The Nature of Kingship (Mulk) in the Context of Continuity and Change in the Thought of Ibn Khaldun[*]

İbn Haldun Düşüncesinde Süreklilik ve Değişkenlik Bağlamında Mülkün Tabiatı

Ömer Türker

Marmara University, Türkiye
om.turker@gmail.com

Abstract: Ibn Khaldūn's societal and political theory, benefiting from the "filters of critique" of thinkers such as Ghazālī and Fahruddīn al-Razī, is a masterful application in the field of societal existence of Ibn Sīnā's metaphysics. From this point of view we can discuss the indispensable assumptions of a societal and political theory that can be produced today from classical Islamic thought through Ibn Khaldūn's theory of kingship (henceforth: mulk). With this goal I will discuss in the next paragraphs, after analyzing Ibn Khaldūn's theory of mulk in the context of its own philosophy, this theory's metaphysical assumptions. Ibn Khaldūn is in various ways one of the Islamic thinkers that is most studied in academia in contemporary times. Many researchers have written books and articles about his views on various fields, such as philosophy, politics, society, economics, and history of science.[1] From amongst them are authors such as Muhsin Mahdi, Ahmet Arslan, Ali al-Wardī, and Tahsin Görgün who have aimed to lay bare the philosophical foundations of Ibn Khaldūn's societal and political thought in particular, by establishing relations with philosophers such as Aristotle, Fārābī, Ibn Sīnā, and Fahruddīn al-Razī. Some writers, such as Syed Farid Alatas, Abdulaziz Elazmeh, M. Umer Chapra, Laroussi Amri, Johann P. Arnason, Dieter Weiss, Recep Şentürk, and again Tahsin Görgün discuss the timeliness and reproducibility of Ibn Khaldūn's theories of the state and society. From amongst these especially Syed Farid Alatas' economic and political analysis of Islam in general and Asian societies in particular and Recep Senturk's alternative sociology of civilizations, attempting to draw on the thought of Ibn Khaldūn, are worthy of mentioning[2]. To these names we can add those writers who compare the views of Ibn Khaldūn with the views of contemporary social and political thinkers such as Karl Marx and Max Weber.[3] As especially Muhsin Mahdi and Tahsin

---

[*] This article is a review of the paper presented at the "2nd International Ibn Khaldun Symposium" organized on 29–31 May 2009 in Istanbul.

[1] For a short overview of these studies, see Cengiz Tomar, "İbn Haldûn, Literatür", TDV İslam Ansiklopedisi, XX, 8–12.

[2] See Syed Farid Alatas, "A Khaldūnian Exemplar fo a Historical Sociology for the South", Current Sociology, 2006, Vol. 54 (3), p. 397–411; "A Khaldūnian Perspective on the Dynamics of Asiatic Societies", Comporative Civilizations Review, 29, p. 29-51.

[3] For a study including the articles on the timeliness of Ibn Khaldun by Muhammad Dhaouadi, Recep Şentürk, Syed Farid Alatas, Faruk Yaslıçimen, Lütfi Sunar, Tahsin Görgün and M. Umer Chapra., see İslam Araştırmaları Dergisi İbn Haldûn Özel Sayısı II, 16 [2006].

Görgün have stressed, the philosophical theories described in works of Fārābī, Ibn Sīnā and Fahruddīn al-Razī do not merely for Ibn Khaldūn function as a means or tool to express his own views, on the contrary, they form the very foundation of his societal and political theory.[4] Ibn Khaldūn's societal and political theory then, benefiting from the "filters of critique" of thinkers such as Ghazālī and Fahruddīn al-Razī, is a masterful application in the field of societal existence of Ibn Sīnā's metaphysics. From this point of view we can discuss the indispensable assumptions of a societal and political theory that can be produced today from classical Islamic thought through Ibn Khaldūn's theory of kingship (henceforth: mulk). With this goal I will discuss in the next paragraphs, after analyzing Ibn Khaldūn's theory of mulk in the context of its own philosophy, this theory's metaphysical assumptions.

