose views we need to consider. Aristotle gave a systematic description of evolution based on the community of people, such as family, village and city they formed as a result of living together as the sources of the state.[9] The other name is Thomas Hobbes, a well-known British thinker who wrote the Leviathan (1651), describing the state as an artificial human artifact, describing the state by centering on a person who is greater in intelligence and reasoning power than other beings, and thinks it is destructiveand conflict-prone in the state of nature.[10] Besides the fact that these thinkers belong to three different time periods, because they have been nurtured from the accumulations of different geographies and are in an effort to draw a general framework of explanations for political thought, we need to take advantage of the thoughts of these thinkers when seeking answers to our basic questions.

Ibn Khaldun's Political Thought and State Philosophy

According to today's sociological approach, Ibn Khaldun, who treats the state and society as two different structures and defines the formation process of both with sociological data,[11] whether the general system of thought or his state philosophy in particular is to be understood, some basic concepts used by him should be briefly reviewed and its main elements should be identified.[12]

---

[8] Yves Lacoste, Tarih Biliminin Doğuşu – İbni Haldun, (Trans.Mehmet Sert), Don Kişot Corpus Yayınları, İstanbul, 2002, p:112

[9] William Ebenstein, (Trans. İsmet Özel), Siyasi Felsefenin Büyük Düşünürleri, Şule Yayınları, İstanbul, 1996, p:32

[10] Göze, ibid, p:133-134

[11] Ülker Gürkan, "Hukuk Sosyolojisi Açısından İbni Haldun", http://dergiler.ankara.edu.tr/dergiler/38/336/3416.pdf (d.o.a:24.04.2009), p:236

[12] Oktay Uygun, İbni Haldun'un Toplum ve Devlet Kuramı, Oniki Levha Yayınları, İstanbul, 2008, p:2-4

Civilization

The concept of umran constitutes the basis of Ibn Khaldun's thought. When we look at the concept's dictionary meaning, "to reside, to live, to visit, to build, a population, living with animals, to be kept in good condition,[13] to be in good condition and to be a productive place, a place of honor, the prosperity in the world, civilized activities and domestic life" are given. This research and investigation of the social activities are also called 'Umran Ilmi' (ilm-i umran).[14] According to our thinker, Umran is in a much broader framework and more sophisticated than civilization and urbanism,[15] "urbanism is only found in cities and towns, while Umran is present both in cities and in towns, namely in urban areas and with the Bedouin."[16]

Given the unique nature of social events and the specific laws they have, according to the definition of the thinker this purpose (of social events), "is to discover and investigate the laws, their functioning and the results they bring."[17] As a result of this complex and encompassing richness of meaning, as a general evaluation, "Ibn Khaldun's works indicate the social, political and cultural activities as well as the problems of Umranian population and economic life. It's about the whole thing about people."[18] According to Ibn Khaldun, centering on human beings and life, three essential characteristics of the Umran phenomenon are mentioned: 1– The people who will not be able to live alone by nature and will come together around a community; 2. The assembled human communities will develop organically in a certain way; 3. People who are elements of social life will specialize in a specific job that they will do well and gain mastery.[19]

Social Solidarity

The other basic concept of Ibn Khaldun's methodology is social solidarity (asabiyyah), which has a dictionary meaning of "connection, nerve, the prominent people of a society, the community of people, and the relatives of from a person's fathers side (the bond that connects someone)."[20]

---

[13] Ahmet Arslan, İbn-i Haldun'un İlim ve Fikir Dünyası, Vadi Yayınları, İstanbul, 1997, p:85

[14] İbn Haldun, ibid, p:113

[15] Lacoste, ibid, p:165

[16] İbn Haldun, ibid, p: 114

[17] ibid, p: 115

[18] Lacoste, ibid, p:166

[19] Albayrak, ibid , p:5

[20] Süleyman Uludağ, İbn Haldun, Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı yayınları, Ankara, 1993, p:70

In addition to the dictionary meaning, depending on what Ibn Khaldun wants to explain, it is also possible to define it as "party spirit", "group spirit", "community spirit", "social solidarity feeling", "social enthusiasm", "tribalism", "nationalism", "… the feeling that allows the individuals in a particular society to come together and become passionate. The definitions that are tried to be performed are more in terms of the breadth and envelope of the framework of the concept, seeing as the definitions of explaining their functions, their effects and their reflections instead of giving the exact opposite of the concept.[21]

Ibn Khaldun divides this concept to two groups: lineage and causes of asabiyyah. Blood and lineage are basic to the involuntarily founded first type, while the second is voluntary and won later. Having the essence of superiority and dominance, the basic aim of asabiyyah is to have power and to establish a state which is the theoreticalized form of domination. In addition to "society is necessary for the human, hegemony for society",[22] hegemony at the highest level is the state and asabiyyah has vital importance for the state. "Asabiyyah is most commonly found in the source of sovereignty to any kind of social organization; More specifically, it is possible to make the transition to the most perfect form of the state and to the civilization of the city, which is identical with it … 'Asaba is the only creative political factor'.[23]

Property, power, social and political life all have asabiyyah at their foundations and therefore "A change in one or the other direction that occurs in an asabiyyah matter necessarily affects other internal organisms."[24] Everything that is mortal will end with "asabiyyah" and will gradually retreat, decline and disappear over time.

