

IBN KHALDÛN AND JOHN LOCKE: A POLITICAL INTERPRETATION OF
SOCIETY – A ROAD TO PRIVATE PROPERTY

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF
SOCIAL SCIENCES OF MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

CANAN ÇAL

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENTS OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF MASTER OF ARTS
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

FEBRUARY 2014

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Meliha Altunışık
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of
Master of Arts

Prof. Dr. Ahmet İNAM
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully
adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

Prof. Dr. Yasin CEYLAN
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members (first name belongs to the chairperson of the jury
and the second name belongs to supervisor)

Prof. Dr. Ş. Halil TURAN (METU,PHIL)

Prof. Dr. Yasin CEYLAN (METU,PHIL)

Assist. Prof. Dr. Ertuğrul R.Turan (ANKARA U.)

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last Name: Canan Çal

Signature : _____

ABSTRACT

IBN KHALDÛN AND JOHN LOCKE: A POLITICAL INTERPRETATION OF SOCIETY – A ROAD TO PRIVATE PROPERTY

Çal, Canan

Master of Arts in Department of Philosophy

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Yasin Ceylan

February 2014, 94 pages

Ibn Khaldûn and John Locke are two prominent scholars of the eastern and the western thought. This study aims at understanding the similarities between political foundations for the *Muqaddimah* and the *Two Treatises of Government*. Private property and labor are the main notions discussed here. Even though the context Ibn Khaldûn and John Locke use labor is dissimilar, the influence of labor to value has a common ground. Besides, the authors take man and his consent as the main foundation of civil society.

Key words: Ibn Khaldûn, John Locke, asabîyah, labor, private property.

ÖZ

İBN HALDUN, JOHN LOCKE: TOPLUM HAKKINDA POLİTİK BİR YORUM- ÖZEL MÜLKİYETE BİR YOL

Çal, Canan

Yüksek Lisans, Felsefe Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Yasin Ceylan

Şubat 2014, 94 sayfa

İbn Haldun ve John Locke doğu ve batı düşüncesinin öne çıkan iki düşünürüdür. Bu çalışma Mukaddime ve Hükümet Üzerine İki İnceleme’de yer alan politik görüşler arasındaki benzerlikleri anlamayı amaçlamıştır. Özel mülkiyet ve emek kavramları bu çalışmada tartışılan temel kavramlardır. İbn Haldun ve John Locke’ un emek kavramını kullandıkları bağlam farklı olmasına rağmen, emeğin değere olan etkisi hakkında ortak bir tutum benimsemişlerdir. Ayrıca yazarlarımız rıza kavramını siyasal toplumun temeli olarak ele almışlardır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: İbn Haldun, John Locke, asabiye, emek, özel mülkiyet.

To my parents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express his sincere thanks to his supervisor, Prof. Dr. Yasin Ceylan for her guidance throughout the research, and also to the other jury members Prof. Dr. Ş. Halil Turan and Assist. Prof. Dr. Ertuğrul R. Turan.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
ÖZ.....	v
DEDICATION.....	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	viii
CHAPTER	
1.INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1. Ibn Khaldûn and <i>Muqaddimah</i>	3
1.2. John Locke and <i>Two Treatises of Government</i>	6
2.MUQADDIMAH.....	11
2.1. Man and Dawlah.....	11
2.1.1. Ûmran.....	13
2.1.2. Asabîyah.....	13
2.1.3. Royal Authority and Mulk.....	17
2.1.4. Forms of Civilization.....	20
2.2. <i>Muqaddimah</i> as a Political Economy Guide:	
Ibn Khaldûn as an Early Economist.....	23
2.2.1.The Mode of Production: Labor, Surplus and Profit.....	24
2.2.2.The Monetary Theory: Theory of Money and Prices.....	28
2.2.3. Prosperity and Ranks.....	30
3. THE SECOND TREATISE OF GOVERNMENT.....	35
3.1. Natural State and Political Society.....	35
3.1.1. Of the State of Nature as the Perfect State of Freedom.....	35

3.1.2. Of the State of War.....	37
3.1.3. The Law of Nature and the Nature of Man	38
3.1.4. Of Paternal Power.....	41
3.1.5. Of Political or Civil Society and Consent	42
3.1.6. Of the End of Political Society and Government.....	43
3.2. Lockean Theory of Property.....	45
3.2.1. Labor as a Rational Ground for Property	45
3.2.2. Additional Value.....	49
3.2.3. Problem of Disproportionate and Unequal Distribution.....	53
3.2.4. Problem of Subsequent Rights.....	56
4. A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS.....	59
4.1. Man as a Rational Being	59
4.2. Social Bonds: Asabiyah and Consent	60
4.3. The Social Division of Labor and the Case of the Property Owner and the Laborer.....	62
4.4. Monarchical Power.....	67
4.5. Deterioration of the State.....	69
4.6. Beyond Nature: Theological Ground and Moral Status.....	70
5. CONCLUSION.....	76
REFERENCES.....	81
APPENDICES	
A.TURKISH SUMMARY.....	84
B.TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU.....	94

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Private property is the product of a development process spanning thousand years of humanity. At the end of both the Greek and the Roman empires, private property appears as an institution. Even though most ancient cultures had an understanding of personal property, real property was accompanied with several ‘community obligations’. In early Greece and early Rome, families and clans were regarded as ‘the real owners of property’. In the same vein, the ancient Germanic tribe owned property via the tribe. Similarly, the Mosaic law of the ancient Hebrews permitted for trade in land property. Besides, the Egyptians owned land as families, yet they paid extensive land taxes.¹

Property theory, which includes several disputes as to the nature of ownership and its normative foundations, is still fascinating. Private ownership is an actual debatable issue today as well. Being a common historical issue, the property rights paradigm comprises the following subjects: the government use of its dominant power, the power of the state concerning regulation and the importance of intellectual property assets.² The aim of this thesis is to discuss the private property paradigm via an analysis of the political ideas of two impressive scholars from the east and the west, Ibn Khaldûn and John Locke.

¹Dr. Garrick Small, “Property Theory: What Is It And Why Teach It”, 2001.

² Gregory S. Alexander, Eduardo M. Penalver, *An Introduction to Property Theory*, (USA:Cambridge University Press, 2012),p. xi.

From antiquity, Plato, Aquinas and Ockham, to Grotius and Pufendorf, the property rights paradigm is discussed throughout the history of political philosophy by means of the notions of the state and the private ownership. In *Republic*, Plato defines an ideal polity and rejects extreme wealth. In this ideal state the Guards and Auxiliaries live in an absence of property. Private property is a privilege for producers. Aristotle agrees with Plato and identifies an ideal city in *Politics*. He divides land into two fundamental parts, public property and private ownership. Aristotle actually believes that property must be a balance of ‘private ownership’ and ‘common use’. Using the public land for the common good, such as growing crops is allowed therein. Private ownership is a support for honourable citizenship.³ Likewise, Ockham insists that Adam had exercised ‘factual use’ over the resources of earth. Muslim scholars were interested in the ideal polity and possessions, too. For instance, Averroes sanctions Platon and contends that ‘the exploitative behaviour of the ruling magnates’ is the cause of problems within a society. The treatment he prefers is ‘the dissolution of private households.’⁴

Being a famous Muslim scholar, Ibn Khaldûn dealt with the private property paradigm. He contends that the importance of property rights is robustly emphasized as a subject of justice in the Quran. He handles the concept of private dominion and private property with regard to human productivity. For the endurance of civilizations, an authority should protect and enforce private possession. Ibn Khaldûn conceives private property as an incentive force for economic activities. In the event that property rights are violated, economic activities rapidly decline.

John Locke advocates that the property comes from ‘occupation’. As a representative of Christian thought, John Locke is also familiar with Aquinas’s writings. He thinks in parallel with Thomas Aquinas who had defined three types of rights, which are the

³ G.Alexander & E. Penalver, *An Introduction to Property Theory*, USA :Cambridge University Press, 2012.

⁴Peter Garnsey, (Ed.) *Thinking about property: From Antiquity to the Age of Revolution*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

preservation of mankind, society and the worship of God. Both argue that either use or appropriation of the world is for the sake of preservation and convenience. John Locke and Aquinas have common grounds concerning human nature. Aquinas argues that man is capable of dominion since he has an intellectual nature. Likewise, John Locke believes that God made the world and bestowed it to a rational mankind.⁵

Before John Locke, a number of early modern thinkers, most prominently Hobbes and Grotius were interested in the original position, namely the state of nature. Both argue that the original position is a state of original equality. In the same context, Grotius and Pufendorf agree that private property is established ‘in the state of nature’ by the consent of all inhabitants.⁶ In the state of nature, nobody has ‘originally a private dominion’, on the products of nature that is exclusive to the rest of mankind.⁷ These philosophers contend that private property is a particular kind of proprietorship and related to ‘occupation’. In this sense, Pufendorf agrees with Grotius that the world belongs to all. Nevertheless, he rejects Grotius and argues that rights in things must be conventional instead of being natural.⁸

1.1. Ibn Khaldûn and the *Muqaddimah*

Ibn Khaldûn is celebrated as one of the most prominent scholars and a pioneer of Medieval Islamic political thought. He carefully investigates the historical facts and their significant influences on social life. Indeed, Ibn Khaldûn’s peculiar investigations and detailed analysis are generally conceived as the first empirical studies in Islamic history.

⁵ James Tully, *A Discourse on Property: John Locke and His Adversaries*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1980), p.65.

⁶ Peter Garnsey, 2007, p.134.

⁷ Karen Vaughn, “John Locke and the Labor Theory of Value” *Journal of Libertarian Studies*: 2 No. 4, 1978, pp. 311-326.

⁸ Peter Garnsey, 2007, pp.69-77.

Ibn Khaldûn's ancestors were from the Hadhramawt, south-eastern Yemen. During the Christian reconquest of the Iberian Peninsula, his family immigrated to North Africa and eventually settled in Tunis. Ibn Khaldûn was born on May 7, 1332 and he had received an excellent classical education. When he was 17, his parents and several of his teachers died of Black Death. For this epidemic disease in the Middle East, at least one-third of the population had died; which had a traumatic effect on the survivors, art, literature, social structures and intellectual life. All these experiences shaped Ibn Khaldûn's perception of the world. Coming from a wealthy and prestigious family Abu Zayd 'Abd al-Rahman Ibn Muhammad Ibn Khaldûn al-Hadrami received a good education; he learned the Quran and studied prominent interpretations of the Quran and Hadith accompanied with jurisprudence. He also had grammar, philology, rhetoric and poetry lessons from professionals in Tunis. Ibn Khaldûn was deeply versed in Arabic literature, theology, historiography, jurisprudence and philosophy. He did serve as assistant and secretary for several government officials. His career was dependent on the good will of his superiors. Ibn Khaldûn had an extremely eventful life, travelling to, among other places, Mecca, Damascus. He changed jobs frequently when political winds shifted. In Palestine and Seville, he occasionally found enough leisure time to teach, study, and write. He encountered with King Pedro I of Castile and Timur among notable personalities.⁹

Ibn Khaldûn's famous work that grounds this thesis is *Muqaddimah*. Ibn Khaldûn wrote the book in 1375 during the period of calm at the castle of Ibn Salamah. *Muqaddimah*, namely 'Introduction' or 'Prolegomena' is written for the preface of his first universal history book, *Kitab al-Ibar*.¹⁰ The *Muqaddimah*, which refers to the *Universal History*, is known *The Book of Admonitions* or *Book of Precepts*. *Muqaddimah* and *Kitab al-Ibar* must be considered separately. *Muqaddimah* is not a

⁹See pp. 28-39 of the September/October 2006 print edition of Saudi Aramco World.

¹⁰Rosenthal notes in the introduction part of *Muqaddimah* "the original "introduction" (*Muqaddimah*) to Ibn Khaldûn's great *History* covers only a few pages. As is customary in Muslim historical works, these introductory pages contain a eulogy of history. During its author's lifetime, the original introduction and the first book became an independent work known under the title of *Muqaddimah*."

narrative history book like *Kitab al-'Ibar*. Rather, it is the introduction to a much longer history of the Arabs and Berbers. In other words, *Muqaddimah* is the history of the people of Ibn Khaldûn's time. *Kitab al-'Ibar*, however, is a history of the Jews, the Greeks, the Romans, the Byzantines and the Goths as well. This universal study is considered as a philosophy of history book and undoubtedly as the supreme work of its type that 'has ever yet been created by any mind in any time or place'.¹¹

The *Muqaddimah* was the product of the late medieval Islamic world. Ibn Khaldûn hereby describes his political thoughts explicitly, launching penetrative theoretical and practical inquiries into the complexity of human societies, cultures and civilisations. *Muqaddimah* is a 'conceptual theoretical exhibit' of civilisation in general and an illustration of the social phenomena.¹² Since, Ibn Khaldûn had a detailed investigation of historical materials; this led him to develop an innovative political study.

Methodically, Ibn Khaldûn's approach to historical facts is in one sense, similar to scientific investigations. Franz Rosenthal and Toynbee disagree about the influences on Ibn Khaldûn's intellectual practices. Rosenthal stresses that Ibn Khaldûn justifies his theory using two great works of Avicenna, the *Kitab ash-Shifa* and its abbreviated version, the *Kitab an-Najadh*.¹³ Ibn Khaldûn prefers to expound on social organizations via his empirical researches. In this way, Rosenthal substantiates the idea that Ibn Khaldûn arrogantly declares himself as the creator of a new science, which includes a detailed examination of the natural process in history.

¹¹ Arnold Toynbee, *A Study of History (Vol. 3): The Growths of Civilizations*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1962, pp. 321-328.

¹² See Zaid Ahmad, *Ibn Khaldûn's Approach in Civilisational Studies*. (Massimo Campanini, ed., *Studies on Ibn Khaldûn*, (Polymetrica: Milano), 2005, p.102.

¹³ See Ibn Khaldûn, *Muqaddimah*, trans. Franz Rosenthal (Routledge & Kegan, 1981), Introduction to *Muqaddimah* p. 849.

Ibn Khaldûn's life is permeated with a tradition of mysticism. He is the one who is inclined to consider a constant and active contact with the Divine. This relation is primarily the prerogative of the individual. Moreover, Ibn Khaldûn acknowledges that there is a casual relation between the supernatural and the forms of human social organization. That is to say, Ibn Khaldûn's philosophy can be called secular.¹⁴

Instead of using the common concepts of Muslim works, Ibn Khaldûn prefers to use peculiar elements that he created himself. In his writings, he does use philosophical, sociological, ethical and economic anecdotes and their methods while explicating the societies. On the other hand, Ibn Khaldûn infers a causality chain towards the evolution of the state and the society. He explicates that the sequence of social change is cyclical and in companion with human acquisitiveness and aggression. These successive stages are the need for cooperation and group solidarity, the rise of Royal authority, and the corrupting effect of dominion and luxury.

Muqaddimah includes six chapters: (1) Human civilization in general. (2) Bedouin civilization, savage nations and tribes and their condition of life, including several basic and explanatory statements. (3) On dynasties, royal authority, the caliphate, government ranks and all the goes with these things basic & supplementary propositions. (4) Countries & cities and all forms sedentary civilization. The conditions occurring there. Primary and secondary considerations in this connection (5) On the various aspects of making a living, such as profit and the crafts. The conditions that occur in this connection. A number of problems are connected with this subject. (6) The various kinds of sciences. The methods of instruction. The conditions that obtain in these connections.