Keywords: Ibn Khaldun, Theory of Mulk, Metaphysics, Islamic Philosophy

Öz: *İbn Haldun çağdaş dönemde çeşitli yönleriyle en çok akademik çalışmaya konu olan İslam düşünürlerinden biridir. Birçok araştırmacı, onun felsefe, siyaset, toplum, ekonomi ve ilimler tarihi gibi çeşitli alanlara dair görüşleri hakkında kitap ve makale seviyesinde çalışmalar kaleme almıştır. Bunlar arasında Muhsin Mehdi, Ahmet Arslan, Ali el-Verdî, Tahsin Görgün gibi yazarlar İbn Haldun'un bilhassa toplum ve siyaset düşüncesinin felsefi temellerini –Aristoteles, Fârâbî, İbn Sînâ ve Fahreddîn el-Râzî gibi filozoflarla ilişkisini kurarak– ortaya koymayı amaçlar. Syed Farid Alatas, Abdulaziz Elazmeh, M. Umer Chapra, Laroussi Amri, Johann P. Arnason, Dieter Weiss, Recep Şentürk ve yine Tahsin Görgün gibi bir kısım yazarlar İbn Haldun'un devlet ve toplum teorilerinin güncelliğini ve yeniden üretilebilirliğini tartışırlar. Bunlar arasında özelikle Syed Farid Alatas'ın genelde İslam ve özelde Asya toplumlarının ekonomik ve siyasi çözümlemesi için ve Recep Şentürk'ün alternatif bir medeniyetler sosyolojisi için İbn Haldun düşüncesine müracaat çabaları zikre şayandır. Bu isimlere, İbn Haldun'un görüşlerini Karl Marx ve M. Weber gibi çağdaş toplum. ve siyaset düşüncesinin öncülerinin görüşleriyle karşılaştıran yazarları ilave edebiliriz. Bilhassa Muhsin Mehdi ve Tahsin Görgün'ün vurguladığı gibi Fârâbî, İbn Sînâ ve Fahreddîn Râzî'nin eserlerinde dile geldiği haliyle felsefî teoriler, İbn Haldun için sadece kendi görüşlerini ifade edebileceği bir vasat veya malzeme işlevi görmez, aksine onun toplum ve siyaset teorisinin zeminini oluşturur. Zira İbn Haldun'un toplum ve siyaset teorisi, Gazzâlî ve Fahreddîn Râzî gibi düşünürlerden istifadeyle "eleştiri süzgecinden geçilmiş" İbn Sînâ metafiziğinin toplumsal varlık alanına ustalıklı bir tatbikidir. Bu bakımdan bugün klasik İslam düşüncesinden üretilebilecek bir toplum ve siyaset teorisinin vazgeçilmez varsayımlarını İbn Haldun'un mülk teorisi üzerinden tartışabiliriz. Bu amaçla ilerleyen satırlarda İbn Haldun'un mülk teorisini kendi felsefî bağlamına atıfla tahlil ettikten sonra bu teorinin metafizik varsayımlarını tartışacağım.*

Anahtar Kelimeler: *İbn Haldun, Mülk Teorisi, Metafizik, İslam Felsefesi*

---

[4] See Muhsin Mahdi, Ibn Khaldûn's Philosophy of History, Chicago : The University of Chicago, 1964, p. 63–131; Ahmet Arslan, İbn Haldûn'un İlim ve Fikir Dünyası, Ankara: Vadi Yayınları, 1997, p. 437–452; Tahsin Görgün, "İbn Haldûn, Görüşleri", TDV İslam Ansiklopedisi, XIX, 543–55.

A. Mülk Teorisi

Ibn Khaldūn constructs his societal theory on a set of concepts such as barbarism (bedâvat), civilization (hadârat), group solidarity (asabiyyah), mulk and state (dawlah). This construction, as he himself also pointed out, aims to create a philosophical science that takes as a subject the society and in that way determines universal laws through which societal events can be analyzed in a correct and comprehensive way. To achieve this purpose Ibn Khaldūn uses the peripatetic substance-form theory (madde-sûrah). The main reason for using this theory is to be able to identify the obligatory and possible situations defined not at the rational level but at the material level. Because of this reason the definer of the individual common nature of the human being who is actor in society, in other words setting off from the unchanging characteristics through the material necessity, tries to reach the mandatory consequences of human nature. To be able to track this nature's necessities he once more takes as a foundation the definition of the peripatetic philosophers. According to this view the human being is a "thinking animal". The term "animal" in the definition is the genus that is near to the human being; as for the term "thinking" it is the characteristic that distinguishes him from the other animals in the same genus. From the viewpoint of being human both characteristics are human characteristics, and therefore they do not change according to conditions such as individual, society, place, and time. So when Ibn Khaldūn speaks of human nature he basically means the human essence that is made up of the characteristics of life and thinking. This nature or essence, because of its animality, has characteristics that are common to all animals. First of these characteristics are the characteristics of feeding and protection to ensure the continuation of existence. However while the necessity of nutrition is a direct need of the animal, the necessity of defense arises as a result of the need for aggression that is a direct need of the animal. Ibn Khaldūn identifies these two characteristics as the final cause (gâî illeti) of the societies that are formed by human beings. That is to say, when he mentions "the need for nutrition and defense is the cause of the formation of human communities" he means that these two situations are the purpose (gaye nedeni) of society. For this aim people come together and amongst individuals "cohesion" takes place. Thus, civilization (umrân) is the general name for societies in which people come together and form a cohesion.

When the need for nutrition and defense is satisfied, because it is a recurring need and therefore continuously occurs, the fulfillment of other particular needs, always makes human beings seek a societal existence. With this understanding, living in society is a natural characteristic of human beings and this is what is meant by "the human being

in its nature is civilized (medenî)". That society is natural means at the same time that it is necessary for mankind. However this necessity does not require that his existence continues by itself without needing anything additional.

For the continuation of the societal existence another element is necessary to provide cohesion between individuals, namely what Ibn Khaldūn has called asabiyyah. In its broadest sense understood as "the spirit of solidarity",asabiyyah essentially makes protection and defense possible through organized power. The function of asabiyyah becomes clear when considering the situation of attack which brings about the need for defense. Attacking or attempting to take what is possessed by someone else (mutâlebe), although it leads to a human situation we call defense and in that way it is one of the reasons why a society comes into existence, it is not one of the situations that continues its existence by changing into something else. And for this reason attack or mutâlebe takes place in any human society as a derivative of protection and defense. This means that a group of people who come together to protect themselves from external attacks at the same time always possess the power to attack outwardly. Attack and defense situations on the other hand are not only situations that can be taken into account when considered at the societal level, but only when they are outward-looking, that is to say when two or more societies are assumed. On the contrary, like with nourishment attack and defense are realized by individual human beings, therefore these are situations realized within the society rather than amongst societies. And this thus means that the direct consequences of the characteristics of nourishment and attack in fact take place within the society itself. With this reason, resulting from the need of nourishment, arts, crafts, and various ways of livelihood, and resulting from the characteristic of attack and the need for protection, arms industry and armament come to existence. Thus asabiyyah basically is a conventional meaning that does not operationalize the defense and attack powers individually – because the need for defense cannot be met by individual arming – but it does on a societal level.