According to Ibn Khaldun, who defines asabiyyah as a basic concept in this way, geographical and economic conditions are the factors that determine the content and forms of this concept "which emerged at the level of the Bedouin Umran in principle and in its original form".[25] Geographical conditions and corresponding climatic conditions will be a decisive factor on the strength or weakness of asabiyyah, as well

---

[21] İbn Haldun,ibid, p: 96; Uludağ, ibid, p:72-73
[22] Arslan, ibid p:115
[23] ibid, p:115
[24] İbn Haldun, ibid, p: 98-101
[25] Arslan, ibid p:111

as the urbanism between the relations of production and the possession of different characteristics of economic structure.[26]

Bedouinism and Hadarism

For the thinker who built the foundations of his theory by observing human life and its differentiations there are the two main stages in the life of the nomadic and urban communities. Despite being defined as nomadism, Bedouinism was used by Ibn Khaldun with a wider sense of meaning. Although being used for Arabs living specially in the desert and the Sahara as nomads, in general terms, "no matter where in the world they lived, or what kind of race or tribe it is, these tribes were the first form and beginners of society.. as the earliest of everything emergence is called badawah or badawi, for the first of human society and the primary form it has they were called badawah and badawi."[27]

Within the framework of this definition, it is also clear that some small communities settled on the soil are defined as bedouin.[28] According to Ibn Khaldun, Bedouin communities consist of two main structures: those living in livestock, living in grassland and not dependent on land, and villagers living in bedouin life, although they are resident for their livelihoods.[29]

The word hadarah was used by the thinker in the sense of "culture and civilization", but in terms of the specific culture of the Bedouins and their culture, he used hadarah to mean "settled culture". Just as not all established communities are civilized, neither are all people and communities living a nomadic life Bedouin. For example, nomads living in tents can be higher living civilizations, those in living caves or forest can be higher than those living in cities.

When Ibn Khaldun explains the difference between these two communities, he sets out from the difference of their ways of living and surviving as an extension of the distinction in the forms of production by economic relations.[30] In connection with increase in production bases and production amounts, bedioun societies go into the

---

[26] İbn Haldun, ibid, p: 101–102

[27] ibid, p: 105; For a detailed defition of the concept of "Bedouin" and its subgenres, Arslan, ibid, p:98–99

[28] Uygun, ibid p:12

[29] Yavuz Yıldırım, İbn Haldun'un Bedâvat Teorisi, Marmara Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, (Unpublished Dissertation Thesis), İstanbul, 1998, p:45

[30] Uygun, ibid , p:14

process of urbanization though the speed and direction of this phase still depends on the geographical, economic and social conditions of the Bedouin community. These two distinctive communities have a dependent economic relationship. While Bedouins "produce raw, unprocessed and primary material", the urbans "produce processed, manufactured and semi-finished goods", resulting in commercial relations based on reciprocal exchange.[31]

Leadership and Property

While Ibn Khaldun classifies communities in two different forms, at the same time he explains the political and administrative structure of these two structures under two separate structures. He says, "The Bedouin associations call for the referral and administration of the primary tribes and clans, and the property (rulership, reign) for the tribes."[32] In the case of a Bedouin society, there is a chieftain in the position with the whole authority based the tradition regarding the authority of the ruler and the ruler of the kingdom.[33] Jobs are carried out on the basis of volunteerism and solidarity in the Bedouin community, where there is no administrative organization, and since there is no class of military and civil servants, they have the chance to pass judgment on the terms of the governor depending on general consensus and persuasion. One step ahead of equals, the adopted leader possesses nobility and power in the Bedouin communities, and rules according to social laws and bases, which are just signs of tradition.[34]

The leader, in the case of urban communities, the state and functioning state organization are the property of the ruler. The most distinctive qualification of politics and government based on state organization is based on "congratulation, victory, heroism and invasion".[35]

Unlike loose obedient Bedouin societies, the end of those who do not submit to the decree of this rulership can result even in death. The leadership and chiefs communities built up in loose bonds are a consequence of the primitive conditions and are "the goal of the tribe of urban settlement, and the aimed object and no force can

---

[31] İbn Haldun, ibid ,p: 105–106
[32] ibid p: 106
[33] For a detalied information about leadership, formation of leadership and its comparison with property
Yıldırım, ibid , p:66–80
[34] İbn Haldun, ibid , p: 106–107
[35] ibid , p: 107

prevent it."[36] The Bedouin community that attained this purpose will be transformed into a ruling posture suited to the rule from the ruler and its formal reflection.

The Origin of State: The Need to Co-Exist

The philosopher, who structures humans and society at an organic level, thinks that people by nature have to live together.[37] There is no divine or human will in the emergence of the political power and of the city-life which is a reflection of state. "Man, by nature must always live in the order of society and under the authority of a power."[38] Living together and the community are two integral parts of each other. "The power of many must be gathered together so that both themselves and their sustenance and possessions are provided. This is essential. By way of assistance, goods and provision will be provided in a sufficient amount to meet the need for the multiplicity of the participants of the production."[39]

The transformation of this mode of production is important in terms of these transitional functions of the prosperity achieved by the production of the surplus in the transit from bedounism to urbanism. "Ibn Khaldun refers to the part in which the man fulfils his obligatory needs, either by labor or by any means as 'sustenance'; the excess of necessity and the richness that constitutes the source of the capital accumulation is called the 'gain'…According to him, the most important factor in the transition of mankind to the surplus-product (gain) phase is the division of labor."[40]

People who have to come together for this need for sustenance also need the help of other people to defend themselves. Although God gave the beasts various virtues that could protect them; gave the idea and a hand at his command. "The hand is an organ created for being the helper and servant of the reason. Thanks to art, tools for human beings are produced. These tools replace other organs that other animals have to defend themselves."[41] But these tools are not enough by themselves, in order to achieve a successful protection mutual assistance is required. As it can be seen from the following: "It is imperative for people to live in an integrated and collective

---

[36] ibid , p: 108

[37] Arslan, ibid , p:92

[38] Uygun, ibid , p:109

[39] ibid , p: 213

[40] Erol Kozak, İbn Haldun'a Göre İnsan-Toplum-İktisat, Pınar yayınları, İstanbul, 1984, p: 174-175

[41] İbn Haldun, ibid , p: 214

manner."[42] In any case where people come together to live together, a certain alignment will be needed at the same time to organize the various positive or negative developments that this association may encounter within the framework of certain rules.