1.2. John Locke and the *Two Treatises of Government*

In the 16th and 17th centuries, the concept of the natural law and the unstable relations of power determined the main problems in politics and economics. Political theorists

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 848.

of that age mainly focused on four basic problems of government. The first one was the religious-civil wars and their difficulties. The second one was the administrative and productive consolidation of modern European states as effective governing units. The third one was the formation of balance of power and trade system of military commercial rivalry amongst states. And, the last one was the European imperial struggle over the conquests and exploitation of non-European populations and resources. All points unfolded here brought about general 'epistemological or legitimization crisis' and provided a new foundation for 'religious, political and scientific knowledge'.

John Locke was the magnificent scholar of English philosophy who carries out some sceptical attacks on traditional bodies of knowledge. In that sense, his studies are actually characterized by his opposition to authoritarianism on the level of the individual person and institutions such as government and church. John Locke, who is known as a 'versatile' thinker was born in Somerset in 1632. When he was a child, his father and his patron took up cudgels against King Charles I in England. He has lived closely with the Puritans who fought in the civil war by the name of 'a parliamentary constitution and godly church'. An idea, 'Enlightenment Whiggery' or the rejection of divine rights deeply affected his ideas. In adulthood, John Locke united with the household of Lord Ashley as his political confidant and secretary. After political conflicts, he left England and lived in Dutch until 1689. He was hiding from English agents. In the last part of his life, he returned to England and became a 'doyen' and an adviser of the government. He studied here with Isaac Newton and wrote various interpretations on Scripture. When, he died in 1704 he was well-known as 'the great Mr John Locke'.¹⁵

John Locke discusses the origin and notable implications of political government in his *Two Treatises of Government* published in 1689. He wrote the first part of the book, known as the *First Treatise of Government*, in response to Robert Filmer who

¹⁵ See Goldie, (Ed.) *Political Essays, of John Locke*, (UK: Cambridge University Press), 1997.

is an English political theorist. Robert Filmer propagandises the divine rights of kings in his doctrine. His best-known work is *Patriarcha*. By adapting to ‘natural subjection’, Robert Filmer argues that all legitimate governments are absolute monarchies. Government, Filmer reports, is a family and the father of which is ‘the king’. In that sense, he puts forward his thesis that Adam is the first king and God assigned him as absolute authority with his divine and natural rights. Besides, he justifies that all governments were monarchical in history. Hence, monarchy is an ideal form for governments. Furthermore, he strongly believes that an individual has no natural right except kings. Man, being subject to such an authority, is obliged to obey political obligations monarchy required.¹⁶ In addition, as Filmer represents, natural subjection presumes that political power is in the monarch naturally and originally; thereof all citizens being lesser political bodies are naturally subject to his will.

As mentioned before, the *First Treatise of Government* is regarded as one of the most powerful responses to Filmer’s *Patriarcha*. John Locke challenges Filmer’s thesis concerning natural subjection. He takes Filmer’s explication of ideas in dominion of patriarchy. That is to say, the political power a monarch naturally exercises over their subjects is identical to the unlimited and arbitrary power patriarchs exercise naturally over their children, slaves and private property.¹⁷ As John Locke puts the problem, any law of nature or positive law requires absolute subjection to a magistrate. In John Locke’s account, the power of magistrate over his subject must be distinguished from that of father over his children, a master over his servant, a husband over his wife, and a lord over his slave.¹⁸ Besides, political power should function for benefit of

¹⁶ Tully urges *Two Treatises* is also seen by John Locke to address a European-wide set of problems and to draw upon European political theories.

¹⁷ Filmer says, “If we compare the natural duties of a father with those of a king, we find them to be all one, without any difference at all but only in the latitude or extent of them. As father over one family, so the king, as father over many families, extends his care to preserve feed, clothe, instruct and defend the whole commonwealth.” (Robert Filmer, *Patriarcha and Other Writings* p.12).

¹⁸ John Locke, Ed. *Two Treatises of Government a Letter Concerning Toleration*, (New Heaven and London: Yale University Press:2003), pp.7- 8.

mankind and public good instead. John Locke declares that absolute natural power obligating natural subjection triggers absolute monarchy.¹⁹

‘Natural subjection’ and ‘natural liberty’ are the most significant foundations for the political theories of John Locke’s era. He believes in natural liberty and describes man who is naturally free in the sense of being ‘not subject to another’. And, he justifies a doctrine of ‘political subjection’ based on some kind of convention, consent, contract, trust or agreement.²⁰ John Locke hereby develops the concept of political power as a political body. He wrote,

Political power, then, I take to be a right of making laws with penalties of death, and consequently all less penalties, for the regulating and preserving of property, and of employing the force of the community, in the execution of such laws, and in the defence of the common-wealth from foreign injury; and all this only for the public good.²¹

Refuting natural subjection, John Locke historically and logically derives that the end of political power is ‘public good’.²² Hence, in John Locke’s scheme, political power is natural property of individuals; in other words, they originally and naturally possess political power. Individuals are self-governing bodies; they are capable of exercising political power themselves. In the state of nature, for instance, they have a natural right to punish anyone transgressing the law of nature since state of nature is the state of perfect freedom.

Second Treatise of Government includes twelve parts as follows: (1) The introduction. (2) Of the state of nature. (3) Of the state of war. (4) Of slavery (5) Of property. (6) Of paternal power. (7) Of political or civil society. (8) Of the beginning

¹⁹John Locke finds natural subjection both economically and politically inconsistent.

²⁰Simmons strongly believes that John Locke's own justification of the term "natural right" is infrequent, and his intentions when he does use it are not altogether clear. The (few) uses in *The Second Treatise* (e.g., JJ, 1, 76, 82, 115) give us no guidance in formulating a view of John Locke's intended meaning. In I. 88, however he usefully contrasts natural rights with "positive" rights apparently meaning by "positive" rights those derived from consent. (John Simmons, *Lockean Theory of Rights*, Princeton University Press: New Jersey, 1994, p.91).

²¹ John Locke, 2003, p.101.

²²*Ibid.*, p.104.

of political societies. (9) Of the ends of political society and government. (10) Of the forms of a commonwealth. (11) Of the extent of the legislative power. (12) Of the legislative, executive, and federative power of the common wealth.

In the first part of this thesis, the history of property paradigm and the political theories of Ibn Khaldûn and John Locke are simply defined concerning their celebrated works, the *Muqaddimah* and the *Two Treatises of Government*. The second chapter of this thesis sets the explications of human civilizations in general, the investigations of the Bedouin civilization, savage nations, tribes and their living conditions and the influence of religious (*sharia*) law on political societies. Besides, *asabîyah*, the mission of government, *fikr*, royal authority (*mulk*), countries, cities, all forms of civilizations and the political implications of the *Muqaddimah* are discussed. The third chapter of this study covers a detailed analysis of John Locke's the *Two Treatises of Government*. This chapter discusses the state of nature and political society, the law of nature and the nature of man. The end of political society and the role of *consent* are investigated here. Moreover, the theory of property is criticised in terms of the problem of subsequent rights and unequal appropriation. The fourth chapter is a comparison between the political and economical theories of Ibn Khaldûn and John Locke. And, the last chapter comprises an interpretation private property as a conclusion of this study.

CHAPTER II

MUQADDIMAH

2.1. Man and Dawlah

Man is political by nature. Ibn Khaldûn follows this ancient paradigm concerning the special case of man in nature. He refers to the philosophical works and says, “The philosophers cite that statement in connection with establishing the existence of prophecy and other things. The adjective ‘political’ refers to the ‘town’ (*polis*), which they use as another word for human social organization.”²³ Ibn Khaldûn explicates the occasion of political man accompanied by historical facts via the relevance of the Divine.

The will of God and self-preservation are two major actors in *Muqaddimah*. Ibn Khaldûn emphasizes that, the first difficulty one historically withstands is his constant hunger. The nature of man forces him to struggle for food and to preserve his life. Even for a day of subsistence, man alone is not powerful enough for fulfilling his needs. Man is obviously not capable of living outside of any social organization. Ibn Khaldûn notes,

...wheat, for instance-that amount of food could be obtained only after much preparation such as grinding, kneading, and baking. Each of these three operations requires utensils and tools that can be provided only with the help of several crafts, such as the crafts of the blacksmith, the carpenter, and the

²³Ibn Khaldûn, *The Muqaddimah: An Introduction to History*, trans. Franz Rosenthal (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2005, p.336.

potter. Assuming that a man could eat unprepared grain, an even greater number of operations would be necessary in order to obtain the grain: sowing and reaping, and threshing to separate it from the husks of the ear. Each of these operations requires a number of tools and many more crafts than those just mentioned.²⁴

The needs mentioned above are beyond the power of one man alone to do all by himself. Ibn Khaldûn puts forward the naturalistic argument here that, man more easily satisfies his general needs in cooperation with others.²⁵ Unfortunately, constant hunger is not the sole trouble one withstands. The problem of security, which generates cooperation among others, is another substantial difficulty man encountered.²⁶ Naturally, God bestowed plentiful power to animals rather than that was given to mankind.²⁷ Similar to special limbs in animals, Ibn Khaldûn notes, the superior qualities of human beings are their hands and ability to think. Nevertheless, Ibn Khaldûn finds this present insufficient to survive by oneself. He suggests that, man who is actually incapable of withstanding the predatory animals cooperates with his natural fellows.

Ibn Khaldûn's historical investigations demonstrate that in early times of societies, cooperation among individuals matured, thus inhabitants constituted civilizations. The constitution of the civilizations is a part of the wise plan of God for Ibn Khaldûn. Mutual co-operation of men fulfilled the wise plan of God. God wills subsistence and bestows man an ability to think, thus the human species does not vanish.²⁸

²⁴Ibn Khaldûn, 2005, p.45.

²⁵Ibn Khaldûn explains the structure and form of relationship in what he terms as *ta'awun* (co-operation). Zaid Ahmad writes that on the nature of human society, this term is used to explain the social relations between members of the society. Every individual is in need of supports of each other in their lives. In the same manner Aristotle also talked about different kinds of associations that exist are founded on different kinds of relationships.(Zaid Ahmad, "Ibn Khaldûn and The Greek Philosophy: Some notes from the Muqaddimah", *Historical Research Letter*, (2012) Vol.2.p.24).

²⁶Ibn Khaldûn grounds his theory to the deficiency of human nature.

²⁷Ibn Khaldûn, 2005, p.45.

²⁸ Ibid.

2.1.1. Ūmran

Investigation of all social transformation of societies, historical indications of transformation, interests and attitudes of inhabitants constitute the main topic of Ibn Khaldûn's science that is called *ûmran*. Ūmran simply means population but it has an auxiliary meaning, namely 'the highest form of sedentary culture'. Social organizations are the basis for the existence of towns and cities. Possessing the rational faculty, people cooperate with each other. In case the number of the people in a territory increases, a larger and better *ûmran* results. Evidently, Ibn Khaldûn prefers to use *ûmran* with divergent meanings.²⁹

Ibn Khaldûn has a detailed analysis of historical stages dynasties naturally experience. Concerning this analysis, people change their attitudes in terms of the peculiar conditions of the dynasty. Ibn Khaldûn describes these five stages (*tawr*) and character traits as follows: that of success (*tawr al-zafar bi-l-bughyat*), the stage of establishing complete control over the people and claiming complete authority (*tawr al-istibdâd 'ala qawmi-hi*), the stage of leisure and tranquillity (*tawr al-farâgh wa-l-da'ah li-tahsîl tahamarat al-mulk*), the stage of contentment and peacefulness (*taw al-qunû wa-l-musâlama*), and the stage of waste and extravagant (*tawr al-isrâf wa-l-tabdhîr*).

2.1.2. Asabîyah

In *Muqaddimah* Ibn Khaldûn identifies two major social categories he calls 'Bedouin' (*badawa*) and 'Sedentary' (*hadâra*). Bedouin life is the first stage people live in and it is simpler than the Sedentary life. Ibn Khaldûn introduces that living

²⁹ Rosenthal believes that Ibn Khaldûn naturally arrived at the idea that progress in civilization is indirect proportion to the number of people co-operating for their common good. Thus, *ûmran* acquired the further meaning of "population," and Ibn Khaldûn frequently uses the word in this sense. Wherever people are cooperating with each other, no matter on how limited a scale, there *is ûmran*. (Ibn Khaldûn, *Muqaddimah*, trans. Franz Rosenthal (Routledge and Kegan, 1981) , Introduction to *Muqaddimah* p.850).

conditions determine these categories. Men who are concerned with agriculture or animal husbandry i.e. cultivation of vegetables or raising sheep are naturally obliged to live out of the settled areas. The settled areas are not available for the wide fields, acres and pastures for animals in relevant applications. Before approaching the secondary luxuries and other conveniences of life, men cooperate and organize in elementary social type due to the simple necessities in Bedouin life.³⁰ The requisites of Bedouin life for personal care are prior to the luxuries and conveniences. The Berbers and non-Arabs, for instance, are some inhabitants of small communities, who live in villages and maintained regions. In addition, Turks, Slavs and the nomadic Arabs who live in deserts are natural Bedouin groups.³¹

Bedouin peoples are prior to Sedentary ones in that the origin of the Sedentary life is the Bedouin life. Ibn Khaldûn underscores that whenever men begin to produce rather than produced before, they rapidly acquire wealth. They build large houses, construct towns and cities to provide comfort, luxury and protection in their dynasties. In this sense, extreme wealth brings about divergent customs within new forms of Sedentary civilizations. In short, urbanization is the goal of the Bedouin. Ibn Khaldûn locates,

‘Sedentary people’ means the inhabitants of cities and countries, some of whom adopt the crafts as their way of making a living, while others adopt commerce. They earn more and live more comfortably than Bedouins live, because they live on a level beyond the level of bare necessity, and their way of making a living corresponds to their wealth.³²

Ibn Khaldûn clearly compares the natural features of man in *badawa* and *hadâra* life. He presumes that the Sedentary ones, in contrast to the Bedouins are not the masters

³⁰ Rosenthal notes that, Ibn Khaldûn's "Bedouins" were not, as a rule, nomads living in the desert, but dwelt chiefly in villages, and practiced agriculture and animal husbandry for a livelihood.(Ibn Khaldûn, *Muqaddimah*, trans. Franz Rosenthal (Routledge & Kegan,1981),Introduction to *Muqaddimah*, p. 851).

³¹ Ibn Khaldûn, 2005, p.91.

³² Ibid., pp.91-92.

of their own affairs. Bedouins are eager for goodness and courage.³³ However, being more disposed to laws, Sedentary people are dominated by execution. Their fortitude and power of resistance are ultimately destroyed. Nevertheless, Ibn Khaldûn argues that only when a civilization reaches to the sedentary stage, men develop various kinds of sciences therein.³⁴ This achievement is an actual demonstration of intellect and fulfilment of men in Sedentary civilization.

Ibn Khaldûn contends that authorities and governments impede mutual aggression and injustice among individuals, and preclude aggressive attacks against their city. The enemy in or outside the government is totally defeated by means of the natural or constitutional power i.e. restrictive laws, enormous walls or military force. Ibn Khaldûn believes that, sedentary culture becomes established and rooted among the inhabitants when a particular dynasty continues to rule,

This may be exemplified by the Jews. Their rule in Syria lasted about 1,400 years. Sedentary culture thus became firmly established among them. They became skilled in the customary ways and means of making a living and in the manifold crafts belonging to it as regards food, clothing, and all the other parts of domestic economy, so much so that these things, as a rule, can still be learned from them to this day. Sedentary culture and its customs became firmly rooted in Syria through them and through the Roman dynasties which succeeded them for six hundred years. Thus, they had the most developed sedentary culture possible.³⁵

Ibn Khaldûn stands for the idea that closely-knit group quite easily interact with each other and preserve their life. Mutual blood relationship leads to close contact, mutual help and close affection. The group feeling which results from the blood relationship

³³Ibid., p. 93.