Ibn Khaldūn compares society and asabiyyah with the disposition of natural objects. In order to form the disposition of natural objects, one of the elements that come together to form the disposition must overweigh the rest; because when all elements are equal the unity of the disposition cannot be provided. As such, with asabiyyah it is necessary that to form a truly unified society one of the human elements of a part of them must overweigh the rest (ghalabah).[5] Even if it seems in the first instance that the

---

[5] Ibn Khaldûn, Muqaddimah,. Derviş el-Cüveydî (Beirut: el-Mektebetü'l-Asriyye, 1996), p. 124.

relationship between ghalabah and asabiyyah is a mutual necessity (telâzum), in reality asabiyyah as such gives priority to ghalabah and it becomes clear that it is the concrete cause for ghalabah. For this reason, while asabiyyah has the forming function regarding human societies, with regards to ghalabah it has a concrete function, and a society that became clear through asabiyyah becomes more clear through the form of ghalabah. From this perspective, ghalabah makes asabiyyah in Ibn Khaldūn's thought a political concept and transforms it from a societal theory into a political theory. Because a chairman (riyasah) that combines sovereignty (hâkimiyyah) and leadership – Ibn Khaldūn sometimes calls this suûdet – can only be formed with ghalabah.[6]

The basic function of riyasah is to control the power of attack and outburst and to manage the community – to distinguish this from previous levels we can call it society – which is now closer to real unity in the direction of certain goals. However Ibn Khaldūn uses the term leader (reis) to mean a ruler who has no sanction power. According to this a leader has follower, but has no power to force his demands. With this, leadership is the position in which ghalabah occurs and in this state carries an incomplete sovereignty. In other words, riyasah points out a leadership situation that is not fully realized by all its necessities. When you add to riyasah the application demands by force then you get the thing we call mulk. Therefore while leadership (riyasah) corresponds to the substance of the nature of mulk that is common amongst all rulers, the meaning of "have something done by force" falls under mulk. Mulk, then, is in general a somewhat more specialized and distinctive form of leadership. And so Ibn Khaldūn uses mulk in the meaning of "an authority that, in order to completely meet the need of defense, prevents the excesses of people against each other, has ghalabah over the people, and has the force and sanction power"

(فيكون ذلك الوازع واحداً منهم يكون له عليهم الغلبة والسلطان واليد القاهرة حتى لا يصل أحد إلى غيره بعدوان وهذا هو معنى الملك)[7] .

Since the source of existence of this authority is human wrath and because of that the power of attack, the basic function is "to prevent the people's excess against each other". For this function a force that will provide compulsion is necessary. As for this compulsion, it opens up the way for the second function of mulk: making your demands happen by force. In this sense mulk, in sequence, is wrath, attack, protection, community, asabiyyah, and in the case of leadership it is a state that contains force, and is the aim of the human self and thus of asabiyyah.

---

[6] Ibn Khaldûn, Muqaddimah, p. 124.

[7] Ibn Khaldûn, Muqaddimah, p. 47, 10.

In other words, the one who has asabiyyah, when he reaches a certain level desires chieftainship (riyasah, suûdet) and suzerainty (metbûah); and afterwards sorrow (qahr) and tyranny (taghallub). When reaching sorrow and tyranny there is no new aim to reach; the aim consists of the protection of the status quo

8. (وأما الملك فهو التغلب والحكم بالقهر)

Because, when you carefully look at the process of the formation of mulk, it is seen that at the same time it also means the continuation of human existence and communities. Because of this, according to Ibn Khaldūn, mulk is the natural sentiment, and its realization is not related to the choices of human beings, on the contrary, the existence of society in a certain process necessarily reaches mulk and continues with mulk.[9] This is what it means by the final form of human society being mulk. With this understanding, with all its stages, the concept of mulk is equal to the concept of the state (dawlah), and forms the advanced version of civilization (umrân).

Ibn Khaldūn makes clear that mulk is based on two foundations. The first one is shawkah (meaning sanctionary power) and asabiyyah. The concrete demonstration of this is the army. As for the second one, it is property that provides the continuation of the existence of those things that the army and mulk need.[10] This can be called treasure. In this case the substance of mulk corresponds to the entirety of what the owner of mulk is in possession of. In other words, all material and spiritual assets that can be thought of in the context of army and finance constitute the substance of mulk. In this regard mulk belongs to a private or legal person who has a subject, collects taxes, sends envoys, protects the borders, and has no ruling (kâhir) power above it. If asabiyyah fails to