State as a Search for a Life of Co-Existence and Trust

Ibn Khaldun said that the need for this order is based on the fact that humans have an animal aside and that this aggressive unsatisfied sensation will be the source of human destructive activities against each other.[43]

"There is a need for a law-giver (as a deterrent from evil) to protect people against each other. Because attacking and injustice are found in the animal-natures of people. The weapon that is manufactured to fight off rape of wild animals is not enough to overcome the rape of human beings. Because the same weapon is available to all other people. In this case, there is a need for 'something else' that will prevent people from violating each other. This 'other thing' mentioned cannot be one of the other creatures. Because all the other animals are lacking in terms of cognition and inspiration from human beings. It follows that the law-giver should be from the people itself. But this law-giver will have a subjugation, a sultanate, a divine hand and a superior dominion over other people It must be like that one can not rape another, or harm. This is the meaning of sovereign."[44]

As it can be understood from this long citation, human beings who start living together in need of food and protection, at next level, will become a danger against each other. This realistic observation tracking the effect of psychological onto the social seems very progressive. It is possible to see the approach of Western political theorists, who will live after centuries after him, that people will be in destructive attitudes towards their fellow citizens in social life, and that an organization with the power to use it will be needed to prevent it.[45]

Another important issue that Ibn Khaldun confronts us in his views on the state and authority is that he says that the idea of sovereign naturally takes place in people

---

[42] ibid , p: 214

[43] Arslan, ibid p:109

[44] İbn Haldun, ibid p: 215

[45] For a comparison between Al-Muqaddimah and Leviathan: Uygun, ibid , p:93-97

Despite the fact that in some animal species the behavior of following a particular authority is visible, ıt is noticed that this behavior takes place in animals as a result of nature (fıtrat) and intuition directing, and that human beings realize the idea of supreme power through politics.

Stating that in the absence of state human-life can not be maintained, the philosopher must hold the 'asabiyya' (social empathy). Because a legit sovereign, "is a person or institution that is a) dominant, b) tax-collecting, c) recognized by other states, d) protector of the borders (having an army), e) whose power and authority is never passed by another"[46]

Ibn Khaldun's bold statement is that there is no direct relationship between the formation of the society and the organization of the formation as a state and the prophethood.[47] Ibn Khaldun, who did not participate in the views of various thinkers in the absence of the Shari'ah, that the state process would not be possible, stated that there was no essential relationship between these two element in these sentences: " Without a strong authority for people, human life becomes an anarchy, and such a life is not possible. However, the societies and states of non-Muslim are a contradiction to that of the anarchy. (So, without Shari'a, a society order and a state organization is possible to be established.)[48]

Recognizing the state as a natural phenomenon, Ibn Khaldun regarded religion and state as separate phenomena because of their different character and their sources.[49] Ibn Haldun, who has tried to understand the factors beyond the ideal that affect the real, the experienced and the living events, does not put the center of the study of the phenomenon the religion, which preaches to be, waiting from human beings to move for certain purposes. He analyzed the religion to the degree that as an institution and function it effects the people of Umran.[50]

---

[46] Uludağ, ibid , p:98
[47] Arslan, ibid , p:93-94
[48] İbn Haldun,ibid , p: 216
[49] Orhan Hülagu, Farabi ve İbn-i Haldun'da Devlet Düşüncesi, Kırkambar Yayınları, İstanbul, 1999, p:105
[50] Uludağ, ibid , p:113-114

Elements of State and its Formation

However, according to Ibn Haldun, who states that conquering can be done through sense of 'asabiyya' which can be made steadfast and strong as a result of the difficult circumstances of bedouin's nomadic life, and that the stability of the state is also dependant on 'asabiyya'; the elements of states are: Race that governs population and culture, tax-collecting that defines economic relations, the protection of the boundaries that determine the country, sovereignty and law-making.[51] Although all of these elements are important, the first two have more important functions than others. Because state built on asabbiya that represents culture and race is maintained through economic relations. Because the first traces of the course of deterioration and destruction will appear in these two elements. After the state is established, the basic element which will determine the power, the strength and the vitality of the state will be the quality of the 'asabiyya'.

When it comes to the borders of the state, the thinker considers a framework in which authority can be used effectively. The periphery-center relationship is important in terms of the beginning of the political deterioration and the process of its operation. Because the thawing and the loss of power begin at the periphery and move towards the center. If suddenly defeated by a central power pace, analogous to heart, it will be the case that there will be a solid central-oriented change rather than a natural process towards the center.[52]

Another important element of the government, which is dominated by the sense of competition in what is good and sovereignity is to make laws driven by the sense of 'asabiyya'. The state expands after being established with a strong 'asabiyya' and turns from a simple content to a more complex structure. In parallel with this complexity, it is imperative to prepare laws that will make everyone obedient in order to facilitate obedience and prevent disorder.[53] The identity of the politics will be effected by those who make the laws. If the law is made by people with reason there will arise a 'politics of reason' (siyasa akliyya). On the other hand if the laws are made accordingly to Shari'ah, there will be Shari'ah governed politics (siyasa diniyya). The reason-based political regime is based on the existence of man only in this world and investigates the conditions of his survival, while the religious political regime aims at the salvation

---

[51] Hülagu, ibid , p:85

[52] ibid , p:86-87

[53] ibid , p:88

of its people in afterlife basically and thus takes afterlife into consideration in real life.[54]

Umran and state and sovereignty are inseparable qualities. Formulazing this relation as "Property is not one of the things that constitute Umran's material, but the form of Umran."[55], the philosopher holds the idea that property and sovereignty is the basic principle that keeps human communities together and prevents them from entering a dissolution. As a reflection of this defined relationship, Umran is developed according to the state, and when the state reaches its highest point, Umran also takes the most perfect form, "The regions that Umran can reach are the same as the regions where the state's hand can reach."[56] and as a result it is dissolved together with the state.