³⁴The sciences with which people concern themselves in cities and which they acquire and pass on through instruction, are of two kinds: one that is natural to man and to which he is guided by his own ability to think, and a traditional kind that he learns from those who invented it.(Ibn Khaldûn, 2005, p.343)

³⁵ Ibn Khaldûn, 2005, p.283.

or something corresponds to it is *asabîyah*. It is the essential cause of any social organizations, either close or distant. Within social groups, direct relationships of relatives make them feel responsible for preservation when they are attacked or treated unjustly by others. Ibn Khaldûn defines this feeling as follows,

Their defense and protection are successful only if they are a closely-knit group of common descent. This strengthens their stamina and makes them feared, since everybody's affection for his family and his group is more important than anything else. Compassion and affection for one's blood relations and relatives exist in human nature as something God put into the hearts of men. It makes for mutual support and aid, and increases the fear felt by the enemy.³⁶

Group feeling is the sole actor that determines the destiny of the entire society. The strongest group feeling leads to the most powerful royal authorities. Ibn Khaldûn historically justifies that the struggle between equal powers of ruling dynasties is widespread. Social groups possessing group feeling reigned over the land and nations. Ibn Khaldûn confirms that only men who share *asabîyah* possess honour and nobility. Men lacking of this feeling are not capable of being superior to others in reality. In regions dominated by *asabîyah*, it is possible to find respect for old men and teachers. Men care for those who are too weak to take care of themselves, and there is humility toward the poor, attentiveness to the complaints of supplicants, fulfilment of the duties of the religious law and divine worship in all details, avoidance of fraud, cunning, deceit and similar thing.³⁷ Men support dependents, maintain the indigent, have patience in adverse circumstances. They fulfil obligations, give liberality and donate money liberally for the preservation of honour. Furthermore, men respect the religious law. Scholars who interpret and prescribe religious rules in accordance with life by observing the things to be done or not to be done are precious for these cultures.

³⁶ Ibid., p.97.

³⁷ Ibn Khaldûn, 2005, p.112.

Another concept essential to stress here is ‘the leadership’ over people.³⁸ Ibn Khaldûn dictates that superiority is the major element that is accompanied by a group feeling, and in the same vein, leadership exists only with superiority. That is to say, one can be a leader within a social group possessing *asabîyah*, in case of being a member of a ‘common descent’. Royal authority and leadership are not equal. Leaders have no power to force others to follow rules.³⁹ Leadership is inherited from ancestors throughout successive generations; the members of relevant families are supposed as leaders.⁴⁰

In Ibn Khaldûn’s expressions, the most significant end of the political life is the royal authority. Human beings naturally need a restraining element that protects their life against immoderate actions. The restraining force mentioned here is also responsible for the preservation of peace. Ibn Khaldûn sets forth, “The goal which *asabîyah* leads to reach is royal authority.”⁴¹

2.1.3. Royal Authority (Mulk)

Ibn Khaldûn goes on to say that political organisation is the fundamental element of civilisation. As noted before, Khaldûnian man has a natural tendency towards fighting each other to secure his material goods. That is to say, weapons preserve men from aggressiveness of animals but men are not capable of sustaining eternal peace among themselves since the animal nature of man leads to various destructive conflicts. A weapon, for instance, is the property of a man and he has license to use it, so a restraining power is required to control the animal character of him. Ibn Khaldûn writes,

³⁸Ibid., p.101.

³⁹Ibid., p.185.

⁴⁰Ibid., pp. 264-265

⁴¹Ibn Khaldûn,2005, p.107.

Each one will stretch out his hand for whatever he needs and try simply to take it, since injustice and aggressiveness are in the animal nature. The others, in turn, will try to prevent him from taking it, motivated by wrathfulness and spite and the strong human reaction when one's own property is menaced. This causes dissension. Dissension leads to hostilities, and hostilities lead to trouble and bloodshed and loss of life, which in turn lead to the destruction of the human species.⁴²

In addition, Ibn Khaldûn approves that people 'cannot persist in' the state of anarchy and God's wise plan is the main solution for this eternal problem. The first rule of this plan is the subsistence of inhabitants. Ibn Khaldûn justifies that government and rulers are obliged to ruling over subjects and handling their affairs.⁴³ They dominate the society by controlling the social bonds. Ibn Khaldûn defines it as follows:

...according to their nature, human beings need someone to act as a restraining influence and mediator in every social organization, in order to keep the members from fighting with each other. That person must, by necessity, have superiority over the others in the matter of group feeling. If not, his power to exercise a restraining influence could not materialize. Such superiority is Royal authority (*mulk*).⁴⁴

'Government' of the state is the highest form of human social organization.⁴⁵ Dynasties and royal authorities are required for building cities or planning towns. By promising the inhabitants, ruling authority forces men to build cities and towns. Ibn Khaldûn aimed at justifying royal authority pertaining to the hierarchical power of humanity that 'If God did not keep inhabitants apart, the earth would perish.'⁴⁶He

⁴² Ibid., pp.151-152.

⁴³ The concomitants of good rulership are kindness, and protection of, one's subjects. The ruler should defend his subjects and see the outcome of things at start. (Ibn Khaldûn, *The Muqaddimah: An Introduction to History*, trans. Franz Rosenthal (Princeton University Press: New Jersey, 2005) p.153).

⁴⁴ Ibid., p.185.

⁴⁵ "A state exists only in so far as it is held together and ruled by individuals and the group which they constitute, that is, the dynasty. When the dynasty disappears, the state, being identical with it, also comes to an end." (Ibn Khaldûn, *Muqaddimah*, trans. Franz Rosenthal (Routledge & Kegan, 1981, p. 851)

⁴⁶ Ibid., p.108.

demonstrates that in different regions of the earth is possible to see the sovereignty of distinct houses. Similar to men, among ‘houses’ the group feelings are differentiated and the strongest ones gain the dominant power. Hence, in accordance with the decree of God all men must recognize the power to which they are exposed. In other case, the earth would not subsist due to the eternal conflicts of equal powers.

Man, Ibn Khaldûn settles, is a political authority. Royal authority is natural to inhabitants. In the same vein, political and royal authorities require good qualities. Ibn Khaldûn asserts that, in addition to the evil in human nature, individuals are eager for desire to acquire praiseworthy qualities due to their ‘natural disposition’ and ‘power of logical reasoning’.⁴⁷ Concisely, man inherits a basis of human nature at birth yet he is open to external influences. He says,

Royal authority is something natural to human beings, because of its social implications, as we have stated. In view of his natural disposition and his power of logical reasoning, man is more inclined toward good qualities than toward bad qualities, because the evil in him is the result of the animal powers in him, and in as much as he is a human being, he is more inclined toward goodness and good qualities.⁴⁸

Conformable hereunto, Ibn Khaldûn compares inhabitants with animals concerning leadership. He argues that royal authority is the natural quality of both men and some unintelligent animals. Considering bees and locusts that obey a leader and recognize an authority, animals have similar natures with men. Nevertheless, men are privileged; they are the ones who prefer authority via their reason instead of natural disposition and divine guidance.⁴⁹

⁴⁷ Ibid., p.111.

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ Ibid., p.47.

2.1.4. Forms of Civilization

Ibn Khaldûn states that, royal authority is a ‘noble and enjoyable position’, which covers the entire world. It holds ‘the pleasures of the body’ and ‘the joys of the soul’. Still, royal authority means war and fighting for superiority, too.⁵⁰ Either offensive or defensive, the group feeling compete for the strongest royal authority. Accordingly, the greatness of a dynasty, the extent of its territory and the length of its duration depend upon the numerical strength of supporters.⁵¹ That is to say, the tribes of large dynasties indicate stronger and larger provinces.⁵² When the borderlines are drawn, men establish, internalize and support their countries in the long run. Without provinces and borders, Ibn Khaldûn notes, men would not be able to protect themselves against enemies. Similarly, the ruling power does not manage to enforce laws of the dynasty, collect taxes or apply restrictions.

History, in Khaldûnian account, is a cyclical process in which any state ceases to exist and conquered by another society. A society might be less civilised but it should have a strong *asabiyyah* to have a triumph. Ibn Khaldûn certainly notes that the vanquished one usually wants to imitate the victor, the new ruling society, but it is rare that less civilised ones copy and imitate the vanquished one. This process takes three or four generations.

Ibn Khaldûn distinguishes the historical stages of dynasties and their peculiar traits concerning their social and political structures. “The first stage is that of success, the overthrow of all opposition, and the appropriation of Royal authority from the

⁵⁰ Ibid. ,p.123.

⁵¹ Ibn Khaldûn emphasizes that, after a number of generations and through successive dynasties, men forget the beginning of royal authority. Obedience to the government is conceived as ‘a divinely revealed book that cannot be changed or opposed’.

⁵² Ibn Khaldûn, 2005, p.130.

preceding dynasty.”⁵³ That is the time of glory in which the rulers serve as model to their subjects and collect taxes; they also defend property and provide military protection. Group feeling hinders rulers from claiming distinct from their subjects.

“The second stage is the one in which the ruler gains complete control over his people, claims Royal authority all for himself, excluding them, and prevents them from trying to have a share in it.”⁵⁴ The ruler of the dynasty is concerned with gaining great numbers of adherents, acquiring clients and followers. He reserves the glory and builds up to members of his own house. Men in this new stage reside similar qualities as the first members of societies. The ruler endeavours to keep his people at a distance and to control over them.

The third stage is of leisure and tranquillity in which the fruits of royal authority are enjoyed. “These fruits are the things that human nature desires, such as acquisition of property, creation of lasting monuments, and fame.”⁵⁵ Ibn Khaldûn notes that, the third stage is the process of destruction of all values including *asabîyah*. Property and fame reach a peak and all the abilities of the ruler concentrate on collecting taxes, regulating income and expenses, bookkeeping and planning expenditures. Dynasties erect large buildings, big constructions, spacious cities and lofty monuments. The ruler supports all men’s lives, money and positions who are dependants of the dynasty. He pays soldiers, attracts friendly dynasties and attacks hostile ones with soldiers as well.

“The fourth stage is one of contentment and peacefulness. The ruler is content with what his predecessors have built. He lives in peace with all his royal peers.”⁵⁶ In this stage, the ruler embraces the tradition of his predecessors and closely follows their

⁵³Ibid., p.141.

⁵⁴Ibid.

⁵⁵Ibid.,pp.141-142

⁵⁶Ibid.,p.142

movements. Neglecting the tradition in this stage means the annihilation of power for the ruler.

“The fifth stage is one of waste and squandering. In this stage, the ruler wastes on pleasures and amusements the treasures accumulated by his ancestors, through excessive generosity to his inner circle and at their parties.”⁵⁷ In the last stage, the soldiers and expert advisers leave the ruler. He entrusts to ‘low-class’ followers concerning the essential matters of the state and dissipates the authority of his forebears. ‘Senility and the chronic disease’ capture the dynasty, which destroy it ultimately.

Ibn Khaldûn demarcates appropriation and supports ‘moderate fragmentation’ of land. Each dynasty should have certain amount of provinces; since, if the dynasty undertakes to expand beyond its holdings, it remains without military protection and is laid open to any attack by its enemies or neighbours. Ibn Khaldûn definitely states that the centre of a dynasty is its strongest part and if a dynasty expands farther, the enormous power it resides rapidly declines. That is to say, excessive conquests of different territories and extension of political power make men highly exhausted and might dissolve the dynasty.⁵⁸

Muqaddimah is not only a historiographical text but also a comprehensive political theory, the centre of which is man in society. Ibn Khaldûn explores the nature of civilizations via investigating their transformations as well. Hence, to understand Ibn Khaldûn’s political ideas better, it is urgent to analyze his investigations on historical and natural facts concerning labor and property.

⁵⁷Ibid.

⁵⁸ Ibid., p.128

2.2. *Muqaddimah* as a Political Economy Guide: Ibn Khaldûn as an Early Economist

Ibn Khaldûn is a significant character as a progenitor of the foundation of modern economic thought.⁵⁹ Even though *Muqaddimah* appears to be merely a systematic history or sociology book at first, for many scholars Ibn Khaldûn has carefully designed a theory as to production, value and prices. In Ibn Khaldûn's point of view, human character, living conditions and group feeling constantly determine production, value and the prices.

Primary capital is one's own labor⁶⁰ by which the fundamental needs of men are satisfied. A certain amount of labor that enters into the production of things Ibn Khaldûn calls 'convenience'. Inhabitants living in large cities and constructing towns go beyond and develop luxury. Within a large civilization, the needs of the inhabitants increase and the demands for luxury become 'customary' necessarily. Labor becomes precious and conveniences get expensive in the same way. The applications of governments become more courageous for business transactions. Conveniences, foodstuffs, and labor become very expensive consequently. A good deal of money is spent and the expenditures of the people increase excessively.

In terms of the conditions they live in, Bedouin and Sedentary people labor the least or the most. Any kind of Sedentary civilization within a city requires certain amount of labor and expenditure. Bedouin people however do not need as much labor as the Sedentary ones. Those who live in small regions are not obligated to have property since small cities require little labor for satisfying the needs. Bedouin, who are famous for their simple regular practices, do not prefer to accumulate any profit or property since they do not need luxury. Luxury is the custom of civilizations.⁶¹

⁵⁹ See Boulika, Hassan, Bartkus and Ahmad.

⁶⁰ Labor Ibn Khaldûn frequently mentioned seems to be a type of 'working activity'.

⁶¹ Ibn Khaldûn, 2005, p.278

2.2.1. The Mode of Production: Labor, Surplus and Profit

Ibn Khaldûn defines value, capital accumulation, labor and profit by means of explaining the natural condition of human being. Labor in Ibn Khaldûn's theory has a substantial role, which is necessary for every profit and capital accumulation. Without human labor, no gain or no useful result can be obtained.⁶² Ibn Khaldûn says, "A portion of the value, whether large or small, comes from the labor."⁶³ He adds that income transforms to be 'sustenance' or 'profit' in terms of the use of production and explains as follows,

When a person does not use his income for any of his interests and needs, it is not called "sustenance." The part of the income that is obtained by a person through his own effort and strength is called "profit." For instance, the estate of a deceased person is called "profit" with reference to the deceased person. It is not called "sustenance," because the deceased person has no use for it: But with reference to the heirs, when they use it, it is called "sustenance."⁶⁴

Ibn Khaldûn contends that man obtains profit in four different ways. First, it is possible to obtain profit by hunting wild animals. Second, profit is obtained by agriculture; either from domesticated animals by extracting surplus products which are used by the people, such as milk from animals, silk from silk worms, and honey from bees; or from plants such as are planted in fields or grow as trees, through cultivating and preparing them for the production of their fruits.⁶⁵ Third, profit may be the result of human labor, which is applied to specific materials. When labor is applied to specific materials, it means 'crafts' such as writing, carpentry, and tailoring, weaving, horsemanship. In case of application to nonspecific materials, it is called professions and activities. Fourth is 'commerce' in which profit comes from

⁶²Ibid., p. 298

⁶³Ibid.

⁶⁴Ibid., p.297

⁶⁵ Ibid., p.299

merchandise and its use in barter. Merchants travel around with the merchandise in various countries. They hoard materials and observe 'the market fluctuations' that affect the prices prominently. Then, they buy goods at a low price and sell them at high prices when the demand is more. Consequently, the merchants make profit and increase their capital.