---

8 Ibn Khaldûn, Muqaddimah, p. 30.

9 Ibn Khaldûn, Muqaddimah, p. 139, 189.

10 Ibn Khaldûn, Muqaddimah, p. 269.

provide some of these aspects it indicates that the reality of mulk has not been completed.[11] If attention is paid, the mentioned situations at the same time also express the field of influence of asabiyyah that holds mulk in its hand. Thus, the owner of mulk can only execute his judgment over those who count as subjects and tax-payers in those territories where the borders are protected. In this regard state and mulk are in the position of the form of civilization (umrân), as for subjects (reaya), cities, and other elements they are in the position of substance.[12] Thus, state and mulk are things that protect the kind of civilization and are not possible to detach from its substance. This means: as unimaginable state and mulk are without civilization (umrân), similarly impossible (muteazzir) is a civilization without state and mulk, because of the nature of the human beings.[13] Because the forceful rule that is the reality of mulk is a characteristic that is present with the ruling person or persons, it becomes a realized meaning between the rulers and ruled. Thus the continuation of mulk does not mean merely the continuation of one party but of both parties. Said differently, while the continuation of the existence of society is dependent on the continuation of mulk or state, similarly the continuation of existence of state and mulk is dependent on the continuation of society. If that is the case, in order to maintain the existence of civilization (umrân) there must be found an element which is related to both mulk and the substance of mulk, and an element that pr ovides the protection of both.

In order to find out what this element is Ibn Khaldūn starts from the theory of substance and form (madde-sûrah). According to the theory the formation and deterioration of bodies (kewn and fesâd) consists of the fact that materials are taking a

---

[11] Ibn Khaldûn, Muqaddimah, p. 175-76.

[12] Ibn Khaldûn, Muqaddimah, p. 343.

[13] Ibn Khaldûn, Muqaddimah, p. 349.

different and new form. If a form (sûrah) corresponds to the essence of the object, the object that loses the unity of its form is no longer that object and turns into something else. The deteriorated form, if it is not from the essence of the object but from one of the accidents, aside from the object continuing as itself, it becomes subject to quantity, quality, or one of the other accident categories in which movement is realized. As for this movement, it consists of a change of the form of accident or body. When we think about civilization (umrân) as an identity that consists of substance and form, the form that protects its varietal unity is the mulk of it. However, since tyranny and sorrow that form the reality of mulk are the result of the strength of animal wrath, mulk in a bare state becomes arbitrary domination. With the words of Ibn Khaldūn, that the person or group who possesses mulk "forces the people according to their personal desires and often asks of them beyond their capacity" concretely entails that civilization, depending on the conditions, in a long or short period falls into decay. Because the forceful power that facilitates the continuation of rule, used by one of the two parties for their own benefit, obstructs the continuing of both the verdict caused by the form – because the interests change according to the person or group – and also it damages the substance that is the carrier of the form and in that way obstructs the continuation of the existence of the form. In this case the nature of mulk, because of being itself during the process it will lead to chaos and destruction, tends to destroy itself.[14] This situation sometimes leads to the destruction of the reign of a specific leader (particular state) and sometimes, along with the asabiyyah that is the protector of the mulk, of the complete state (universal state), which means the destruction of civilization (umrân) in the real sense.[15]

Thus the nature mulk in a bare state is not convenient to be enduring and there is a need for an element which will protect the relation between the substance and form of civilization and that will maintain it. So according to Ibn Khaldūn this element is the political law which forms the reality of umrân and takes into account the interests of both sides and which acquires general acceptance. When a state lacks such a law it cannot be said that its affairs are in order and its sovereignty has been fulfilled, which means it is not a true state.[16]

---

[14] Ibn Khaldûn, Muqaddimah, p. 177.

[15] Ibn Khaldûn, Muqaddimah, p. 349.

[16] Ibn Khaldûn, Muqaddimah, p. 177.

In this context Ibn Khaldūn's analysis of the continuity of umrân is based on two concepts: interest (maslahat) and law (qanun). Ibn Khaldūn uses the concept of interest as the opposite of the aim (gharaz) and desire (shahwah) of an individual or group. Maslahat in this sense means the societal interest that provides the continuation of civilization (umrân). The rules which are implemented to acquire these interests and to remove the negative consequences that obstruct these interests form the law. Interest and law, since they are states that are additional to the bare nature of mulk, Ibn Khaldūn calls "mulks" (plural of mulk) that rule people according to their own aims and desires and which are devoid of interests and laws "natural mulk" (tabiî mulk). And the mulks that rule the people according to the established rules with the aim of acquiring the interests and fence of the negative consequences he refers to according to the principle that determines the interest. Ibn Khaldūn's division of interest is especially based on the knowledge and science classification of the late theologians (kelamiyyun) and philosophers. And also it is parallel to the analysis in the last part of the Muqaddimah that is about the sources of knowledge. According to this, if the interests are worldly interests that are identified by absolute reason without taking into account religious obligations and if the laws are based on these interests this is called political mulk. The aim of this mulk is to rule the people in accordance with reason-based thinking. If these interests in the real sense are otherworldly interests and the worldly interests are catered towards otherworldly interests and are determined according to them this form of rule is caliphate (khilafah). And the aim of this mulk is to rule the people in accordance with "legal thinking" In contrast to political mulk, the caliphate entails that the conditions in the world are determined in relation to the otherworldly interests in accordance with the lawgiver (Shâri'), which in reality means the caliphate is practiced on behalf of the lawgiver in protection of religion and the world.[17]

So Ibn Khaldūn's analysis of the nature of mulk shows that there are two essential conditions for the full realization of this nature. Firstly, that the external factor which functions as a sanctionary power possesses the characteristic of using force. Secondly, that the using of force and sanctionary power are applied along with laws that are implemented in relation to worldly interests or both worldly and otherworldly interests. It is possible to add to these two conditions a third condition of which Ibn Khaldūn is speaking in his analysis of the period of the first four caliphs: the gaining of interests