The state will tend to expand and develop once it is established, depending on the asabiyya. There are 5 phases that will be confronted by the state that is never thought without asabbiye. The first phase is the foundation and victory period based on the victory and the success of bedouin; the period of instigation and domination is established inside; the third stage is the period of peace, order, peace and reconstruction based on agriculture and trade; the fourth phase is the period of consensus and peace in which the emperor does not have the will to enlarge, and the fifth phase is the period of waste and deterioration in which the power holders are fooled and faltered.[57]

Ibn Khaldun, in his evaluations of the rise and fall of the state establishes a relationship between this dissolution process and bureaucracy and military class. The pen and sword, which show the two powers of the state, are two important means at the same time. The sovereign needs the army in order to implement his orders; as a result, army is prior to other institutions. The state is in need of the army at the most when it has become needy and experiences weakening periods. They will need the help of recruited foreign army even if they don't hold the same 'asabiyya'.[58]

---

[54] Arslan, ibid , p:174-175; Gürkan, ibid , p:238

[55] Cited by, Arslan,ibid , p:105

[56] ibid , p:105

[57] Ülken, ibid , p:236-237; Hülagu, ibid, p:90-91; Uludağ, ibid , p:93-95; Barbara Strowasser, "İbn Khaldun'un Tarih Felsefesi: Devletlerin ve Uygarlıkların Yükseliş ve Çöküşü", <http://dergiler.ankara.edu.tr/dergiler/42/448/5036.pdf> (d.o.a:17.04.2009), p:177-178; Gürkan, ibid , p:240-241; Uygun, aynı eser, p:145-152

[58] Hülagu, ibid , p:92

At the same time, the thinker finds in the rise of the state a fundamental relation between art works, public works movements and civil works. According to the rise of the state and the enlargement of its possibilities, the increase of the qualities of the civilized works, the big cities and the great works of art can only be brought to life by the great states.[59] There is a level of mutual relationship between the level of welfare and wealth of the people and the power of the state. "Just as the power of the state depends on the richness of the people; the gathering of the people and the expansion of division of labor, and thus the production, the economic activities, the increase of the wealth depend on the strength of the state"[60]

The Problem of State's Life Span

Ibn Khaldun, who has built a general system of thinking within the framework of a cyclical understanding of history, says that states will complete the five phases mentioned and also formulates the idea that the fall that will begin with the arrival of the maturity age will result in the disappearance of the state as his model. According to him, it is an inevitable cycle that the state organism, like every living thing, will be born, grow, live and disappear for a certain period of time. As other entities disappear after a while, the asabiyya will also disappear in the wake of various social events.[61] Although this period is changing depending on the strength and power of the asabiyya of the states, the states will surely suffer a devaluation.[62]

The main reasons for the collapse of the state according to the theory explaining the collapse of the states for sociological reasons are the internal factors. Though it is an attack of external force that causes the collapse, the philosopher thinks that the developments that require collapse are from inside and they cause the devastating foreign attack.[63] Explaining this relationship in the form of cause and effect, for the philosopher, the establishment is contained within the ascension, and the period of ascension and prosperity is contained in the collapse. "So prosperity and civilized life are already found in collapse. According to him, one of the causes of the state's

---

[59] Arslan, ibid , p:104; Hülagu,ibid , p:93

[60] Kozak, ibid , p: 166

[61] Ülken, ibid , p:236

[62] Hülagu, ibid , p:93

[63] R. Gökbunar-E. Kömürcü- A.Z. Yalçın, "Mali Sosyolojide İbn-i Haldun'un Yeri", <http://www.icisleri.gov.tr/_icisleri/ TurkIdareDergisi/UpLoadedFiles/207-221.ramazan%20gökbunar.doc> (d.o.a :25.04.2009), p:212, Arslan, ibid , p:132

suffering and decadence is the increase of the bureaucracy. And ceremonies and rituals, uniforms, engagements and other forms of artisanal increase, its breaking from the people and the signs of collapse."[64] The flashy and expensive habits point to the peak of the level of development that the 'hadari' society could come up with are also brings the society to the point of collapse and dissolution".[65]

Ibn Khaldun, who has evaluated economic, psychological and ethical reasons together, explains these factors in the following way: "After obtaining the tools of civil life, reconstruction and production, people again fall into the habits of natural welfare. Here, the process of decline and destruction and the collapse of the state are based on the subversion of people, especially of the state, to make the rest of the people comfortable, peaceful, prosperous and calm. It is difficult to give up on habits. People want to have the best means of life. As the need grow, they foster each other. Because desires have no end. When luxury starts, the gains become insufficient. Needs and demands multiplied, so costs increased. Expensiveness is also increased. Taxes also increased. However, for the increase of Umran, the tax burden should be low. Umran requires satisfaction in order to grow. The tax burden should be minimal for enterprise and enthusiasm. Taxes further increase the cost. Because the seller puts the taxes, all the expenses, the cost of his own livelihood into the price. As the costs increase in the society, the stable circle is overcome, waste is multiplied. Because habits also are formed, they challenge themselves to fulfil the needs of this life, but they cannot afford to get out of it. They spend all their earnings, increasingly exposing themselves to poverty. As the border is crossed, the economic structure of the city is now demolished. The Umran will also fall. Instead of being conscientious and disgusting the people's property, different things become to take place. The collapse of the state accelerates."[66]

As can be seen, both economic and psychological factors bring effect to the same direction. We see how the habits that the welfare community will trigger an interaction and that if this process is once started there is an irreversible flow.[67] Especially, it is clear that the search for adaptation, which takes place through taxation, and the

---

[64] Hülagu, ibid , p:94
[65] Lacoste, ibid , p:170
[66] Cited by, Hülagu, ibid , p:95
[67] For a detailed information on the implact of way of living to people's psychological stances, please look: Uygun, ibid , p: 21–29

process of a political decision-making process in the form of tax increase as a result of these searches, is a disruptive effect that the actors in the economic life will experience.