Ibn Khaldûn shows that the method of production determines social and economic conditions and forces people to live in *badawa* or *hadâra* types of life. In contrast to Bedouin life, people in Sedentary life are entrusted with the defence of 'property' and 'lives' with a governor or a ruler. The militia in a dynasty guarantees people by guarding them concomitantly. In other words, men in sedentary life are safe by the walls surrounding and the fortifications protecting them. In the same manner, production determines social life and range of population influences the growth of economy. With few inhabitants, Khaldûn notes, each city is deprived of profit or luxury.⁶⁶ He says,

All the additional labor serves luxury and wealth, in contrast to the original labor that served the necessities of life. The city that is superior to another in one aspect of civilization that is, in population, becomes superior to it also by its increased profit and prosperity and by its customs of luxury which are not found in the other city.⁶⁷

Surplus is the result of co-operation since combined labor and collective agriculture such as making tools and pillowing the soil are more productive activities than individual labor. The goods of trade might consist of slaves, grains, animals, weapons or clothing material. In case of being more than needed, labor is spent for luxury and imported through exchange and wealth. Hence, people possessing high

⁶⁶ Bartkus and Hassan note that inhabitants of the desert will have only the necessities of life as long as they remain nomadic and are unable to take the advantage of specialization and trade like those that are able to adopt sedentary life. This idea is similar to that expressed in the *Wealth of Nations*. (James R. Barthkus, M.Kabir Hassan, "Ibn Ibn Khaldûn and Adam Smith: Contributions to the Theory of Division of Labor and Modern Economic Thought", p.8)

⁶⁷Ibn Khaldûn, 2005, p. 273

surplus are the ones who have a good deal of wealth. Relation between population (*ûmran*) and labor shows that when the amount of population increases, luxury increases too. When supply rises, people produce more goods and services, and they demand more luxuries. Abundant labor and profit make economic activity rise, men accumulate capital and the prosperity instantly increases. Boulakia stresses that Ibn Khaldûn demonstrates a social organization of production for men while fulfilling their needs.⁶⁸ This cooperation is a form of ‘specialization of labor’. Through specialization, many times greater than the needs of inhabitants can be satisfied. Specialization leads to high productivity. Ibn Khaldûn writes,

This may be exemplified, for instance, in the Maghrib, by comparing the situation of Fez with other Maghribi cities, such as Bougie, Tlemcen, and Ceuta. A wide difference, both in general and in detail, will be found to exist between them and Fez. The situation of a judge in Fez is better than that of a judge in Tlemcen, and the same is the case with all other population groups. The same difference exists between Tlemcen on the one hand and Oran or Algiers on the other, and between Oran or Algiers and lesser cities, until one gets down to the hamlets where people have only the necessities of life through their labor, or not even enough of them.⁶⁹

On the other hand, value of labor actually changes in terms of the market principle. In small cities, for instance the inhabitants are poor and indigent, because labor does not provide surplus, and it is not available there to accumulate profit. In the same way, more income and expenditure make conditions favourable for big cities. To illustrate the case better, Ibn Khaldûn concentrates upon the case of ‘a beggar in Fez’ who is better off than a beggar in Tlemcen or Oran. He notes,

I observed beggars in Fez who, at the time of the sacrifices of the *ʿId* festival, begged enough to buy their sacrificial animals. I saw them beg for many kinds of luxuries and delicacies such as meat, butter, cooked dishes, garments, and utensils, such as sieves and vessels. Such as the beggars in

⁶⁸ Jean David Boulakia, “Ibn Khaldûn: A Fourteenth-Century Economist” *Journal of Political Economy* 1105-1118

⁶⁹Ibid.,p.274

Fez who looks for luxuries such as meat, butter and cooked dishes.⁷⁰

Concisely, abundant labor with surplus and wealth, in turn improves cities and inhabitants by accumulation. The main condition for improvement of a city is a large income accompanied by high expenditure. Moreover, Ibn Khaldûn believes, those cities are more charitable and bountiful than the inhabitants of any other city.

The profit coming from surplus is used for fulfilling diversified needs that the abundance in profit transforms badawa life. Men in badawa accumulate more than they need and demand new goods and services. Luxury rises, prosperity increases, and conditions become favourable enough for change of inhabitants. Differential services force the inhabitants to enter into sedentary life. He explains the case as following,

As one knows, Sedentary culture is the adoption of diversified luxuries, the cultivation of the things that go with them and addiction to the crafts that give elegance to all the various kinds of luxury, such as the crafts of cooking, dressmaking, building, and making carpets, vessels, and all other parts of domestic economy. For the elegant execution of all these things, there exist many crafts not needed in desert life with its lack of elegance. When elegance in domestic economy has reached the limit, it is followed by subservience to desires.⁷¹

When a great surplus leads to wealth and luxury, people accumulate profit and sustenance and make it ‘capital’.⁷² By referring to Quran concerning sustenance, “He created for you everything that is in the heavens and on earth. He subjected the sun and the moon to you. He subjected the sea to you. He subjected the firmament to you.

⁷⁰ Ibid., p.275

⁷¹ Ibid., p.285

⁷² Accumulating capital for Ibn Khaldûn is not capital accumulation in modern sense. It is a type of hoarding products.

He subjected the animals to you.”⁷³ Ibn Khaldûn paves the way for capital accumulation.

Ibn Khaldûn defends that ‘agriculture’, ‘craft’ and ‘commerce’ are the natural ways of making a living and being simple and innately natural agriculture is prior to all the ways mentioned above. Ascribed to Adam, it is also the oldest natural practice exhorted to inhabitants. In Ibn Khaldûn’s hierarchical alignment, the crafts are more scientific and composite. Thus, existing among the Sedentary peoples, crafts are ‘secondary’ and ‘posterior’ to agriculture. Similar to agriculture ascribed to Adam, craft is identified with Idris who is ‘the second father of inhabitants’. Commerce is the natural way of making living for Ibn Khaldûn in spite of its tricky methods. The surplus between purchase prices and sale prices is the way of making profit and it is legal. Ibn Khaldûn confesses that the specific characteristic of commerce is permitted with cunning.

In Ibn Khaldûn’s opinion, commerce is the attempt to make a profit by increasing capital, through buying goods at a low price and selling them at a high price. Division of labor inside the county spreads out of the countries. Countries import and export products since certain cities might have crafts that others lack. In a sense, they exchange their abilities.

2.2.2. The Monetary Theory: Theory of Money and Prices

Labor creates value. Either in carpentry or in weaving, the value of labor is far more important than the wood and yarn that go into the process. Ibn Khaldûn puts forward that the mineral stones, gold and silver are the sole measure of value for all kinds of capital accumulation. These are the basis of profit, property and treasure. Except these monetary standards, all things are subject to market fluctuations. He writes,

⁷³ Ibid.,p.297

When a city is highly developed and has many inhabitants, the prices of necessary foodstuffs and corresponding items are low, and the prices for luxuries, such as seasonings, fruits, and the things that go with them, are high. When the inhabitants of a city are few and its civilization weak, the opposite is the case.⁷⁴

Ibn Khaldûn admires cities with good organizations and intellectual infrastructure, which attract and invite people. In a city, increasing demands brings about precious labor. Therefore, the conveniences become expensive and government makes business transactions. Contrary to modern monetary theory, Ibn Khaldûn argues that the presence of money does not stimulate economic activity. The profit motive, social organization, and the use of capital are the factors that determine the volume of trade and the quantity of money in circulation.⁷⁵

Ibn Khaldûn designates a supply demand theory as well. He contends that the prices are affected by the supply and demand prominently. When a good is scarce and demand is high, its price gets high in a dynasty. Conversely, when a good is abundant and demand is low, its price gets low. The prices get low or high in big and small cities differently. In big cities, labor is abundant and opportunities are more than the needs. In case the production made is more than the necessities, society demands more than before. The city gets prosperous; crafts and labor get expensive simultaneously. Men have to pay more than the services worth. For Ibn Khaldûn there are three reasons for this; first one is increasing need, second one workers' rising the valuation of their work and the third one is the waste of money owners and their competition for the services. In small cities, small supply of labor makes men anxious about food shortages. Therefore, they accumulate their possessions and store them carefully. Ones who want to buy those products are obliged to pay more.

⁷⁴Ibid., p.276

⁷⁵See Abdol Soofi, "Economics of Ibn Khaldûn revisited" *History of Political Economy* (Summer 1995),p.17

Except the vital needs and conveniences are few in markets, consequently the prices are low.⁷⁶

Boulakia believes that, Ibn Khaldûn's theory constitutes the embryo of an international trade theory, with investigations of the terms of exchange between rich and poor countries and of the propensity to import and export. He notes, Ibn Khaldûn is the one who scrutinizes the influence of economic structure on development and the importance of intellectual capital in the process of growth.⁷⁷

2.2.3. Prosperity and Ranks

Labor, Ibn Khaldûn notes, is the sole reason for profit. As noted before, when population increases, the available labor again increases as well. In the same vein, when the profit increases, the need for luxury increases, too. He settles that income and expenditure balance each other in every city. If the income is large, the expenditure is large. The inhabitants become more favourably situated and city grows they live in, if both income and expenditure are large. Ibn Khaldûn deliberates the movement of luxury and the rise of labor as follows:

But in the premises of the houses of the indigent and the poor who have little sustenance, no insect crawls about and no bird hovers in the air, and no rat or cat takes refuge in the cellars of such houses, for, as the poet said: The bird swoops down where there is grain to pick up and frequents the mansions of noble generous persons.⁷⁸

⁷⁶Bartkus and Hassan demonstrate via many passages that both Ibn Khaldûn and Smith further develop those ideas into an understanding of how markets function to determine prices. Ibn Khaldûn discusses the differences in prices for labor in different locations and attributes the differences in wages to differences in stages of development of the localities. Bartkus and Hassan emphasizes again that when demand for luxury goods increase due to increasing population, the wages of those that provide these goods will rise. (James R. Barthkus, M.Kabir Hassan, "Ibn Ibn Khaldûn and Adam Smith: Contributions to the Theory of Division of Labor and Modern Economic Thought", p. 10)

⁷⁷See Jean David C. Boulakia, "Ibn Khaldûn: A Fourteenth-Century Economist", *Journal of Political Economy*, Louisiana State University in New Orleans, p.1109

⁷⁸ Ibid.

On the other hand, Ibn Khaldûn verifies that prosperity directly requires rank. The exact point he refers here concerning rank is the connection between labor, profit and private property. In Ibn Khaldûn's opinion, the protective power of rank is substantial factor for preserving the property. He notes that a person of rank has the people approach him with their labor and property. They do that in order to avoid harm and to obtain advantages. The labor and property through which they attempt to approach him is, in a way, given in exchange for the many good and bad things they may obtain or avoid with the aid of his rank. Such labor becomes part of the profit of the man of rank. The value realized from it means property and wealth. The man possessing rank, Khaldûn argues, thus gains wealth and a fortune in a very short time.

Ibn Khaldûn fairly declares that the numerous classes among men are the parts of God's wise plan with regard to his creation. The interests and permanency of inhabitants are preserved by God's regulation. Ibn Khaldûn argues that some people are not aware of their benefits and it will be obligatory to force them about to come together. Ibn Khaldûn does not object to the idea that man should have freedom of choice but they might be ignorant of their interests. Therefore, for preservation of inhabitants God appointed the Lord with the right to use others for forced labor. Ibn Khaldûn refers to the Quran saying that rank is the basis of the power enabling superiors to regulate the life of others. He insists that ranks conduce toward a natural right to dominate lower classes who are the inhabitants of a town or zone of civilization. Depending on the class and status of the person, the rank is either influential or restricted. Ibn Khaldûn writes,

If the rank in question is influential, the profit accruing from it is correspondingly great. If it is restricted and unimportant, the profit is correspondingly small. A person who has no rank, even though he may have money, acquires a fortune only in proportion to the labor he is able to produce, or the property he owns, and in accordance with the efforts he makes coming and going to increase it. This is the case with

most merchants and, as a rule, with farmers. It also is the case with craftsmen.⁷⁹

Ibn Khaldûn expands on the connection between differential ranks, influence and power inhabitants have. Happiness and welfare are the advantages of the rank one has acquired. Ibn Khaldûn points out two specific characteristics of inhabitants required for desires of rank, which are being obsequious and using flattery.⁸⁰ Obsequiousness and flattery are major ways of obtaining any rank. In short, rank produces happiness and profit, and that most wealthy and in that vein happy people have the quality of obsequiousness and they use flattery. However, a man who is proud and supercilious has no use for rank and his earnings are restricted to the results of his labor. Ibn Khaldûn prognosticates that the earnings of the proud are reduced to 'poverty' and 'indigence'.

Ibn Khaldûn actually blames two natural qualities of inhabitants that are 'haughtiness' and 'pride'. Assuming that 'I'm perfect, and people need my scientific or technical skill' develops a feeling of superiority. Especially believing in the superiority coming from the forebears leads to arrogance. Perfection is not passed on by 'inheritance'. In addition, fixed ideas of being skilful and experienced are proud. Such attitude disdaining the flattery and obsequiousness are the basis of egoism. Ibn Khaldûn finds it nonsense to be arrogant and rejecting ranks. He stresses that, a man who does not desire higher ranks is hated by others; he remains in a state of indigence and poverty, consequently his livelihood is destroyed. Boulakia indicates that Ibn Khaldûn was a member of an aristocratic family that influences his ideas substantially. He defines Ibn Khaldûn as follows:

...destined to occupy the highest ranks in the administration of the state and to take part in most of the political quarrels of North Africa. However, because of his Spanish background,

⁷⁹Ibid., p.306

⁸⁰ Ibid., p.307

he never became a full member of his society and remained an exterior observer of his world.⁸¹

Ibn Khaldûn is singled out for political criticism respecting opportunism. In his biography, Muhammed Abdullah Enan advocates that Ibn Khaldûn, by the side of the victorious, is standing under his banner without hesitation.⁸² Similarly, Franz Rosenthal supports that Ibn Khaldûn endeavoured to acquire leadership in the organization of his society and to master the intellectual development of humanity. However, as Ibn Khaldûn was a genius, his actions and aspirations were simple and uncomplicated. He was ruthless and opportunistic because his background and upbringing had taught him to consider the most desirable achievements in this world, and, largely. Rosenthal bases his opinion that for Ibn Khaldûn all means were necessary and therefore justified to achieve the first goal.⁸³

It is difficult to say Ibn Khaldûn is inconsistent with his studies because he praised the obsequiousness and in the same way, he found arrogance blameworthy. In Chapter V of the *Muqaddimah*, he notes 'rank' increases profits and preserves property. Therefore, obsequiousness and flattery are the substantial parts of the subsistence of inhabitants. In contrast, neglecting God's wise plan, arrogance induces poverty with indigence. For Ibn Khaldûn, one's assumption that 'I am perfect' leads to haughtiness and pride. Instead of flattering higher station, one's attitude controlled by feeling of superiority is a dangerous illusion, which inspires haughtiness. He believes in God's wise plan that regulates the status concerning roles. In Ibn Khaldûn's opinion, each man is 'successful' at the things that he was 'created'. Since, as he addresses through all parts of the *Muqaddimah* God knows the best.

⁸¹See Jean David C. Boulakia, "Ibn Khaldûn: A Fourteenth-Century Economist", *Journal of Political Economy*, Louisiana State University in New Orleans, p. 1105

⁸²See Muhammed Abdullah Enan, *Ibn Khaldûn: His Life and Work* Lahore: Kashmiri Bazar, 1941, p. 29

⁸³ See Translator's Introduction to *Muqaddimah*, (Ibn Khaldûn, *Muqaddimah*, trans. Franz Rosenthal (Routledge & Kegan, 1981), Introduction to *Muqaddimah*, p. 844)

In this chapter, the main political and economic ideas of Ibn Khaldûn are investigated. Labor, private property and prosperity lead us to understand and interpret Ibn Khaldûn better. As well as Ibn Khaldûn, this study mainly focuses on John Locke and his political and economic perspective. Labor and the private property pave the way for the discussions of the third chapter regarding the *Second Treatise of Government* specifically.