---

[17] Ibn Khaldûn, Muqaddimah, p. 178.

and defeating the harms in the matter of sanctionary power, without the need of letting the external actors use force, the individuals don't have conscientious objection. Thus, the santionary power that forces the person to act in accordance with the interests are external actors outside of the person.[18] Because beside the fact that in such a situation the first condition of mulk remains dysfunctional – which is the condition that ensures that chairmanship (riyasah) shifts to the stage of mulk – the laws that were orders turn into actual advices. This condition shows that there is no coherence between state and mulk: as all mulks are a state, not all states are mulk. Although there is a real state in the first period of Islam there is no fully formed mulk. However Ibn Khaldūn thinks that this is because of exceptional circumstances in human history and when these possible exemptions are not taken into account mulk and state are indeed coherent. Because according to Ibn Khaldūn our experience of human relationships in general shows us that people, such as in the period of the first caliphs, apart from exceptional periods, do not obey laws voluntarily but because of the command and following up of the establisher of laws. Governance that does not carry any of these three characteristics is a governance in which the nature of mulk is realized incompletely and yet in the process of maturation. In that case these three characteristics are characteristics that form the essence and nature of mulk and possess them because of being itself.

The concept of mulk with these characteristics assumes that the societal and political processes because of its essence are conflicting. The person or persons who possess or carry mulk are those that because of their asabiyyah have come out of this process of conflict successfully. In this case the direct result that emerges from mulk is that the carriers of mulk take the other under control and dominance. If "taking under control" can be taken as rulership, then the first and foremost thing that mulk brings to its carriers is rulership. At the beginning of possessing mulk in the understanding of dominance with suffering, rulership is a collective capacity and success amongst the military powers of asabiyyah. But this, as opposed to assumptions of contemporary theories that see rulership as collective capacity and success, is not based on that societal and political relations are at least possibly in harmony, rather it is based on

---

[18] According to this, the nature of mulk wasn't completely formed during the four caliphs period. In this period the sanction was religious and everyone's sanction power originated from themselves. On the other hand, after the time of Muawiyya asabiyyah inclined towards mulk with purpose, the religious sanction weakened and for this reason "sultanic" and "asbani" sanction were needed. See Muqaddimah, 196.

continuous conflict. The leader of asabiyyah, who is possessing mulk and therefore is in the state of being the primary carrier of mulk, while destroying the asabiyyah during the process tends towards monopolizing the leadership. When asabiyyah that provides the earning of mulk is destroyed then mulk concentrates in one person. This situation that is called "infirâd" by Ibn Khaldūn is called the zero sum by contemporary sociologists, and reaches the peak of asymmetry which is from the realization onwards a basic characteristic of mulk. But "infirâd" needs amongst the carriers of the nature of mulk mutual relativity, and therefore does not give the possibility to gather the monopoly into one hand. Yet, when mulk reaches the stage of 'infirâd', the rulership of the owner of mulk, beside of the characteristics of taking under control of the others, it develops some kind of dependency relationship with the now occurring recruiting asabiyyah. In other words, while recruiting asabiyyah, because its interests dependent on the owner of mulk, serve his will and interest, the owner of mulk, because of his interests depending on the recruiting asabiyyah 'will fulfil their wishes'.

As this dependency strengthens the power to control or, despite the resistance, the power to fulfil his own wish will weaken. To the extent that the control is weakened, rulership turns into a capacity that is divided amongst the bearers of mulk. But in any case rulership holds the feature of inequality in gaining resources that are counted as worthy for the bearers of mulk as well as for the all segments of society. In this context, the basic element of rulership that emerges as a necessity of the nature of mulk is the realization of a wish or aim. So rulership in the understanding of Ibn Khaldūn is a purposeful rulership. The bearer of rulership is whether an individual who monopolized mulk or individuals who came together for specific purposes. The ability to make decisions that direct the flow of events and control capital is the most important consequence of mulk and therefore of rulership. In this case there must be an observable conflict so that mulk and rulership can gain existence. In this stage, authority, in the understanding of 'fulfilling the desires of the person of group that poses mulk by subjects', is authority that emerges through imposition and is essentially a result of rulership. Therefore, in the mulk that is based on asabiyyah before recruiting asabiyyah, the autority the mulk owner has over the subjects is a derivative of rulership. The authority the mulk-owner has over his subjects, in this stage, is not a derivative of of rulership that comes out of mulk. Because mulk was not gathered in one person before the formation of recruiting asabiyyah, the founding

asabiyyah members claimed to have a right in mulk and therefore in rulership. When taken the formation process of mulk into consideration these claims are legitimate. Because in this stage the source of legitimacy in 'the understanding of having right of mulk and iktidar' is militant and victorious power of which the militant members of asabiyyah are gradually partners.