There are two possibilities for government officials to remove the imbalance between the state's incomes and expenses. They will either increase state incomes or cut down state costs. However, a certain state is achieved that even if these two ways are tried, success will not be achieved. It will not be possible to reduce the expenses of the state. Because the wages of the bureaucracy and the military class, which have been built on the basic functioning of the state and are now very enlarged, have to be paid. At the same time, the discontent that the state will entrust to its security and the salaries of its army and generals who are not loyal to it except for a monetary affiliation will be dismissed. It will not be possible to diminish the costs of the ruler and his immediate surroundings, who have come to be the "son of habits" who have become accustomed to the comfort and luxury of city life.[68]

Attempts to increase their income will remain ineffective. The increased tax rates for it will cause people to move away from production because they will negatively affect their expectations and hopes, and paradoxically, it will further reduce state revenues. Seeing that the intervention on tax rates has been inconclusive, this time the state will enter into economic life as an active actor and will build commercial monopolies. In order to make this enterprise effective, it will not restrain himself using power against the actors in the market when necessary, which will cause the producers to run away from the production, the traders from trade, and the consumers to run away from the cities. The state, which sees this as unfit, this time will invade the property rights and confiscate every property around it and its hand, which will cause even the closest people to turn away from him and to form alliances with other anti-state internal and external forces that take advantage of opportunities. Cities will be vacated, people will be separated from their jobs and the state and civilization will disappear after economic life.[69]

---

[68] Arslan, ibid , p:148
[69] ibid , p:149-150

Aristotle's' Idea of State The philosopher, in his approach to state in his book Politics, defines human beings as "social animal" created in order to live in the Polis.[70] According to Aristotle, "The Polis is the last civilizational step to be reached by mankind through stages like family, tribe, village. Polis is the result of a natural and compulsory development, a perfect society with self-sufficiency" and it is there even before all the elements which created it.[71] The basic purpose of everything in nature is to be self-sufficient, and only Polis is self-sufficient. As he can achieve self-sufficiency only in Polis, human beings are by nature social beings (zoon politikon/anthropos).[72]

According to Aristotle, the state "is an organism possessing all qualities of a living being, a natural community."[73]3 As can be understood from this conclusion, according to Aristotle, the state is confronted as an 'end'. The philosopher who thought the state to be naturel logically and philosophically, as he believed in the logical conclusion of "sum's being included in the part", regards the state being included in family, village and city.[74] The philosopher explains his ideas in this way "Human beings are by nature social and only Gods and animals can live enjoying certain borders of the protective city."[75]

Family, village and city-state are certain points of 'social state' and each social state has their own functions addressing the needs of people. While the daily necessities of the people are being addressed within the family cohort, which is the first stage of social evolution, responding to the fundamental and primitive cultural needs that the family can not meet is satisfied in the village association which is wider and more complex than village. In the city-state, which is the highest point of social evolution, it seeks to answer the needs of a better life other than the basic elements of life. The state, which is the highest unity in terms of values and aims, has more than simple problem of unity in the state and is a acquisition for noble purposes.[76]

---

[70] In Aristotle's works, the concept of Polis is used for state and its country kavramı Please see: Aristoteles, Politika, (Trans. Mete Tuncay), Remzi Kitabevi, İstanbul, 1975, p:72; Göze, ibid , p:41

[71] Aristoteles, ibid , p:9; Göze, ibid , p:41

[72] Macit Gökberk, Felsefe Tarihi, Remzi Kitabevi, İstanbul, 1980, p:88; Göze, ibid , p:42

[73] Ebenstein, ibid , p:32

[74] Aristoteles, ibid ,p:10

[75] Ebenstein, ibid , p:32; Göze, ibid , p:42

[76] Ebenstein, ibid , p:32-33

Aristotle, who also defines the forms of government with the state, states that at different times different "best" forms of governance may be the subject and quantification will be an important point of differentiation when determining these forms of governance. His basic definitions can be summarized as: One person (kingdom), a minority (aristocracy) or all the citizens (politeia)[77] might be the subject of establishing the common 'end' of well-being.

Observing that the administrations are changing at certain intervals, the thinker pointed to the existence of different special causes for each administration besides the general reasons to explain this change. For Aristotle, who sees equality or inequality as the causes of state's destruction, equality and inequality should be in a certain balance at every level government. Some governments go to extremes in the direction of equality principle, but some go to extremes on inequality principle. For instance, in democracy, it is wrong to accept the majority equal in the absolute sense and confiscating the property of rich in order to reach the equality in order to target societies' diversity.

In the same way, it is a mistake for oligarchies to disseminate the idea of inequality in every direction absolutizing the idea that the people in the oligarchy are not equal. Thusly, this idea of inequality causes revolutions. In addition to this, "there can be other special and general reasons such as ambition of earning and respect, fear and abuse of power."[78]

In summary, Aristotle sees the city-state as an 'end', regards the evolutionary process starting from families ending at the state as inevitable for achieving 'inevitable'.[79] Regarding the state natural in this sense, the philosophers counts for the logical and philosophical reasons behind it in the idea of provision of needs and the objective of 'self-sufficiency' which can only be achieved in Polis. For him, State can not be thoght as a 'means' but only an 'end' to achieve the goal of self-sufficiency.

---

[77] Aristoteles, ibid , p:81
[78] Göze, ibid p:49-51
[79] Aristoteles, ibid , p:9 ve p:91

Hobbes' Idea of State

It is possible to find Thomas Hobbes' ideas about state, in his book written in 1651, the name of which is inspired from a giant mentioned in the Old Testament.[80] In its natural state human being with destructive qualities needed an authority to establish and maintain a social order, and the state, which aimed to overcome this need, emerged as a human-product... The state created for the protection and defense of man carries out judicial and executive duties through its officers.[81] The "wealth and existence of his people is his strength, the salvation of the people (salus papulis) " is his task, his counsellors his memory, his righteousness and laws his wisdom and wills. Compliance is his health, social disorder is his illness, civil war is his death."[82]

Having found the source of the authoritarianism that the state should carry in the human beings who are differentiated from other beings with reasoning and judgement, Hobbes states that religious feelings are found only in human beings. Searching for the explanation of events and facts he witnesses, human beings in the instance of the idea of 'cause of causes' reaches the idea of God. Man will try to establish a trust circle within him, believing in a supreme god idea in the face of fear of the future, death and poverty.[83]

The expectations and the goals of the people who live together with their fellows, who are equal in nature and who are equal in body will be similar. The next goal of a person who has the goal of protecting and maintaining his or her life is to have something that he likes. He may get involved in any action in order to provide for his needs, even in murder. This process will result in an endless struggle between the weak and strong.[84]