CHAPTER III

THE SECOND TREATISE OF GOVERNMENT

3.1. Natural State and Political Society

State of nature is the state of 'perfect freedom'. All men are free to order their actions and are not subject to the will of another man therein. State of nature is a state of also equality, wherein all the power and jurisdiction are reciprocal and no one has more than another does. Without any subordination or subjection, everyone has a manifestation of his own will, John Locke says, "...since, the creatures of the same species and rank are promiscuously born with all the same advantages of nature."⁸⁴ It is imperative for him to explicate the state of nature before deriving the political power from its origin.

3.1.1. Of the State of Nature as the Perfect State of Freedom

What does then John Locke mean by 'individual' and what grounds are his or her rights based upon?⁸⁵ The keystone of John Locke's individualist premises in the *Two Treatises of Government* is that all men have natural rights preserved by natural law

⁸⁴John Locke, Ed. *Two Treatises of Government a Letter Concerning Toleration*, (New Heaven and London: Yale University Press:2003), p.101

⁸⁵John Locke calls the right which all men have to the things necessary for subsistence 'property' and this is, in some sense, distinguished from 'property in' something which a person 'comes to have' in the process of individuation of the common gift. (James Tully, *A Discourse on Property John Locke and His Adversaries*, (New York: Cambridge University Press,1980), p.3

‘No one ought to harm another’ because all men are ‘equal’ and ‘independent’.⁸⁶ John Locke derives the right to preservation from the fundamental law of nature; mankind ought to be preserved. That is to say, natural law guarantees one’s freedom, property and right to life. The law of nature hinders men invading others rights and necessitates peace and preservation of mankind. Comprising ‘natural law’, which both regulates and governs all life, the state of nature is not a state of ‘licence’ or ‘uncontrollable’ liberty. John Locke emphasizes,

...though man in that state have an uncontrollable liberty to dispose of his person or possessions, yet he has not liberty to destroy himself, or so much as any creature in his possession, but where some nobler use than its bare preservation calls for it. The state of nature has a law of nature to govern it, which obliges every one: and reason, which is that law, teaches all mankind, who will but consult it, that being all equal and independent, no one ought to harm another in his life, health, liberty, or possessions.⁸⁷

In the state of nature, all men are equal and there is ‘no superiority or jurisdiction of one over another’ as well. Hence, “...every man hath a right to punish the offender, and be executioner of the law of nature.”⁸⁸ Transgression is one of the major concepts within this context. In this sense, natural law decrees that transgressor should be punished for evil he has done. God had set the measures for the mutual security of all men; and being the executioners of natural law one is capable of punishing the transgressor. Anyone transgressing natural law declares his being out of the society thereby approves his being executed by another rule as a substitute for reason and common equity.

Up to this point, John Locke describes rights in the sense of equality. Yet, he deliberates Hooker’s understanding concerning duties and maxims derived from

⁸⁶ John Locke, 2003, p.102

⁸⁷ Ibid., p. 102

⁸⁸ Ibid., p.103

natural equality.⁸⁹ Similar to Hooker's theological point of view John Locke supports that everyone, by the like reason, is bound to preserve himself and ought to preserve the rest of mankind. That is to say, neither does one impair the life, liberty, health, limbs, nor takes away goods of another.⁹⁰

3.1.2. Of the State of War

John Locke outlines the differences between the state of nature and the state of war, noting that they are antithetical. The state of nature is not the state of enmity and destruction, and is not a passionate and hasty mode of life. Men in the state of nature, however, involve the common law of reason. John Locke maintains,

Men living together according to reason, without a common superior on earth, with authority to judge between them, are properly the state of nature. But, force, or a declared design of force, upon the person of another, where there is no common superior on earth to appeal to for relief, is the state of war: and it is the want of such an appeal gives a man the right of war even against an aggressor, though he be in society, and a fellow subject.⁹¹

As it is apparent, anyone appealing to get another man in his absolute power hereby does put himself into 'a state of war' with another. In other words, declaring power over someone is to externalize one's consent and is against the absolute right of freedom. Such a declaration paves the way for slavery. In the same vein, John Locke advocates that freedom grounds the state of nature and reason bids men preserving life. For instance, in case that a thief invites a man in a state of war, natural law allows any counterattack or killing the thief supposing the aggressor behind this

⁸⁹Liberty, for the American Founders, includes the Lockean notion that we have a natural right to life, liberty and property, which rights cannot be abridged by others. There is indeed present here that freedom *from* interference which is so pronounced in the modern notion of right. However, lying at the core of this Lockean notion is an ancient and medieval metaphysics transmitted by Hooker-that sees right as essentially grounded in the teleological order of nature. (Edward J. Furton, *Richard Hooker as Source of the Founding Principles of American Natural Law* pp. 105-106)

⁹⁰ John Locke, 2003, p.102

⁹¹Ibid., p.108

attitude. Since, whoever transgresses the foundation of the natural law destroys the rule of reason. The state of nature resides in the peace, good will, mutual assistance and preservation. The state of war however is the state of malice, violence and mutual destruction. That is why it would be amiss for John Locke, to insist on perpetuating unlawful force with individual judges.⁹²

No one will hurt someone else's life, health, liberty and property, because all men are 'equal' and 'free'. All men are responsible for protecting others' existence, and for protecting their own existence. In this sense, it is forbidden to hurt the lives of others, freedom, health or property. The state of nature is the natural regulation and movement of persons in their 'state-owned savings' on things as well. In a state of equality, all men have similar natural talents and can use their power mutually. Hence, 'will of the freedom' is a natural possession for John Locke and it cannot be transferred to other subjects. Natural right of equality demands the right of freedom. Destruction is forbidden unless there is a noble reason to require it. That is to say, natural obligations force men to behave in accordance with nature. Therefore, John Locke seems to be presuming that all persons are moral equals who possess the same rights and duties.⁹³

3.1.3. The Law of Nature and the Nature of Man

What is then that is the importance of natural law common to all? John Locke hereby encourages the executor of laws concerning the punishment for any offence. Owing to this rule, which is common to all, any prince or state possesses the right to condemn an alien for any crime in his country. The law of nature demands the punishment which is equal to all, and state restraint similar offences via punishment. Nevertheless, the degree of punishment is important. John Locke prescribes

⁹² Ibid.

⁹³ See A. John Simmons, *The Lockean Theory of Rights*, (New Jersey: Princetown University Press, 1994) , p.84

palatably, “...each transgression may be punished to that degree, and with so much severity, as will suffice to make it an ill bargain to the offender, give him cause to repent, and terrify others from doing the like.”⁹⁴

In the *Two Treatises of Government*, John Locke introduces his account that to understand Political Power and derive it from its original, it is substantial to consider the state all men are naturally in at first. In the state of nature, all power and Jurisdiction are reciprocal; no one has more than another. Man in full state of equality resides possession of the right of self-government, which is called ‘natural freedom’. On the other hand, the state of nature is apolitical in a sense there is no government or natural ruler but John Locke indicates that it has “The state of nature has a law of nature to govern it, which obliges every one...”⁹⁵

Similar to the well-known Aristotelian idea, ‘man’ in the *Second Treatise* is a natural and political animal. Before John Locke, Hobbes presumes that individuals outside the state are not law governed and not moral thereof. He argues against this view that man is governed by natural law in the state of nature. Unlike Hobbes, John Locke was the one who does not believe that the state of nature is a state of licence with the conflicts of judgements because man is rational⁹⁶ John Locke was well aware that being executioners of the law of nature and the judges of their own cases, individuals possess ‘self-love’, ‘passion’ and ‘revenge’, and they reflect ‘ill natures’. He definitely says,

...that it is unreasonable for men to be judges in their own cases, that self-love will make men partial to themselves and their friends: and, on the other side, that ill-nature, passion, and revenge will carry them too far in punishing others; and

⁹⁴ John Locke, 2003, p.103

⁹⁵ Ibid., p.102

⁹⁶ “One of the reasons in fact, why natural law has been called a natural law is that the knowledge of it is said to be acquired by man’s natural faculties, i.e. sense perception and reason the joint exercise of which constitutes what John Locke and others called the ‘light of nature’ The light of nature thus reason and the law of reason, a law that does not bind children, idiots, or animals, precisely because they are by nature devoid of understanding in the ordinary sense.” (W. Von Leyden, 1956, p.7)

hence nothing but confusion and disorder will follow: and that therefore God hath certainly appointed government to restrain the partiality and violence of men.⁹⁷

Contrary to his former arguments defining man governed by natural law, John Locke criticizes the deficient nature of man. Upon this ground, he grants the government hindering of 'confusions and disorders'. Civil government is the proper 'remedy' for inconveniences of the state of nature. Unjust will of anyone or judges amiss in the state of nature flow smoothly to the political society and melt with all the rest of mankind. Nonetheless, there would be individuals who still are in the state of nature i.e. the occasion of governments among each other. "All princes and rulers of independent governments all through the world are still in a state of nature despite of absolute transition of men to political society."⁹⁸

Naturally, individuals also have equal rights to exercise political power. They are not subject to the will of another, whence original power of a political body necessitates institutionalized form of governmental power. John Locke uses 'natural' to imply that natural law could be perceived by the use of a natural faculty i.e. reason and sense perception, which are common to all. Perhaps the most striking aspect of Lockean theory is the totality of common truths which natural law is founded on. That is to say, John Locke was well aware that the construction of a theory entails a common ground, which could be the light of nature.

The law of nature is a definite and permanent foundation for moral goodness that is recognized through neither dedication nor custom. John Locke does justify natural law by referring to God. He claims that natural law is the decree of God. This definition in turn amounts to deriving natural law from the power of the first legislator. A political or economic investigation of his theory should cover an analysis of his arguments on God with relations of natural law, since John Locke's

⁹⁷ John Locke, 2003,p.105

⁹⁸ Ibid., p.106

theory of property takes its start from the description of God and man in the state of nature.

3.1.4. Of Paternal Power

In keeping with former arguments, John Locke suggests men to part with the state of nature from which a state of war emerges in society. The state of absolute freedom preserves deficiencies. Here, upon this ground John Locke explains political power in the following passage,

To avoid this state of war is one great reason of men's putting themselves into society, and quitting the state of nature: for where there is an authority, a power on earth, from which relief can be had by appeal, there the continuance of the state of war is excluded, and the controversy is decided by that power.⁹⁹

Several inferences can be made from this passage pertaining to John Locke's ideas on political power. It is visible so far that God is the supreme judge of all men and men should give up being judges of their own consciences. Natural law decrees that all power and jurisdiction are reciprocal and no one has more rights than another. God is the absolute judge of heaven, in the same way an objective judge ought to be in the world.

God bestowed the knowledge of him and the most habitable part of the universe over other creatures. Man is aware of his power; he considers what the end of this privilege is. Reason is the common measure that is given to mankind and leading to the production of moral truth. This special faculty man resides makes him acquire natural law or decrees of God.¹⁰⁰ John Locke endorses that 'reason wills peace'. John Locke emphasizes,

⁹⁹John Locke, 2003, p.109

¹⁰⁰ See Mark Goldie, ed. *Political Essays, of John Locke*, (UK: Cambridge University Press), 1997, p.270

The *freedom* then of man, and liberty of acting according to his own will, is *grounded on* his having *reason*, which is able to instruct him in that law he is to govern himself by, and make him know how far he is left to the freedom of his own will.¹⁰¹

Subsistence of imperfect individuals necessitates constructing a political society. Men, in the state of nature are not capable of solving controversies because not all men are the absolute judges of their own cases. Men, departing with the state of nature and his natural rights hereby acquire the contractual ones. In other words, legitimate contracts require sacrificing the natural liberty man resides in the state of nature. Hence, rights become more evident in a ‘civil society’.

3.1.5. Of Political or Civil Society and Consent

Men are naturally in the state of nature and they remain so until they make themselves members of political society with their own *consent*. John Locke asserts that consent is accompanied by silence. Living within a society and obeying its rules means declaring being not reluctant to anything including inequalities. Man makes himself a part of a political body by means of his consent for living with others.¹⁰² He does put himself under an obligation to everyone and ties to determinations of the majority. Nonetheless, liberty in political society is as great as the natural liberty. He tells us law guarantees liberty as follows,

So, that however be mistaken, *the end of law is not to abolish or restrain, but to preserve and enlarge freedom:* For in all the states of created beings capable of laws, *where there is no law, there is no freedom.*¹⁰³

¹⁰¹ John Locke, 2003, p.126

¹⁰² Political individualism is one of the major conceptual innovations of early modern political thought.

¹⁰³ John Locke, 2003, p124.

Constructing the political structure, men do give up their rights to government, freedom partially and punishment completely. Qua its supreme power, natural law reveals a ground; “ought” is designated from “is”. In Lockean theory, it is reasonable to arrange positive laws in accordance with the law of nature. The law of nature is the archetype and measure for civil laws, and indicates the normative foundation for all subsequent forms of society.

Political power mentioned here comprises several roles in the name of legislative, executive and federal power of the common wealth. The legislative power is responsible for making laws, and preserving the lives, activities and possessions of its subjects. Besides, it possesses a right to direct the force of the commonwealth towards preserving community and the members of it as well. Political power makes and applies laws. The executive power uses the force of community to execute laws with penalties. In addition, the federal one involves the power of regulating ‘war and peace’, ‘leagues and alliances’ and transactions with all persons and communities outside the common wealth.¹⁰⁴

3.1.6. Of the End of Political Society and Government

What is the reason of leaving the state of nature and entering into a civil society? It is one of the most controversial issues for social contract theories. To understand this phenomenon, it is urgent to explore what the state of nature is in Lockean account. The state of nature means the lack of established and settled laws. A monarch does not dictate natural law; instead, common consent receives and allows its existence. They are plain and intelligible to all rational creatures, yet natural law cannot fulfil men’s needs all the time. John Locke upholds, “... men being biased by their interest, as well as ignorant for want of studying it, are not apt to allow of it as a law binding to them in the application of it to their particular cases.”¹⁰⁵ A man who is the judge of

¹⁰⁴Ibid., p.165.

¹⁰⁵John Locke, 2013, p.155.

his own case and the executioner of the law of nature is inclined to be partial to them. What is more, it is not possible always to control natural feelings, those of 'passion', 'revenge', 'negligence' and 'unconcernedness'. Hence, executing laws for providing justice is essential for the peace of society, thereby all conflicts and controversies can be solved. It is required to determine crime and innocence. Such conveniences in the state of nature men are exposed to compel men to enter into the political society. Similarly, irregularities and uncertain exercise of power hinder the preservation of property. However, under an established government and laws preserve property and provide security by contracts. John Locke says,

Therefore, whoever has the legislative or supreme power of any commonwealth, is bound to govern by established standing laws, promulgated and known to the people, and not by extemporary decrees; by indifferent and upright judges, who are to decide controversies by those laws.¹⁰⁶

John Locke recapitulates the property of man in political society, which includes their 'lives', 'liberties' and 'estates'. Reason decrees the mutual preservation of one's property and man wills to leave the state of nature. In the state of nature, man is the absolute lord of his person and possession. Nevertheless, enjoyment of their rights is not guaranteed. Their rights are exposed to the invasion of others, so they feel unsafe and insecure.

Freedom does couple with fear and continual danger, gets worthless in any society; and thereby man puts himself under government for preserving his property. In this sense, John Locke declares that any rational creature cannot change his condition with an intention to be worse.¹⁰⁷ In accordance to the former arguments, the origin of right and the executive and legislative power of government are derived from the intention of men to leave the state of nature.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., p.156.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid.