On the other hand, the mulk being a relation between the ruler and the ruled, it needs the elimination of observable conflicts in order to maintain the existence of mulk and rulership. Because in the case of forceful sanctions mulk and rulership, to the extent that it serves the interests of a person or group, will tend to be destroyed. In that case, the carrier or carriers of rulership will gain continuity if they make their individual or group interests part of common social interests. This situation will transform the evil and aggressive way of mulk and rulership into good and reconciliatory and will make of mulk, through laws, the form of society in the real sense. The becoming of a unity of society and mulk consisting of substance and form influences the boundaries and sharing of rulership and authority deeply. First of all, the identity shaped by substance and form possesses some features independent from the bearers of rulership and authority which goes even beyond the purpose and will of a person who gathers mulk to himself. In other words, the specific features are the structural requirements that occur with conscious or unconscious actions of a particular individual or group within society. The spiritual beings which Ibn Khaldūn made the issues of the knowledge of society by speaking of them as symptoms that get attached to mulk because of its essence (of mulk), are almost all from these kinds of situations. These situations, which are requirement of the form, are the ones that are most difficult to be resolved because they gain reality in society through the actors. Because they contain many elements that make up the substance of society, as well as the individual and social contributions of the bearers. Therefore an attempt of resolution related to this requires an analysis of the separated features of substance and form as well as an analysis of the required situations of form regarding being a certain substance and the restrictions it becomes a topic for.

In that case the gaining of real unity of the social existence through laws based on interests along with mulk, is an additional situation and privatization compared to previous situations, it is also the case for the bearers of mulk, rulership and authority.

Because in this case mulk is given in the service of interests. Although the degree of service among certain mulk-members is different this situation is adding some wilful (iradî) purposes, which aim for the continuation of society, to the natural aim of mulk; this situation leads to leaving attack for defence, conflict for serenity, sorrow for softness, relative barbarity for friendship. One of the most important consequences of this situation is the numerical expansion among the bearers of rulership in the meaning of 'taking under control' and the bearers of authority in the meaning of 'fulfilling the demands of another person or group'. Such numerical enlargement can be either through established institutions or through actual situations that are not fully institutionalized. Establishments are determined depending on interests and establishments which gain existence independent from its bearers to the extent it is necessary for the continuation of the nature of mulk, because they are carrying the nature of mulk in their own essence, they limit the rulership of the leader and assume a systemic character. In other words, because they are partners with the mulk-owner in fulfilling their wishes by using force, they function as 'taking under control' in their own boundaries. Since institutions represent the realization of interests, authority is shared amongst persons and groups who identify, enforce, and follow interests. The rulership in this situation loses its function to become a resource for authority to an important degree and the knowledge of interests, the application and the following becomes recourse for authority. Because private and legal rights are determined not by the capacity of using force and in this context the power of taking under control but by interests and laws. For this reason the legitimacy of rulership as a sustainable situation in political or ssher'î mulk, different from natural mulk, is depending on interests and laws and is basically explained around the notion of justice.

Here, Ibn Khaldūn sees this stage not in the terms of the human being an animal but as a stage in which the characteristics of him become more visible as being reasonable and thinking. Because, according to him, the qualities that maintain human beings as human beings are the good habits (hilâlü'l-khayr). Good habits are the complements of glory and honor which are an extension of asabiyyah. Since mulk is the purpose of asabiyyah its extensions and complements are also the purpose. Therefore even if the nature of mulk will be realized it will remain incomplete.[19] These habits become more evident in individual and societal interests and situations and the so-called virtue

---

[19] Ibn Khaldûn, Muqaddimah, p. 133-35.

arises. Mulk, rulership, and authority-owners start losing their positions to the extent that distance from these occurs. Because the realization of the nature of mulk, the attack and pretension that gain mulk to asabiyyah, in process, it transforms it to defense and protecting the currency. In this case, the emergence of luxury, comfort, and plentitude with the maturation of mulk, as long as it is not balanced by virtues, will destroy the foundations of mulk which is the form of society, and the process of the foundation of a new asabiyyah along with the starting of a new mulk.

Analysis that has been made until now shows that Ibn Khaldūn thinks that mulk and rulership have no certain sociological form. When the concept of mulk is taken in the bare state as Ibn Khaldūn is calling it natural mulk and as a one-stage process, the theory of mulk turns into a theory that explains dynasties. Because, mulk in its bare state, because of its nature, goes toward solitary and requires the gathering of rulership in one person. But the transformations and the two basic stages of the mulk during the process show that this theory is special to dynasties. Because in this case it is possible to understand asabiyyah as the meaning that provides social solidarity and solitary as the centralization of rulership. The situation of "fulfilling demands by using force" that forms the nature of mulk and the transitions which rulership and authority that emerged from mulk are situations that can take place in all kind of regimes. When looked at from this perspective Ibn Khaldūn thinks of concepts like asabiyyah, tyranny, interest, and laws which form the roof of mulk as concepts that need mutual relativity on one hand and as concepts that in some situations have different degrees of realization on the other. In other words the human conditions the concepts in question are pointing out are concepts that need each other for the realization in the sphere of social existence as they are concepts that are possible to be understood through reference to each other. On the other hand the realization of these situations in the field of social existence, in final analysis, has no certain form or quantity. Anyone who wants to analyze the societal structure should before determining the form and quantity of spiritual beings in any society determine the existence of meaning or definition. This theory does not solely rely on the concept of rulership as a necessary consequence of human animal desires, on the contrary, it finds rulership and ultimate competence in the concept of justice by connecting the continuation of rulership to virtues that balances the animal desires. Moreover the virtues that Ibn Khaldūn lays down as a condition for the continuation of rulership or the perpetuity of the state, are

seen as the human conditions imposed by the continuity of the material existence of the state and of society. In other words, the form of social or political existence necessarily has to produce its own virtues. These virtues, which are moral values caused by the fact that the human is a thinking entity but not moral values because of the necessity of God's commandments or moral values through which you reach metaphysical truths, but are universal principles that are the necessity of the continuation of material existence and in this sense necessitate being a social entity.