Because of competition, insecurity and the tendency to be superstitious, the struggle between people will always be the case."Competition makes people struggle for their interests. The sense of insecurity drives people into battle to ensure security. The passion to protect fame and to prove they are unrivalled makes people aggressive."[85]

---

[80] Gökberk,ibid p:281; Ebenstein, ibid , p:165

[81] or more information on the duties of sovereign power please see Thomas Hobbes, Leviathan (Trans. Semih Lim), Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1993, p:174

[82] Aktaran, Göze, ibid , p:133-134; Gökberk, ibid , p:284

[83] Hobbes, ibid , p:82; Göze, ibid , p:134; Ebenstein, ibid , p:166

[84] Hobbes, ibid , p:97; Göze, ibid , p:134-135

[85] Aktaran, Göze, ibid , p:135

The war of all against all (bellum omnium contra omnes) is not temporal and in that case, a man is a wolf to another man (homo himini lupus).[86] Because they are in battle, there will be no power or law that people will obey, nor will there be a fair or unfair distinction because there is no law. As violence, trickery and cunning are the basic principles of this warfare, there will not be a practical meaning of private property and what is yours could be others' in a minute. However, this person will try to reach an atmosphere of peace aimed at his mind and his passions in order not to annihilate himself. It is inevitable for other people to be persuaded in this direction and met on an agreement basis for the protection of the peace environment. The conditions of this agreement will be determined as natural laws and the basic principle will be "not do something that you do not want to be done to yourself". With the help of this agreement humans will transfer from natural state (status naturilis) to citizen (status civilis) .[87]

This situation, which requires everyone to abandon the absolute right on everything, will not be able to be maintained only by agreement, but to comply with this agreement and natural law, there is a fear of death and a more compelling principle than the orders of the mind. The presence of an authoritarian force is also imperative for humans to subjugate, to be visible, to be held, to be scared, to be punished, and to be opposed. A merger that is not supported by algebra and oppression and does not involve the power of punishment is condemned to be alleged and will not bring any assurance to people"[88]

The owner of this power will be the State/Leviathan which will establish the agreement between the people and whose fundamental objective is individual security.[89] People must transfer all powers and authorities either to a person or a parliament, but this transfer must be of absolute quality and should not be subject to any saving of man after the form of the state is determined.[90] The state, which has become the dominant power now, will have absolute liberty in its movements; He may take any measures he deems necessary without any connexion to prevent the deterioration of peace and security.[91] The property will be reduced to a status granted by the state to not be a

---

[86] Gökberk, ibid , p:285

[87] Gökberk, ibid , p:285; Göze, ibid , p:136–137

[88] Aktaran, Göze, ibid , p:49–51

[89] Hobbes, ibid , p:127

[90] Hobbes, ibid p:131; Ebenstein, ibid , p:167

[91] Ebenstein, ibid , p:172

cause of conflict and state will be the sole source of law as a lawmaker in the society and with this freedom will be defined as the ability to do things that the law does not prohibit.[92]

Describing the establishment of the state with peace and security, Hobbes considers it necessary to ensure equality of everyone before the law for the security problem and states that another task is to make good laws necessary for the well-being of the society.

Because it will not be immortal, the state will also face death for causes caused within ''The power of the state is either absolute or nothing.''[93] The inevitability of having an indivisible authority and the attainment of a weakening in the absolute power of the state will prepare the collapse.[94] The destructive doctrines deciding good and evil at the same time, the absolutization of the right of property given to persons, the idea of dividing the sovereign power, the failure to maintain a balanced approach between religion and state politics, the lack of adequate financial resources and the defeat in war are also reasons for state's destruction.[95]

A Comparative Evaluation Regarding Means/Ends Problem

After accounting the thoughts that form the basis of political philosophies of thinkers, we can move on to the other part of our work and evaluate their thought as a means / ends problematic centered comparison.

In order with overcoming some of the needs brought about by social life, we are getting some evidence about the historical projections of ideas that we will express in the means/ end debate on the state, which is one of the various institutions that are at the center of mankind. recognizing that the whole of theoretical discussions on the state and the thoughts obtained can not be presented in this short work, the views of Aristotle, Ibn Khaldun and Thomas Hobbes, which we thought to describe the process of the state from the side of the human being, sometimes became one with our basic argument, and at times there were some differences.

---

[92] Göze, ibid , p:139-141
[93] Gökberk, ibid , p:286
[94] Hobbes, ibid , p: 226
[95] Göze, ibid , p:142-144; Hobbes, ibid , p:226-234

In our explanation of our natural tendency as a starting point, we have arrived at the idea of accepting the state as a means of solving human needs. However, simply defining the state as a means or ends may be incomplete as a tool to evaluate the debate initiated over 'means or ends' problem framework. However, our basic approach is to think that the state is a 'means' in the adventure of social life, and after the formation of the state, it is thought that we have experienced a shift towards a 'ends' direction in the face of the emphasis on the necessity of some elements.

Human beings are rational beings, who are by nature co-existing, that understand they have to go into division of labor for some functions that can not come on their own by the social unity that they form with each other. This rationality will expand from the point of view of the necessity of social life as a simple division of labor, when beginning to become complicated. Man, who will arrive at the potential costs of continuing on the path of voluntarism, will surely define these costs for him and will set up an institution that holds the practice of "force-power" in cases of conflicts and needs.. The fictional nature of the state, which will begin to gain its appearance after defining its functions, functions, and elements, will lead to the diffusion of state in social life and humans having their places in any area will create a sense of "necessity" that will feed different approaches to the state in the consideration of the state. This " inevitability of the state" might lead to the thought of going to a different point than the human-centered starting point, and of thinking that the state might be the end rather than the mean in the face of such inevitability.

At this point we will try to make some evaluations of how the thoughts of the thinkers we refer to in terms of the state philosophy on means / end debate can be perceived in terms of this discussion.

As it will be remembered, Aristotle thought the state as the ultimate point, reached during the evolution of families and villages in the natural process of co-existence. Being self-sufficient was an inevitable impulse to be reached for all living beings in nature, and man could only be self-sufficient within the state, which was the most perfect reflection of the collective life and its evolution. The idea of the state as the naturally shaped process, however it may seem slightly intertwined combination of 'means' and 'ends', seems to be thought as an 'end' for humanbeings to be self-sufficient.