3.2. Lockean Theory of Property

John Locke was the philosopher who fought to disprove the monarchical ideals of his age.¹⁰⁸ He endeavoured to show the justification of property rights, one of the crucial problems of his age. The traditional foundations of monarchy and their absolute power were shattering day by day. He advocates that monarchy is inconsistent with civil society and cannot be a form of a civil government at all; since, it does not remedy the inconveniences of the state of nature. Man in the dominion of monarchy is not capable of finding an objective known-authority to appeal to. Private property right, which is established by the natural law in the state of nature, embraces all men in the world who are either in the state of nature or in political society

Initially, John Locke presumes that God created the world and gave it to mankind in common. Natural law dictates that all men have the natural right of 'self-ownership'. In the state of nature and in the successive period, each man is responsible for meeting his needs. Not only the necessity of subsistence, but also this duty or the decree of God constrains men to create private property. Common possession however seems to hinder private property on all the fruits nature produces. Thus, devoid of consent of all commoners, how man is capable of having property is a challenge.

3.2.1. Labor as a Rational Ground for Property

John Locke addresses to 'reason' that God has given men to make use of the best advantages and conveniences of life. The paramount convenience of life is the earth that supports and comforts the subsistence of men. It is required to appropriate the product in their natural state for supporting men's life. John Locke directly reveals

¹⁰⁸ Ashcraft states that John Locke wrote *Two Treatises of Government* as further expression of Shaftesbury's purposes. It was not written as a philosophy. Rather it is prepared as a party book. (Richard Ashcraft, "in Revolutionary Politics and John Locke's Two Treatises of Government: Radicalism and Lockean Political Theory", *Political Theory*, vol.8. no.4. (November 1980): p. 55.

that appropriation is available for subsistence. “The fruit, or venison, which nourishes the wild Indian, ... must be his, or so his, *i. e.* a part of him, that another can no longer have any right to it, before it can do him any good for the support of his life.”¹⁰⁹

What excludes the common rights of other men on nature is a controversial issue John Locke reflected. The first thing to note is that the first property a man naturally resides in is the property in his own person. As clarified before, qua being a free political body, man is not subject to the will of other. Nobody has a right to benefit of the labour of anyone’s body and the work of his hands. John Locke declares,

The labours of his body, and the work of his hands, we may say, are properly his. Whatsoever then he removes out of the state that nature hath provided, and left it in, he hath mixed his labour with, and joined to it something that is his own, and thereby makes it his property. It being by him removed from the common state nature hath placed it in; it hath by labour something annexed to it, that excludes the common right of other men.¹¹⁰

John Locke indicates that labor is unquestionable property of a man to exclude the common right of others. Any time, any effort, expended in purposeful action is defined as labor. No matter how trivial an effort is.¹¹¹ When did the private property begin? John Locke makes clear that he does not mean ‘hard work’ creates private property. First gathering, at least picking up an acorn is enough for having private right. Labour adds something to nature and reveals a crucial distinction between private and common. Since, one is not capable of fulfilling his needs by appealing to the consent of all; John Locke hereby encourages appropriation of nature without common consent. Labour removes the natural out of the common state they were in and fixes the user’s property in them. The chief matter of property is the earth itself

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., p. 111.

¹¹⁰ Ibid., p.112.

¹¹¹ See Karen Vaughn,1978, p.312.

God bestowed to men. John Locke hereafter refers to God as follows; God decrees not to spoil or destroy,

As much land as a man tills, plants, improves, cultivates, and can use the product of, so much is his property. He by his labor does, as it were inclose it from the common...God who gave the world in common to a mankind, commanded man also to labor, and the penury of his condition required it of him.¹¹²

John Locke reiterates his description on appropriation of nature that labor is the major concept creating value. Assuming that man is capable of creating value via using labor, the earth should be used for great conveniences of life. In the beginning of life, nature was unassisted until a man encloses land. Lockean approach presumes that man uses labor by nature and takes the fruits of his toil. By the decree of God, man is supposed to subdue all over the earth and improve for the benefit of life. Moreover, John Locke demonstrates that it is not rational to leave land uncultivated since God gave it for benefit. He does appraise the appropriated land instead of unassisted nature regarding value. When compared to labor, the value of land is minimal. Labor makes the far greatest part of the value of things we enjoy in the world and rapidly increases the use value of goods and usefulness of products as well.¹¹³ From all mentioned here, it is evident that man is the absolute master of himself. Labor is the great ‘foundation of property’ and ‘the greatest part of value’. In this sense, private property right is derived from labour. Hence, private property is the major element leaving the state of nature and entering into civil society.

God is the Lockean reference to command to subdue and to force man to labour. No matter where a man had fixed his labor, his property cannot be taken from him. God had introduced private possessions, yet precluded immoderate possession and forbidden wasting. John Locke tells us,

¹¹² John Locke, 2003, p.113.

¹¹³ Ibid., p.118.

The measure of property nature has well set by the extent of men's labour and the conveniences of life : no man's labour could subdue, or appropriate all ; nor could his enjoyment consume more than a small part ; so that it was impossible for any man, this way, to intrench upon the right of another, or acquire to himself a property, to the prejudice of his neighbour, who would still have room for as good and as large a possession after the other had taken out his as before it was appropriated. This measure did confine every man's possession to a very moderate proportion, and such as, he might appropriate to himself, without injury to anybody...¹¹⁴

Hence, men exchanged precious metals and valuable products i.e. sheep for shells, wool for sparkling pebble or a diamond. Thus, 'perishable supports of life' did not depreciate and labor used in appropriation was not wasted. After an agreement, men mutually consented to value the worthless substances such as metals and thereby accepted the use of money. Labor is not, of course, the only ground of private property allowed by John Locke. Rather, labor is the ground of original exclusive property rights. In this way, something, which is previously unowned, can become owned.¹¹⁵ "...gold, silver, and diamonds, are things that fancy or agreement hath put the value on, more than real use, and the necessary support of life."¹¹⁶ John Locke praises the invent of money, since money prevents products from perishing and decaying. "And as different degrees of industry were apt to give men possessions in different proportions, so this invention of money gave them the opportunity to continue and enlarge them."¹¹⁷ With the invention of money the market intruded into areas of life previously the domain of the family, custom and central authority. The power of money grew during the seventeenth century and come to determine public policy.¹¹⁸

¹¹⁴ Ibid., p.115.

¹¹⁵ See John Simmons, *Lockean Theory of Rights*, (New Jersey: Princeton University Press,1994), p. 225.

¹¹⁶ John Locke, 2003, p.120.

¹¹⁷ Ibid.

¹¹⁸ See Joyce Oldham Appleby, "John Locke Liberalism and the Natural Law of Money" , *Past and Present* no 71, (May 1976) , p.321.

3.2.2. Additional Value

Lockean appropriation theory has led to continuous debates of political philosophy. Many scholars dare to posit that private property theory is a plausible argument. As to property rights, they posit different perspectives with dissimilar aspects.¹¹⁹ Robert Nozick in *Anarchy, State and Utopia* interprets John Locke's Theory of Acquisition. He discusses the case of appropriation through mixing labor with substances. For Nozick, the principles of justice, which John Locke attempted to specify in acquisition includes critical questions. Labor adds something that is more than nature, and lets men appropriate and extracts new substance from the common state thereby values things. Man makes something his property via his natural 'property of his own person'. Labor is the instrument of man to use through annexing value to things. Nozick takes it as a big problem; firstly, he notes that John Locke ignores the fact that sometimes labor makes something less valuable. He questions,

If I own a can of tomato juice and spill it in the sea so that its molecules made radioactive, so I can check this mingle evenly throughout the sea, do I thereby come to own the sea, or have I foolishly dissipated my tomato juice. Perhaps the idea, instead, is that labouring on something improves it and makes it more valuable; and anyone is entitled to own a thing whose value he has created.¹²⁰

Secondly, why should one's entitlement extend to the whole object? Any John Locke commentator would agree that men, by dint of annexing something more than nature, are adding value to substances. Nozick, by contrast contends that, it is hard to understand why one is entitled to the whole object rather than the added value one's labor has produced.¹²¹ The question is whether improving an object is a sufficient condition of having the full ownership of something.

¹¹⁹ Perspectives mentioned here will be explained within two aspects, theological perspectives and secular ones.

¹²⁰ Robert Nozick, *Anarchy, State and Utopia*, (New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, 1974), p. 175.

¹²¹ Ibid. p.175.

Nozick's view, in this way compels all plausible grounds of property right theories. He deliberates over the condition of others after appropriation. Any object coming under one's ownership changes the position of others. In other words, the liberty to use the object suddenly disappears. After all, interfering with the liberty of others brings about the worsening situation. John Locke's proviso of 'enough and as good for others' is relevant to such liberties. Nozick considers that, providing this proviso, John Locke tries to ensure the situation of others in a good way. He says,

Someone may be made worse off by another's appropriation in two ways: first, by losing the opportunity to improve his situation by a particular appropriation or any one; and second, by no longer being able to use freely without appropriation what he previously could.¹²²

Then again, John Locke approves inheritance from ancestors to their children. For John Locke 'every man is born with a double right': first, a right of freedom to his person, which no other man has a power over, but the free disposal of it lies in himself. Second is a right, before any other man, to inherit with his brethren his father's goods. Nozick locates that the appropriation process gives rise to a permanent bequeathable property right. Appropriation of scarce substance will raise the price and thereby it will be 'difficult to acquire' it all. Through first appropriation and all the later transfers, Nozick points, Lockean proviso that says, 'leave enough and as good for others' is violated. He ventures to construct a more complex and adequate principle of justice in acquisition embedded in justice in transfer because the price relations violate the Lockean proviso. Nevertheless, Nozick supports free operation of a market system apart from monopoly dominance that does not 'run afoul of' Lockean proviso.¹²³

Simmons examines the *Two Treatises of Government* as to which types of rights a man possesses. John Locke often uses the word 'property' to refer simply to all of

¹²²Ibid., p.176.

¹²³Ibid., p.182.

our rights, of rights over us, our actions, our land, and our external goods, which the government has to secure. At other times, however, John Locke uses 'property' to refer to smaller 'subclasses' of our rights. For instance, property refers almost exclusively to our rights in external things, or in the several parts of that which God gave to mankind in common, our goods, estates, possessions, the fruits of the earth etc. At different times, he prominently uses 'property' to refer to all of our rights, our rights in all external goods, and our rights in land. Nevertheless, the primary use of 'property' is obviously to refer to our rightful possessions in land and transferable external goods.¹²⁴

John Locke's theory of property is thought to be his most important contribution in political thought; yet it is also one of the most heavily criticized theories. Actually, there are important debates over what exactly John Locke was trying to get by his theory. Macpherson in *The Political Theory of Possessive Individualism* criticized Lockean property theory. He analysed the Lockean understanding of property right regarding 'possessive individualism'. In his opinion, John Locke is a strong defender of unrestricted capitalist accumulation or class-based capitalism. John Locke set three restrictions or provisos¹²⁵ for the accumulation of property in the state of nature. Macpherson directly examines these legitimate conditions for appropriation, the prevention of spoiling, leaving 'enough and as good' for others and appropriating through one's own labor. John Locke ascertains that labor can be alienated between capitalists and wage-labourers. This leads to the division of society into distinct classes. For Macpherson, John Locke gives more importance to property owners and takes them as the sole voting members of the society.¹²⁶

¹²⁴ John Simmons, *Lockean Theory of Rights*, (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1994), p. 228.

¹²⁵ Widerquist argues that scholars have identified as many as three limits on Lockean appropriation: (A) the no-waste proviso or spoliation limitation, (B) the charity or subsistence proviso, and (C) the enough-and-as-good proviso or the sufficiency limitation. There is little agreement about which provisos are necessary, whether they were intended, or what their implications are, but with reasonable simplification, it is possible at least to consider them jointly. (Karl Widerquist, "Lockean Theories of Property: Justifications for Unilateral Appropriation", *Public Reason* 2, (2010), p.7.

¹²⁶ Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, John Locke's Political Philosophy, First published Wed Nov 9, 2005; Substantive Revision Thu Jul 29, 2010.

John Dunn analyses Macpherson's critiques of the *Two Treatises of Government* as to differential ownership of property. He is well aware that, John Locke yearns to commend the English law for the sake of property. Main duty is self-preservation. Dunn notes, this reminds him of the morality of Hobbes. Lockean property theory does include a set of duties and rights in general and is exactly dependent upon a theological ground as well. Like other sixteenth or seventeenth century Protestant thinkers, John Locke conceived the calling as the station of life to which pleased God.¹²⁷ Dunn also criticizes Macpherson and notes that John Locke interpreted the social structure as a completely moral notion. Dunn contends that Strauss and Macpherson are similar in that they describe John Locke's theories as 'packaged in a sort of theological 'Polythene' .¹²⁸

James Tully in *A Discourse on Property* made a comprehensive analysis of John Locke and his adversaries on property rights. Similar to Dunn's interpretations Tully takes labor as a positive moral duty and as wider than making and doing. On Tully's account, Lockean theory should be analyzed in terms of God-man- creation relations. Tully hereby addresses to the *First Treatise of Government* that says, "God makes him in his own image after his own. Likeness, makes him an intellectual creature, and so capable of Dominion."¹²⁹ For Tully, John Locke actually believes that God has the natural right to men since he made them. In the same way, men have the right of his makings. He explicates this affiliation as follows:

God as maker has non-contingent knowledge of, and a natural maker's right in, His workmanship. The implication of this is that man has positive duties to God and resulting natural claim rights to duties. Man as maker appears to have analogous maker's knowledge of, a natural right in his actions. This analogy is a logical feature of workmanship

¹²⁷John Dunn, *The Political Thought of John Locke: An Historical Account of The Argument of the Two Treatises of Government*, (London:Cambridge University Press,1969),p.219.

¹²⁸Ibid.,p.222.

¹²⁹John Locke, 2003, p.23.

model; it was first employed to explain the relation of God to man and the world.¹³⁰

Property right, Tully contends, is an inclusive right and derived from the natural law. Resulting from this natural law to preserve oneself and others, man is not ‘at liberty’ to exercise or not to exercise the right. Instead, one is under a positive and a natural duty to do so. Property right is entailed by, and is a justification of claims to perform duties to God. Tully refers to Copleston and paraphrase his saying “...men have natural rights because they have natural duties.”¹³¹

Likewise, Tully refers to Dunn by means of stressing that what “...defines human life (for John Locke) is a set of duties and a right to promote happiness in any way compatible with duties.”¹³² As mentioned before, Dunn defines Lockean labor as a moral form of activity and in a moral ground ‘person’ is defined as a free man who is the master of his own actions.¹³³ Furthermore, Tully replies the problem of appropriation Nozick questioned regarding the whole possession notwithstanding the partial labor value. For Tully, John Locke refers to materials provided by God instead of pre-existing objects through labor activity. Tully's interpretation of John Locke is his interpretation of the sufficiency condition and its implications.

3.2.3. Problem of Disproportionate and Unequal Distribution

John Locke endeavours to show the legitimacy of private property and ‘disproportionate and unequal distribution’ as well. Jeremy Waldron discusses the political implications of John Locke’s political theory. Even though the general approach of the *Two Treatises of Government* is egalitarian, the second chapter

¹³⁰ James Tully, *A Discourse on Property: John Locke and His Adversaries*, (London: Cambridge University Press, 1980), p.110.

¹³¹ Ibid., p.63.

¹³² Ibid.