B. The Metaphysical Foundations of the Theory of Mulk

Ibn Khaldūn's theory of mulk is based on the five principles of classical Islamic metaphysics, especially as seen in Ibn Sînâ. The first is the principle that the existence of man is the soul and body. The second is the principle that all objects consist of substance and form, and that the difference between the objects is realized by that the substance is taking new forms. The third is the distinction of being and essence that Ibn Sînâ has developed to explain essentially unity–plural relation. The fourth is Aristotelian teleology. According to this principle, everything in existence has a final goal and everything is in a movement to realize its own goal. This goal is at the same time also the competence of that thing. The fifth is the following principle, which is a general outcome of these principles: The competence of everything is contained in its definition, and any object can only be competent/maturation to the extent of its definition. Ibn Khaldūn's success is that he is able to apply these principles to social existence, which is the subject of the science of society, in accordance with the hierarchy of philosophical sciences. But there are two basic determinations that introduce his application of which the first has to do with method and the second with the domain of existence.

First of all, Ibn Khaldūn notices that there is no exact overlap between the philosophical sciences that are divided into two main parts, theoretical and practical, and the field of existence they commit to examine. As it is known, both Fârâbî and Ibn Sînâ begin to count philosophical sciences by dividing them into two things, one existing through human will and the other existing independently of human will. The things that exist through human will fall within the scope of practical knowledge consisting of morality, housekeeping and politics. These sciences too have two aspects, theoretical and practical. While in the theoretical part, the universal rules

related to the examined topics are determined and verified, in the practical part the wilful acts which must be done or avoided are determined and verified. For this reason, although the theoretical part is accepted as a part of practical sciences, it actually falls within the scope of theoretical sciences.[20] According to Ibn Khaldūn, it seems that practical science, especially politics, is about human communities formed by human individuals together. However, it is clear that this is not the situation when it is examined more closely. Because it is very different to examine something in terms pertaining to something and being that thing. Political science examines how human societies should be governed. In this form, politics is a whole practical science in that it deals with society in the sense that it is a matter of governance, not of society. The same is valid for the oratorical science, which is a subdivision of the art of logic and consists of "persuasive words that make the public accept or reject any view".[21] Ibn Khaldūn says based on this consideration that there is a methodological difference between the science of society and politics and oratory because as the science of society is a science which aims to determine and analyze, the other two are normative sciences. But more important is the implicit consideration of Ibn Khaldūn of the fact that social existence in its bare state is not only unexamined but also unexplored at the same time in the political and oratorical sciences. For this reason, he felt the need to prove social existence which is the subject of the science of society.

Ibn Khaldūn bases the existence of society on the traditional human definition of Islamic philosophers, that is to say, a "thinking creature", which is the basis of the theory of umrân and mulk as a whole. Because while vitality is the source for the needs of human beings and their actions for the fulfilment of these needs, thinking is a source of human's moral, political, and civilian values. This principle turns into a strong explanatory framework with the other assumptions listed above. According to this the definition in question expresses the human nature whose needs are unchanging because of being itself, although the subject and quantity changes according to individuals or even to societies. Ibn Khaldūn, in terms of functionalizing

---

[20] For more information, see Fârâbî, Kitâbu'l-Burhân, trans. Ömer Türker – Ömer Mahir Alper, İstanbul: Klasik Yayınları, 2008, p. 48-51; İbn Sînâ, Kitâbu'ş-Şifâ Mantığa Giriş, trans. Ömer Türker, İstanbul: Litera Yayınları, 2006, p. 5-9.

[21] For a more detailed information about Ibn Khaldun's thoughts on this issue, see Ahmet Arslan, İbn Haldûn'un İlim ve Fikir Dünyası, p. 81-83; Şenol Korkut, "İbn Haldûn'un 'es-Siyâsetü'l-medeniyye' Teorisini Eleştirisi", İslam Araştırmaları Dergisi, 15 (2006), p. 115-140.

this definition, by following the Ibn Sînâ's line, he determines the essence and purpose of human according to this definition. Ibn Sînâ, before, had distinguished the necessity of existence and the necessity of essence by metaphysicizing the concept of beingessence, which was a logical distinction in the Aristotelian tradition, and reinterpreted the principle of causality and purposefulness in relation to this separation. Ibn Khaldūn also follows Ibn Sînâ's trail and accepts the definition of human as his essence thus his unchanging essence and self. When this essence acquires reality outwardly, the gender and part (living and thinking) in this definition will become human's substance and form. Although it is impossible for substance and form to gain existence without one another and to separate them from each other in the external world, each has its own requirements. As mentioned before, while the necessities of substance cause people's coming together and the emergence of societal existence, the necessities of form show the situations that are attached to society because of being society. The substance-form theory states that the necessities of form are realized to the extent that substance is sufficient and take form depending on substance, and that the substance and form of any object are also determining its purpose and the boundaries of its competence. For example a seed of wheat carries the being of first a wheat seedling then the becoming of a wheat head, after that the transformation into ripe wheat grains in itself.