There is also the idea that some of Aristotle's own characteristics of the time he lived in the city of Athens could also have an effect on the development of this thought. Because the thinker had witnessed this dissolution process at a time when the Greek city-states began to dissolve in terms of their political, economic and social characteristics. Perhaps witnessing the confusion and the negative consequences of the foreign invasion may have led him to emphasize the state as an inevitable institution in terms of its functions. However, in spite of these somewhat speculative assumptions, the fact is that the place where the state is located in the face of human beings, as social animals (zoon-politikon) in Aristotle, has such a high emphasis that it cannot be a 'means'.

Ibn Khaldun, who took part in the tradition of Islamic thought, explained the process of formation of the state as a natural consequence of the existence of collective life, without linking it to either human or divine will. The people who can only make the sustenance production that they need to survive together with their fellow-friends in a collective way, will also benefit from this unity to make tools to protect themselves from wild animals. However, the question of protecting people against those they have come together in order to survive and defend their lives seems to be a problem. Because the tools created to be used against animals are possessed by everyone and we need a 'founder' (va'zı) -possessing a deterrent power- for preventing those tools to be used against each other. This deterrent power should be another organism rather than the people.

The position of human who, due to its nature must live in co-existence under the authority of state and the sovereign exercising its authoritative force, shaped within of the theory of 'assabiyya', simply explained as 'social empathy'.

We can determine the position of Ibn Khaldun in the discussion of means / ends more healthily when we jointly evaluate his two theories: That our basic direction is towards power and sovereignty and that there is a natural and inescapable tendency towards 'badawiyya' to 'hadariyya' in which the state is formed.

Evaluating asabiyya in its simple form, as it is only natural to be expected from it, to be the source of evolution from tribal life to city life and the source of inevitability of this evolution, might lead us to the conviction that state is seen as an 'end'. Ibn Khaldun is linking the formation of the state to man and sees the state as a consequence of the

basic directions of man. As he grounds the foundation and development of state and also the processes attached to its growth and end to the human beings and asabbiyya (the soul of solidarity), Ibn Khaldun posits the state not as a determining factor but as a 'determined'. It is not possible to regard human beings as 'means' against the state, who are given a 'determining' role.

What should be noted here is that the existence of the phenomenon of asabiyya in the direction of state-formation is an inevitable result of social life and the aim of the state in the face of man has different qualities. Because the state is a dependent variable against the people, it is possible to think that the state can not be a 'means' against the people. However, in spite of all these inferences and explanations, instead of identifying a one-sided relationship in the name of the thinker, it is reasonable to say that the state is positioned as a 'means' in terms of functionality against humanity, given the general view of its philosophy of politics.

According to Thomas Hobbes, who builds the ground on which his political thought is based by describing natural state of the subject in question, the human being is destructive in its natural state. The expectations and demands of people with equal physical and ideological characteristics will also be gathered at the same point and inevitable competition will begin to gain priority over this limitation. The limits of competition will be so unpredictable that there will be such a state of conflict in which a man is wolf to another man' (homo homini lupus) that any negative deed, including killing, can be expected from human beings. At this point, the rational man who will realize that this process possesses the dynamics that will destroy him will come to an agreement establishing the armed state with a deterrent force which is inevitable to use force against him and, when necessary, to put an end to this natural principled conflict. This state formed by the emotion of peace and security will have an absolute, indivisible authority to fulfil its purpose. According to the philosopher, it is inevitable that the state has no partners in its authority. For the purpose of fulfilling the 'means' brought the state, it will do the legal regulation that it wants without being limited by anything. People who set up the state by mutual agreement will have no chance of exercising power on it after the state is established. Despite being emerged from the agreement, it must not be anticipated that the state will adhere to the rules of this agreement among people. As an extension of this, the state, which will make "good laws" without any limitation or limitation for the purpose of the good of the society, will have a position on the people as it is over everything with its absolute authority.

The task of the state defines the state as 'end' in terms of the functions that are imposed on him for the sustainability of the social life. The idea that the state, which has a framework outside and over the wills of those who bring it to life, must have no boundaries when it comes to determining the laws and the power of civil-servants who use the authoritative power of the state in the application these rules, makes us think that the state is inclined to be thought as a 'means' in the framework of 'means or end' debate.

In addition to the assessments we have made to the above-mentioned thoughts on the state's "means or ends" debate, the evaluations we have deducted, if a system that formed as an extension of the collective life of people who have the ability to transform nature with all kinds of reasoning and judgement power, it seems reasonable to think that it would not be possible to evaluate it as an 'end'. During evaluating the state in terms "ends or means", when thought in the anthropo-centered cosmos, in which the state is only for humans and their need, it is inevitable to think the state as 'means'.

In Lieu of Conclusion

The basic element that will determine the content of the question of whether the state is a means or an end will in fact be shaped by how the state is defined. Because the main approach in the definition that will be given in the question of "What is state?" will give us an answer for the question. For this reason, it would be more appropriate to start by defining the state and then to interpret the problematic of means/end.

The state "is the outcome of the necessity of living together, regulation of security, protection, relations; establishment and application of ordering rules in areas where operation has become problematic, provision of the rules by using force from time to time when there is no lawful obedience. A political institution that seems like a particular organization based on the fictions and acceptance of people to address their needs."

The main elements emphasized in this definition are that the state is a structure brought by the community. State structuring is shaped by the process of dynamic structuring that people have developed along with their living practices and

transformed according to their needs. Factors such as the beginning of some tasks and the beginning of some of these groups in fulfilling these duties have brought about the first mechanism that will be built on the state organization.

The question of the origin and legitimacy of power, the key element of the state mechanism, has always been on the front-line, with the concept of the state. The state, which achieves a different entity from its people, has to act by using various organs to fulfil its expected functions. The first organizations that began to shape around the chief at the most basic level later met with a state organs led by kings or sultans who based their origin of their power to God.