¹³³ James Tully (1980) posits the influence of Aristoteles and Aquinas on John Locke.(p.117).

seems to him inegalitarian. He maintains that while legitimizing the private property right, John Locke attempts to justify disproportionate and unequal distribution. He insists that Lockean theory of property should be understood within theological concerns. Nonetheless, there are substantial contradictions between the implications of Lockean Protestant Christianity and modern liberal egalitarianism. Waldron, borrowing from Nozick does claim that Lockean property right comes from two aspects. Teleology of the creation of natural resources and the special significance of labor in relation to that teleology are the baseline of Waldron's interpretation.¹³⁴ In his opinion, the teleology of natural resources reminds the argument about mixing one's labor as a rule of God concerning subsistence. What is to say, the case of having property is not only comprehended as a right of mankind but also as a duty of God. Lockean labor, Waldron says, is a moral value in terms of 'God-like' creativity. God is our maker and we are his property. Similarly, men are the makers of the things, whence things men produce are the property of men. This model is 'the workmanship model' that many John Locke commentators agree. As John Locke determined in the *Two Treatises of Government* property right is mostly for a rational beings. He says,

God gave the world to men in common; but since he gave it them for benefit, and the great conveniences of life they were capable to draw from it, capable to draw from it, it cannot be supposed he meant it should always remain common and uncultivated. He gave it to the use of the industrious and rational.¹³⁵

Therefore, as a rational being, for fulfilling the purpose of God or following the commands, man appropriates substances. Waldron, in this sense, discovers the proviso for appropriation regarding rational and industrious man. Waldron thus extended the idea that labor should be understood in terms of its value creation possibility. Nevertheless, he recognizes, in Lockean studies, labor is an activity but

¹³⁴ Jeremy Waldron, *God, John Locke and Inequality: Christian Foundations in John Locke's Political Thoughts*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p.160.

¹³⁵ John Locke, 2003, p.114.

to be a valuable activity labor certainly should support the life of mankind. In addition, Waldron supports the idea that John Locke is an egalitarian, so his argument as to which concept property is based on is egalitarianism. He evaluates the restrictions in a completely different way than other scholars.

According to him, Waldron contrary to Macpherson and Tully's claims, John Locke's 'sufficiency restriction' is not normative. He discusses the difference between necessary and sufficient conditions for property right. For him, Macpherson and Tully have misunderstandings about the beginning of property right. For Waldron, the case pointed out by John Locke in the *Two Treatises of Government* which pictures 'he hath mixed his labour with, and joined to it something that is his own, and thereby makes it property.' is the process; yet it is not the definition of necessary condition for appropriation. Concisely, concerning unequal appropriation problem, John Locke has a reputation for being charitable. Waldron notes, John Locke was charitable to the poor except the Idle or Prophane. Hence, John Locke insists the application of 'Poor Law' that 'everyone must have meat, drink, clothing and firing.'¹³⁶ However, John Locke's charity is not radical such as selling all you have and giving it the poor. He believes charity is substantial for proper limitation of property and prevention of economic inequality, which turns into political inequality.

Richard Ashcraft underlines that the Lockean theory of property is a revolutionary theory. Referring to the *Two Treatises of Government* he tries to posit the radicalism in John Locke's theory of property rights. Ashcraft argues that the *Second Treatise*, an attack on monarchical ideas such as Robert Filmer's arguments, was written to justify revolutionary political action against tyranny. As a political tract, John Locke seeks to provide a rationalization for the political activity. Lives, liberty, property and religion are the basic concepts behind resisting against tyranny on the grounds of

¹³⁶Jeremy Waldron, *God, John Locke and Inequality: Christian Foundations in John Locke's Political Thoughts*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p. 186.

self-defence.¹³⁷ Ashcraft illustrates a sophisticated political atmosphere characterized by the plots and conspiracies of radicals, government spies and agent provocateurs. Besides, the intimate political relation between John Locke and Lord Shaftesbury makes Ashcraft to analyze John Locke's studies within a radical ideological framework. John Locke was one of the 'literary representatives' of the revolutionary movement within the intellectual strata. John Locke's *Two Treatises of Government* is a political defence. This defence involves the principle of liberalism as well as 'the Glorious Revolution' of 1689. In short, John Locke was the representative of Shaftesbury's political purposes.¹³⁸

3.2.4. Problem of Subsequent Rights

John Locke's position for Simmons is relied on neither purely theological nor purely secular arguments. The *Second Treatise of Government* is neither a defense of unlimited capitalist appropriation and a conservative acceptance of all existing property relations nor a defense of purely conditional property and radical redistribution.¹³⁹ Instead, being pluralistic and moderate, Lockean political theory is a liberal mix of the two. Property right for John Locke is not an absolute right or full ownership. John Locke allows that property in external goods 'must continue' to be used by the owner.¹⁴⁰

In John Locke's account of appropriation, property is established by labor and subsequent title to property can be acquired in variety of ways.¹⁴¹ John Locke

¹³⁷ Richard Ashcraft, "Revolutionary Politics and John Locke's Two Treatises of Government: Radicalism and Lockean Political Theory", *Political Theory*, vol 8, no.4, November 1980, pp.429-86.

¹³⁸ Ibid., p.429.

¹³⁹ See A. John Simmons, *The Lockean Theory of Rights*, (New Jersey: Princetown University Press, 1994), p.222.

¹⁴⁰ John Locke, 2003, pp.117-118.

¹⁴¹ (1) *Inheritance* as we saw in 4.4) can give subsequent title, either consensually (as in inheritance based on spousal contract) or "naturally" (as in filial inheritance); (2) *need* can give title to the surplus of another's property, as we will see in 6.3; (3) one may acquire title to another's property as *reparation for injuries* done to one by that person. The right to take reparation is (as we saw in 3.2)

contends that each person was born with a right which Simmons calls ‘the right of self-government’. He unveils the problem of alienation of rights referring to section XXIII of the *Second Treatise of Government*, which is against slavery and absolute subjection. John Locke unveils here that man has not ‘the power of his own life’. The prohibition of enslavement demonstrates that a man does not have the rights to transfer. What is to say, rights are not inalienable in Lockean account. Referring Tully, Simmons says,

Now one might, of course, suppose that John Locke intends to defend only the alienability of our rights in external moveable goods, while still maintaining (ala Tully) that property in land, in our lives and liberty, and our common use rights *do not* include the right of alienation. But this view is hard to defend as well. For, to begin with land, it is hard to understand how parents could leave land to their children or join land to the commonwealth (both activities being described by John Locke as occurring in the state of nature), if our natural property in land is not alienable.¹⁴²

Though rights we possess over our lives and liberties are consistently treated as in principle alienable by John Locke, he is in certain ways confused about the implications of his own moral theory for Simmons. Locke’s position is agreeing that all rights are alienable; no matter whether those rights are in our moveable goods, our land, or in us. Thus, inalienability of rights entails the lack of the right to ‘give away the property we need to survive’. According to Simmons, John Locke defines a kind of trust relation between men and God, the creator. God let men to use their life in certain ways, he entrusted them about not to destroy or endanger their lives.

In this part of the study, famous interpretations of scholars concerning private property are analysed. It is apparent that John Locke, just as Ibn Khaldûn does, justifies private property rights by appealing to labor. Following chapter covers a

part of each person's natural executive right, based on the forfeiture of rights suffered by wrongdoers; (4) *alienation* of property rights (by gift, sale, or trade, for example) can also give subsequent title to what was first acquired by labor.(Simmons,1994, p.225)

¹⁴²A. John Simmons, *The Lockean Theory of Rights*, (New Jersey: Princetown University Press, 1994) , p.231.

comparative analysis of Ibn Khaldûn and John Locke in the concept of labor that grounds the private property paradigm. Both the theological grounds of their works, *asabîyah* and consent are substantial concepts referred to here. Besides, the notion of state that is the common problem of two scholars and its relation to private property are discussed in particular.

CHAPTER IV

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

4.1. Man as a Rational Being

Nature of men concerning the acts of changing his situation in *Muqaddimah* is noteworthy. They are naturally inclined to acquire things over simple necessities, and construct cities and towns. As mentioned in Chapter II, men have an ability to think and it is bestowed by God. Because of the ability to think, God makes men behave ‘in orderly’ and ‘well arranged’ manner. Ibn Khaldûn writes,

He enabled them to arrange for their activities under political aspects and according to philosophical norms. Those political aspects and philosophical norms lead human beings from the things that are detrimental to them, to those that are in their interest, and from evil to the good.¹⁴³

Ibn Khaldûn uses the term *fikr* to describe the power that leads men to understand and to be able to fulfil the needs of their lives. His greater concern here is explicating that by means of the power of *fikr* a man is inspired to obtain his livelihood and to establish co-operation, which brings about the establishment of a human community. Furthermore, *fikr* paves the way for divine revelation, which comes through men via

¹⁴³ Ibn Khaldûn, 2005, p. 336.

the mediation of the prophecy. Hence, they act according to that guidance as well as to prepare for salvation, for the life of the next world.¹⁴⁴

John Locke stands for the idea that man is a free rational being. Concerning the relation of man, God and the world, John Locke says, “He gave it to the use of the industrious and rational and labour was to be his title to it...”¹⁴⁵. He also states that by means of his natural ability, man directly acquire the law of nature by noting, “...for though the law of nature be plain and intelligible to all rational creatures.”¹⁴⁶ Conforming here, John Locke confirms, except the natural law freedom should be limited by force. One cannot enslave or put himself under the absolute, arbitrary power of another. “Nobody can give more power than he has himself; and he cannot take away his own life, cannot give another power over it.”¹⁴⁷

4.2. Social Bonds: Asabiyah and Consent

Ibn Khaldûn’s observes the government and historical transformations of *badawa* and *hadâra* life. Historical transformation, Ibn Khaldûn stresses is the nature of *ûmran*. He concentrates on group feeling, *asabîyah*, which is the incentive power for progressing towards civilization. Akbar Ahmed points out that *asabîyah* is an exclusivist principle acting for the majority of the group. However, there can be ‘a potential of degeneration’ accompanied with changing positions into ‘tyranny for the minority’. Besides, while the rise of a new order is full of hope, its eventual damage is both predictable and dispiriting. Ahmed adds the certitude of Ibn Khaldûn’s

¹⁴⁴ See Zaid Ahmad, *The Epistemology of Ibn Khaldûn*, and Routledge Curzon :London, 2003, p.21.

¹⁴⁵ John Locke, 2003, p.131.

¹⁴⁶ Ibid., p.155.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid., p.110

‘rhythm of history’ and further endorses its ‘inherent pessimism’.¹⁴⁸ Similarly, Zaid Ahmad takes *asabîyah* as an instrument for enduring civilisation. He notes *asabîyah* is not a ‘chauvinist term’ since Islamic thought rebuffs chauvinism.¹⁴⁹ Anderson states that Ibn Khaldûn does not demonstrate the group feeling substantively as a cause but perceives it as a nature of mobilization of group action, or as bracing property. This feeling can take several forms for Anderson. It is ‘polyvalent’ in itself and is a common thread among diverse kinds of groups, from the more primitive tribes to the more civilized societies.¹⁵⁰ On the other hand, the distinctive usage of *consent* is remarkable in *Muqaddimah*. Ibn Khaldûn believes that God appointed silver and gold as monetary standards. However, the value of silver and gold are determined by people’s consent. He says,

...it should be known that treasures of gold, silver, precious stones, and utensils are no different from other minerals and acquired capital, from iron, copper, lead, and any other real property or ordinary minerals. It is civilization that causes them to appear, with the help of human labor, and that makes them increase or decrease.¹⁵¹

Similar to Ibn Khaldûn, John Locke simply discovers the personal will together with the role of *consent*. He believes that what begins and constitutes any political society is nothing but the consent of free rational men. As mentioned before, man in the *Two Treatises of Government* is rational. Being aware of his own interests, man leaves the state of nature and enters into civil society for improving ambiguous living conditions.

¹⁴⁸ Akbar S. Ahmed, “Ibn Khaldûn and Antropology: The Failure of Methodology in the Post 9/11 World”, *Contemporary Sociology*, Vol. 34, No. 6 (Nov.2005), p.594 .

¹⁴⁹See Zaid Ahmad, Ibn Khaldûn’s Approach in Civilisational Studies. (Massimo Campanini, ed., *Studies on Ibn Khaldûn*, (Polymetrica: Milano), 2005.

¹⁵⁰See Anderson, Conjuring With Ibn Khaldûn: From an Anthropologic Point of View ,*Journal of Asian and African Studies*vol. 18 no. 3-4, 1983, pp. 263-273

¹⁵¹Ibn Khaldûn, 2005, p.303.

John Locke also justifies the private property right referring to the role of *consent*. He goes on to say that in various parts of the world, several communities established the bounds of their distinctive territories, by means of laws, thereby they regulated the ‘properties of the private men of their society’. Hence, they settled the property by ‘compact and agreement’; they consented to use money and labour, then industry began therein. He says, “...by common consent, given up their pretences to their natural common right, which originally they had to those countries, and so have, by positive agreement, settled a property amongst themselves...”¹⁵²

4.3. The Social Division of Labor and the Case of the Property

Owner and the Laborer

Even though Ibn Khaldûn and John Locke are the members of different civilizations, their political investigations have a common basis. Labor is the vital ground of their world-famous economy theories. Both merely insist that without labor, it is impossible to create value. Ibn Khaldûn posits the importance of previous works on products but labor is the most substantial part. He says, “Carpentry and weaving, for instance, are associated with wood and yarn and the respective crafts needed for their production. However, in the two crafts first mentioned, the labor that goes into them is more important, and its value is greater.”¹⁵³

On the other hand, specialization of labor, which is the necessary condition of life, is a considerable issue. Ibn Khaldûn argues that various skills and tools are advantages for survival of mankind. However, the power of the individual is not sufficient for him to obtain the food he needs. A man, for Ibn Khaldûn, is not powerful enough to provide him with as much as he requires for living. He tells, “Each of these operations requires a number of tools and many more crafts than those just

¹⁵² John Locke, 2003, p.136.

¹⁵³ Ibn Khaldûn, 2005, p.298.

mentioned. It is beyond the power of one man alone to do all that, or even part of it, by himself.”¹⁵⁴

Without a combination of many powers from among his fellow beings men cannot survive. Men obtains food for himself and for others through solidarity. Thus, many times greater than the needs of their own number can be satisfied. Adil Mouhhammed urges that the changing process, which determines the new modes of production, thereby raises early capitalist production. The Sedentary people gain that status via exploitation of surplus through the division of labor.¹⁵⁵ Ibn Khaldûn posits the exploitation of workers by investigating the issue of free labour as opposed to the slave. He defends that forcing men to work for nothing makes no productive work.

Ibn Khaldûn separates the used parts of products from the non-used parts. He called the part that is used up ‘sustenance’ similar to the concept that Karl Marx called necessary labor. In Ibn Khaldûn’s words, sustenance is the part of the profit that is utilized.¹⁵⁶ Abdol Soofi notes,

Ibn Khaldûn’s economic thought is related to Islamic doctrines as much as the Western writers’ ideas are related to Judeo-Christian tradition. If Marxian and Keynesian economics are not considered to be economics of Judaism or Christian economics, respectively, then one may not label Ibn Khaldûn’s economics as Islamic economics. ...In spite of Ibn Khaldûn’s strong religious convictions and his repeated references to God, Prophet Mohammad and Quranic verses,

¹⁵⁴ Ibid., p.45.

¹⁵⁵ “Ibn Khaldûn describes the production process through the example of bread production, where various tasks, such as kneading and baking, are divided among workers who are employed by the owner the capitalist. This production process is social and early capitalist in nature because the owners of the means of production hire workers to produce output that exceeds their needs, and they sell this output for a profit to purchase both necessities and luxuries. This economic surplus is furthermore, used to expand and sustain this mode of production. In fact, the economic surplus can be exported to other countries through international trade and, indeed, the latter is pursued to support the developmental process. Other social institutions arise to serve the same purpose.” (Adil H. Mouhhammed, *On Ibn Khaldûn’s Contribution to Heterodox Political Economy*, History of Economic Review, Ibn Khaldûn’s Contribution to Heterodox Political Economy p. 90).