These stages at the same time also express the purpose of seed and the competencies it can reach. These competences are the limits of its essence and it is not possible to cross these boundaries. A careful reader will notice that all the analyses in Muqaddimah concerning the spiritual situations of the society are made according to these principles. Just as all the competences of a grain of wheat are found in its own strength, all the competences of the human communities are included in the substance and the form of a human. These competences are, as far as material conditions allow, the purpose of human beings as individuals as well as of human societies. Since everything will course towards its substance and its competence in the extent that the reasons and circumstances that motivate the substance are sufficient, societies are moving towards the competencies contained in human definitions. Although the essential requirement of the substance is some kind of competence, the ultimate competence of the kind is to fulfil all the requirements of its form. In this context the ultimate competence of a society is the realization of the power of thinking of a

human, the spirit that is an abstract being, as precisely as possible. Thus, the fact that Ibn Khaldūn puts laws based on interests, sciences and arts at the end of improvement stage of mulk is caused by human societal experience and the interpretation according to his definition.[22] Just as when a seed becomes a mature spike it completes its own purpose, when a society maturates to the extent that the substance is allowing to (or is sufficient), it will complete its own purpose and leave its place for another society. For this reason, Ibn Khaldûn's understanding of history is not progressive but circular. Of course, it cannot be said that Ibn Khaldûn believes that all the competencies that the human spirit has, in an unrealized way, can be realized in a society. But he is well aware that even though the substance is passive, it is the only medium in which form can become competent. For this reason he thinks society and state are surrounded by natural borders just like an individual. Natural borders determine the amount of human kind's competence that can occur in a given society. However, since natural boundaries are variable, considerations of a given state or society must be based on experiential data of the state or community. In other words, even if the analysis of the relation between substance and form of the society gives us the information of general situations that is expected to happen or in general a theoretical framework about the society, knowledge of the qualities and quantities specific to a society can be obtained by an experiential investigation.

Conclusion

The result from the above evaluations is as follows: In Khaldûn's mind there is a theoretical frame isolated from a given time and place, in accordance with the essence theory of social existence. Because he assumes that the conceptual framework of the essence of society gives an analysis of nature and that attribute changes in a particular mulk and state that arise at any time and place will not cause any change in the essence. But to be satisfied only with the theoretical framework is to fall into a situation that Ibn Khaldūn criticizes philosophers about. Because the most creative aspect of Ibn Khaldūn's philosophical readings is that he realized that the general concepts (el-umûr el-âmme) must be privatized according to certain materials, and that he has moved the metaphorical power of the metaphysic to the theory of society.

---

[22] Furthermore, Ibn Khaldun's remarks on the competence of human species lead to self-contradictions within the evaluation of especially kalam and philosophy and the calmness that he poses while analysing other conditions of mulk disappears when kalam-philosophy relationship is in question.

Thus Ibn Khaldûn has materialized pure rational accounts of possibility, necessity and impossibility specific to human communities. This situation gave him a general passing of human nature and society, and has allowed him to form a theoretical frame over time on the one hand, and on the other hand it shows that this theoretical framework can only function with experiential data on a given society. In other words, Ibn Khaldûn identifies the necessities, possibilities, and impossibilities of the propositions by starting from their substances. The provisions to be given for a specific society can only be determined by considering its substance.[23]

His reliance on the concepts of nature and essence on the one hand and on the other hand to think that the truth and falsehood of the propositions, that is giving information about this nature and essence, are not being determined in terms of rational consistency but in terms of substance, gives Ibn Khaldūn both the possibility of establishing social existence as a matter of science and establishing the balance of stables and variables. In this context, the basic claim of Muqaddimah is that it is necessary to have a theoretical framework that overlaps the event of the society and the state in terms of being itself in order to make accurate analyses about a given society and state. Hence, what Ibn Khaldûn's mulk theory promises us is an accurate analysis of society and state in terms of being itself. With no doubt, the theoretical framework which makes this analysis possible, does not lose the ability to identify and describe phenomena when abstracted from Ibn Khaldūn's philosophical assumptions. Because, the identification and the representation of the phenomena are possible thanks to the questions which give priority to the philosophical assumptions. Even if we accept that the theory prioritizes observation, we can understand this in the meaning of what Ibn Sînâ said in Kitâbû'l-Burhân, that there is an overlap between the questions and the ones known by the questions.[24] But in this case the theory loses its analytical power and basic claims to a significant extent. Because the concepts of nature, essence and purpose, as used by Ibn Khaldûn, are closed to progressiveness and evolutionism, and in this respect his theory separates from progressive and evolutionary theories of contemporary society. This is the essentialist side of the theory. On the other hand, when we refuse to distinguish the soul-body, Ibn Khaldūn's

---

[23] For Ibn Khaldun's considerations of general concepts of metaphysics, see Ömer Türker, "The Perception of Rational Science in Muqaddima: Ibn Khaldun's Individual Aptitutes Theory", Asian Journal of Social Science, 26 (2008), p. 471-72.

[24] Ibn Sînâ, Kitâbu'ş-Şifâ İkinci Analitikler, trans. Ömer Türker, İstanbul: Litera Yayıncılık, 2006, p. 201-209.

solutions about the spiritual situations of the society lose its importance and turn into simple observations. Because Ibn Khaldûn explains the social virtues, sciences, arts and phenomena like magic, prophecy, dream, revelation that arise in society, adhering to this principle.

Science of society is, thanks to the essentialist and the dualist character, connected to the metaphysical traditions. It seems that the possibilities of alternative thinking that this theory has, is the dualistic side based on the assumption that the soul is, in particular, a rational matter. It is perhaps possible to reinterpret the concept of essence by considering contemporary criticism regarding essentialism. But if we abandon the existence of spirit and its being a rational matter it is not possible to make contact with post-Ghazālīan Islamic philosophy, poetry and mysticism, which especially Ibn Khaldûn is an heir of.