As a result of the changing state perception along with the social contract and the constitutional idea, the structure and functions of the state organization are defined and differentiated within the framework of its new elements. At present, there are now three main functions that are agreed upon: legislative, executive and judicial. While the legitimacy of the authority used by all these organs had been based on a divine source and the use of its representatives on earth, it is now generally accepted against certain exceptions that the legitimacy of the state and its institutions is the free will of the people who bring about it. In the future, during the process of transformation of, education-training and human relation, the state phenomenon will get its share and change.

We have mentioned the details of what the state is up to the now. In the center of this description, main concerns are humans and human needs.. In the course of natural life, the problem of means/end will start shape in the face of the central position of the human being, a being quite distinctive from other living things thanks to its reason and judgement.

As the human beings are the origin; and the basic purpose of state is his/her needs, then as the state is established to take care of these needs, it is possible to say the state is a 'means'. But sometimes, communities and the communities who establishes the state, starts to have a different identity from its establisher, the human-beings. The state is at first a concept in the minds of its people; but when, with its institutions

and rules, it starts to develop, state gains a new appearance quite different from the individual, weak and singular.

As for us, building a common ground towards the 'first cause' will make an important contribution to the resolution of 'means or ends debate", Even if there is a consensus on the provision of human needs as 'the first cause', it is possible to come across paradigms that would perceive the state as an objective in the acceptance and intellectual evaluation of the identity of the next stage of the state in its 'corporate' appearance. In other words, along with basing the state on people's own fictions and assumptions for the 'provision of human needs", it is possible to interpret the state within the framework of an 'end', in subsequent developments.

In order to make possible this kind of evaluations, it is dramatically important to underline the essence and values humans possess; and emphasise on the reason and judgement as the power of agend behind the historical flow. The idea of constructing the state as an effective means for man, who is understood to possess the power of using and adapting everything on the earth with reason, seeking to protect itself from destructive aspects himself, in accordance with his own reality, is a very realistic fact. The essential element to be emphasized here is that the humanbeing who have the ability and the possibility to mobilize everything in the nature for his own use, must be leaved behind a step that can not be passed on to any fact or distinction. It is a fact that human beings, possessing distinctive intangible powers such as reason and judgement that allow them to become separated from other beings, have material and spiritual needs. By acting on this phenomenon it will be possible to undertake a new task in the state as an extension of the distinction of material and spiritual needs. The state, which is being designed to overcome the material needs of eating, drinking, reproducing and living a healthy life as a part of nature, will fulfil this duty while at the same time it will be expected to provide the necessary space for man's other spiritual needs. As an extension of this new distinction and this new task that has been imposed on the state, we have placed the state in the position of being a 'means' again in the discussion of purpose.

How can an institution that is supposed to fulfil the mission of firstly providing a person's needs be placed on one of the more important spiritual elements that cause a

person to be separated from other beings in the nature and defined as a goal? Yes, in fact, the answer we give within our account is very clear. The state is an instrumental (means) mechanism that uses the powers and powers of power that are passed on by people who have shaped themselves as an extension of the basic assumptions of this fiction, designed to ensure that the human needs of both material and spiritual needs are resolved in these two directions.

As a result, it should be said that the state is and must be a means with various mechanisms that are embodied by fictional basis for man and his life. We have to identify it as both a philosophical category and as it should be, based on the state's appearance and modern authority, and the bureaucracy mechanism, not based on its prevalence in society. At the same time we have to make this determination to add strength to the existence of the weakened man in front of the modern state machine, which has come out as an actor with absolute power.

References

Albayrak, A. (2000). Bir medeniyet kuramcısı olarak İbn Haldun. *Uludağ Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi, 9*(9).

Aristoteles. (1975). *Politika*, (Çev. Mete Tuncay). İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi,

Arslan, A. (1997). İbn-i Haldun'un ilim ve fikir dünyası. İstanbul: Vadi Yayınları.

Ebenstein, W. (1996). Siyasi felsefenin büyük düşünürleri, (Çev. İsmet Özel). İstanbul: Şule Yayınları.

Gökberk, M. *Felsefe tarihi*. İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.

Gökbunar, R., Kömürcü, E., Yalçın, A. Z. (2009). Mali sosyolojide İbn-i Haldun'un yeri. *Türk İdare Dergisi, 1*(455), 207–211.

Göze, A. (2007). Siyasal düşünceler ve yönetimler. İstanbul: Beta Yayınları.

Gürkan, Ü. (1967). Hukuk sosyolojisi açısından İbni Haldun. *Ankara Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Dergisi,* 24(1), 223–246.

Hobbes, T. (1993). *Leviathan*. (Çev. Semih Lim), Yapı Kredi Yayınları.

Hülagu, O. (1999). *Farabi ve İbn-i Haldun'da devlet düşüncesi*. İstanbul: Kırkambar Yayınları.

İbn Haldun (2007). *Mukaddime*, Cilt I–II, (Haz. Süleyman Uludağ). İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları.

Kozak, E. (1984). İbn Haldun'a göre insan-toplum-iktisat. İstanbul: Pınar yayınları.

Lacoste, Y. (2002). *Tarih biliminin doğuşu – İbni Haldun*. (Çev. Mehmet Sert). İstanbul: Don Kişot Corpus Yayınları

Oktay, C. (2007). Siyaset bilimi incelemeleri. İstanbul: Alfa Yayınları

Uludağ, S. (1993). *İbn Haldun.* Ankara: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı yayınları.

Uygun, O. (2008). *İbni Haldun'un toplum ve devlet kuramı*. İstanbul: Oniki Levha Yayınları.

Ülken, H. Z. (1983). *İslam felsefesi–eski Yunan'dan çağdaş düşünceye doğru*. İstanbul: Ülken Yayınları.

Strowasser, B. (2009). *İbn Khaldun'un tarih felsefesi: Devletlerin ve uygarlıkların yükseliş ve çöküşü*. *Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 39(1), 173–181.

Yıldırım, Y. (1998). *İbn Haldun'un Bedâvat teorisi*. (Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi) Marmara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.