¹⁵⁶ See Abdol Soofi, 1995.

his economic analyses were not based on any religious doctrines.¹⁵⁷

With the improvement of cities luxury and prosperity rise and consequently tax revenues increase, too. Contrary to John Locke, Ibn Khaldûn criticizes the amirs and rulers who confiscate the capital of its owners. Similar to many scholars, Zaid Ahmad feels the trace and taste of modern flavour in Ibn Khaldûn's ideas, which is the meticulous observation of human economic life leading to systematic understanding of the complex division of labor and specialisation of functions.¹⁵⁸ In the field of economics, Ibn Khaldûn explicates the supply and demand factors that are conveyed to price changes. He evaluates the interdependence of prices and the ripple effects on successive stages of production of a fall in prices and the nature and function of money. In his writings on public finance, he also shows at the beginning of dynasty why taxation yields large revenue from low rates of assessment. At the end, taxation yields small revenue from high rates of assessment, instead. Furthermore, as a rule, Ibn Khaldûn underscores, government decisions are actually unjust in terms of property rights. So, one who has property can preserve himself from injustice by a protective force of ruler or rank. When, the property owner enters into the *asabîyah* of ruler and thus avoids robbing with tricks and legal pretext applied by authority.

In the same manner, In John Locke's opinion 'property right' is a natural and positive right for persons who appropriate their needs via labor. He says, "...the improvement of labour makes the far greater part of the value."¹⁵⁹ Furthermore, John Locke actually believes that labor gives supplementary value. In other words, labor adds something which it does not have naturally. He explains, "The useful products

¹⁵⁷Ibid., p.18.

¹⁵⁸ See Zaid Ahmad, 'Ûmran: The Khaldûnian Conception of human society and civilisation. p.110 (Massimo Campanini, ed., *Studies on Ibn Khaldûn*, (Polymetrica: Milano), 2005).

¹⁵⁹John Locke, 2003, p.117.

of the earth nine-tenths are the effects of labour... that in most of them ninety-nine hundredths are wholly to be put on the account of labour.”¹⁶⁰

Appropriation and labouring, which are the natural necessities, have an ethical ground as well. John Locke supports the idea that subsistence is a decree of God, for this reason, perishing the products is the violation of the natural law. He maintains, “...but if they perished, in his possession, without their due use; if the fruits rotted, or the venison putrefied, before he could spend it ; he offended against the common law of nature.”¹⁶¹ Without doubt, one should make an effort since, “...land that is left wholly to nature, that hath no improvement of pasturage, tillage, or planting, is called, as indeed it is, waste; and we shall find the benefit of it amount to little more than nothing.”¹⁶²

John Locke portrays here that property simply begins with thought. For instance, when one pursues a hare and thinks to hunt thereby removes her from the state of nature. However, most thinkers are critical about the issue that leads to a significant inconsistency in the *Second Treatise of Government*. The inconsistency mentioned here is the mediation through appropriation from a servant to an authority. Even though John Locke suggests that, the only way of having property right is personally labouring on something, he appears to retract the restriction. He writes,

Thus, the grass my horse has bit; the turfs my servant has cut; and the ore I have digged in any place, where I have a right to them in common with others, become my property, without the assignation or consent of any body. The labour that was mine, removing them out of that common state they were in, hath fixed my property in them.¹⁶³

¹⁶⁰Ibid.

¹⁶¹Ibid., p.116.

¹⁶² Ibid., p.118.

¹⁶³John Locke,2003, p.112.

Labor is the sole element creating private property rights. And, Lockean theory comprises that the occupation of one's horse and a servant are the labor of one. Hence, labor and the labor product of a servant or a horse belong to one's master. As to this relation, David Ellerman supports that John Locke's theory of property is not the labor theory of property at all, and commentators have misinterpreted John Locke, by reading 'one's labor' as the labor one performed for centuries. He says that John Locke's theory is based less on a principle than on 'a pun'. His pun always interprets the phrases such as 'one's labour' as 'his labour'. In Lockean account, 'the labour that was mine' means the labor owned rather than the labor performed.¹⁶⁴

Regarding this controversy, it is essential to understand the relation between the owner and the laborer better. John Locke seems to arrange wage relations via *consent*. As Tully notes, Macpherson finds the passage mentioned above consistent with the rest of the *Two Treatises of Government*. It is reasonable for Macpherson to alienate one's labor in return for wage. In Macpherson's view John Locke is a scholar who claims that the right to alienate one's labor for a wage is an essential feature of capitalist and modern competitive market societies.¹⁶⁵

John Locke describes a master-servant relation, too. The property right is fulfilled either by labouring on land or by selling one's labor and working for others person where any appropriated land is not available.¹⁶⁶ In this sense, Tully writes that in the Lockean account a man has a right to subsistence in 'the surplus goods of another.' The labor that is mine equally refers to the servant's labor I purchased.¹⁶⁷ In this way, Tully claims there is no place for the capitalist in the *Two Treatises of*

¹⁶⁴ See David Ellerman, "Property and Contract in Economics: The Case for Economic Democracy", p.32, www.ellerman.org/Davids-Stuff/Books/P&C-Book.pdf.

¹⁶⁵ Macpherson, *A Political Theory of Possessive Individualism*, 1964, p.60.

¹⁶⁶ Ibid., p.213.

¹⁶⁷ James Tully, *A Discourse on Property: John Locke and His Adversaries*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1980), p. 136.

Government.¹⁶⁸ He contends that, there is a necessary relief, a man can labor for himself and for another but only if there is an alternative.

John Locke was well aware that governments do not sustain themselves without large incomes. All men should pay their proportion for the maintenance of the protection government provides. Nevertheless, this proportion is not determined by the claims of one's power. He says that this payment should be with one's own *consent*, *i. e.* the consent of the majority, giving it by either themselves or their representatives chosen by them. In case that any one claim a power to lay and levy taxes on the people without such consent of the people thereby invades the fundamental law of property. This shakes confidence concerning the end of government.

4.4. Monarchical Power

Ibn Khaldûn defines the case of execution and elaborates the relation between the executors and executed ones in a social organization. In fact, the conditions he remarks on are not the state of conflicts and contradictions. Still, man having the license of execution comprises the small part of the whole in a social organization. The rule governing nature declares men to be dominated by someone else. It is a necessary case because Ibn Khaldûn believes that not everyone but only chiefs and leaders have ability to be master of their own affairs. He says,

If the domination is kind and just and the people under it are not oppressed by its laws and restrictions, they are guided by the courage or cowardice that they possess in themselves. They are satisfied with the absence of any restraining power. Self-reliance eventually becomes a quality natural to them. They would not know anything else. If, however, the domination with its laws is one of brute force and intimidation, it breaks their fortitude and deprives them of

¹⁶⁸Ibid., pp. 137-138.

their power of resistance as a result of the inertness that develops in the souls of the oppressed.¹⁶⁹

Ibn Khaldûn criticizes the excessive power of domination either in the actions of a state (*dawlah*) or in any social organization. Actions applying brute force and intimidation deprive men of courage, creating a society unwilling to take the initiative. Accordingly, application of laws must not be 'enforced' via punishment that leads to 'a feeling of humiliation' and 'breaks one's fortitude'. 'Education' is one of the other main instruments of domination; both education and instruction instil laws to mankind in their childhood. Men in the influence of the exaggerated domination of laws thus grow up in fear and docility with losing of self-reliance. The restraining influence of governmental and educational laws comes from outside and they destroy fortitude. The religious laws, do not destroy fortitude, since their restraining influence is 'inherent'. Governmental laws, however, affect sedentary people, in childhood and adulthood; they 'weaken souls' and 'diminish stamina'. Ibn Khaldûn defends the idea that greater fortitude is found among the savage Arab Bedouins, since they live apart from the laws of government, instruction and education.¹⁷⁰ Nonetheless, Khaldûnian understanding of political organisation has a strong tendency towards absolutism in monarchy. Similarly, the tendency of the appointed governors is towards greater independence of the central authority.¹⁷¹

Concerning the authority, John Locke's political theory is actually based on the equality of mankind who are created by God at first. Men are all free and equal from the birth. Inequalities appear via a contract with consensus. Conforming to it, he illustrates man who searches after the truth endowed with his intellectual faculties because man is rational and industrious enough to know his benefits. Besides, man is naturally free, self-governed, and capable of constituting a government. Being

¹⁶⁹ Ibn Khaldûn, 2005, pp.95-96.

¹⁷⁰ Ibid., pp.96-97.

¹⁷¹ Zaid Ahmad, 2005, p. 113.

famous for these ideas, John Locke was widely known as the father of classical liberalism and much of his work was opposed to authoritarianism.

4.5. Deterioration of the State

Ibn Khaldûn has a deterministic idea of state. In a naturalistic manner, he proposes that royal authority and the dynasties are the goal of group feeling (*asabiyyah*). Commerce, craft, and the science are both conditions and consequences of urban life. In addition, Sedentary culture is the goal of Bedouin life. Similar to any physical being, Sedentary culture in civilization has a physical life. When the prices for customs and luxuries increase, the town consequently deteriorates. Ibn Khaldûn explains the new corrupt situation as such,

They corrupt the city generally in respect to business and civilization. Corruption of the individual inhabitants is the result of painful and trying efforts to satisfy the needs caused by their luxury customs; the result of the bad qualities they have acquired in the process of obtaining those needs; and of the damage the soul suffers after it has obtained them, through acquiring still another bad luxury quality. Immorality, wrongdoing, insincerity, and trickery, for the purposes of making a living in a proper or an improper manner, increase among them.¹⁷²

High prices and all their profit enter into large expenditures dominate sedentary people. Ibn Khaldûn attributes the decline of civilisation of a dynasty to ‘demand-pull’ and ‘cost-push’ inflation. Nevertheless, his monetary theory contradicts the quantity theory of money, and he does not believe in the casual relation between the quantity of money and the general price level.¹⁷³ He notes that the breakdown of Arab Muslim civilization in Khaldûnian understanding is due to ‘the excessive materialism’, which disintegrates *asabiyyah*, weakens religion and animalises human nature.

¹⁷² Ibn Khaldûn, 2005, p. 286.

¹⁷³ Abdol Soofi, 1995, p.14.

‘Materialistic involvement’ triggers imbalance in the human condition as mentioned in preliminary sections and the corruption of human nature leads to the decline of civilizations. Hence, deteriorated life of people gets in disorder. Towns consequently fall into ruins. Here, Ibn Khaldûn refers to the Quran again, “When we want to destroy a village, we order those of its inhabitants who live in luxury to act wickedly therein. Thus, the word becomes true for it, and we do destroy it.”¹⁷⁴

Ibn Khaldûn maintains that the decline of royal authority is a result of a natural process. In John Locke’s theory, however, the members of the society ‘restrain the exorbitances’ and ‘prevent the abuses of power’. Similar to Ibn Khaldûn, John Locke presents the danger of ‘ambition and luxury’ concerning the deterioration of society. These reasons trigger the decline of an authority in which the princes teach distinct and separate interests from their people.¹⁷⁵ Governments and societies are dissolved in three ways for John Locke. The first way is through foreign force and conquest of a dynasty. The second way is through alteration of legislation. The third one is regarding execution; when the supreme executive power ‘neglects’ and ‘abandons’ enforcing laws or the legislative power performs contrary to trust, the government is dissolved.¹⁷⁶

4.6. Beyond Nature: Theological Ground and Moral Status

Here upon this ground, it is essential to note that in *Muqaddimah*, Ibn Khaldûn frequently uses revelations as the divine references from the Quran. However, he does not settle that God reveals all theories favouring the authority. In other words, historical investigations on several nations show that, inhabitants who did not possess a divinely revealed book, might still be able to survive with the help of a group feeling. Ibn Khaldûn advocates,

¹⁷⁴ Ibid., p.113.

¹⁷⁵ John Locke, 2003, p.166.

¹⁷⁶ Ibid., pp.143-151.

People who have a divinely revealed book and who follow the prophets are few in number in comparison with all the Magians who have no divinely revealed book. The latter constitute the majority of the world's inhabitants. Still, they too have possessed dynasties and monuments, not to mention life itself. They still possess these things at this time in the intemperate zones to the north and the south. This is in contrast with human life in the state of anarchy, with no one to exercise a restraining influence. That would be impossible.¹⁷⁷

As much as the influence of natural facts, the decree of God is the most crucial reference of Ibn Khaldûn's writings. The political leadership and the political authority, for instance, are the results of the permission of God. God is undoubtedly able to deprive men of Royal authority. Ibn Khaldûn says, "If God wants evil to happen to certain people, nothing can turn it back." ¹⁷⁸

Nevertheless, Ibn Khaldûn presumes that the natural power of the religious law is the origin of the entire universe. He strongly insists that the religious law justifies the perfection of the divine law. The appropriation of the decrees of God makes man peaceful, courageous and victorious. In this sense, social life ought to be constructed in accordance with the revelations of God. He does refer to Koranic quotations facilitating justifications of his political theory in the *Muqaddimah* for essential foundations of compatible cases concerning the revelations of God.

Beyond man, there is the supernatural, which has many different manifestations. It extends from the sublime realm of the omnipotent, omniscient, and eternal Muslim Deity. Ibn Khaldûn sincerely believes in the reality of all the supernatural's manifestations. However, despite his belief in the reality of the supernatural, Ibn Khaldûn relegates its influence to a realm outside of, or beyond, the ordinary course

¹⁷⁷Ibn Khaldûn, 2005, pp. 41-48.

¹⁷⁸Ibid., p.113 .

of human affairs.¹⁷⁹ Nevertheless, he meticulously restricts the power of divine impacts or revelations upon human affairs.

Self-preservation is the first common ground of Ibn Khaldûn and John Locke. Similar to Khaldûnian attitude, John Locke refers to man's natural inclination and strong desire to preserve his life and being. John Locke shows a relationship between right and desire.¹⁸⁰ Macpherson suggests that John Locke deduced God's intention and his moral principle from man's desire, and he reconciles right and desire. Macpherson believes that John Locke is similar to Hobbes regarding this deduction. As mentioned before, man is the center of Khaldûnian theory that psychological factors transform social characteristics for civilisations. Ibn Khaldûn resorts to religious texts as a firm basis for historical law. Hanafi describes those rules respectively,

1)The laws of history are natural, but humanity and nature are created by God; the differences among peoples, societies and languages are well established in the Quran; 2)the unalterable historical law is at the same time the fulfilment of the will of God; 3) the cyclical evolution of history and cultures-with their unavoidable end- is understood in the light of Quranic verses such as <<To every nation a term; when their term comes, they shall not put it back by a single hour not put it forward>> (Q:7,34) ; 4) the historical law is also a moral law in the light of Qur'anic verses such as <<The noblest among you in the sight of God is most god fearing of you (Q:49,13)

¹⁸¹

Ibn Khaldûn claims that common truth is the religion of God. The extent of the state (*dawlah*) widens and the dynasty grows by religion. Men, thus unite for religion,

¹⁷⁹ See Ibn Khaldûn, *Muqaddimah*, trans. Franz Rosenthal (Routledge & Kegan,1981), p. 848.

¹⁸⁰ Tully argues John Locke's point is twofold. First, man can have subjective desires and these will be rational, and therefore right, insofar as they are coincident with God's desires for man. God always has His desire under the control of his reason. Thus, to act in accordance with desires which are rational by this test is to act in accordance with God's reason, or natural law. The only rational desires are those which motivate man to seek preservation in a way conducive to the fulfilment of God's desire to preserve mankind.(1980:p. 46-47)

¹⁸¹See Hasan Hanafi, The *Muqaddimah* of Ibn Khaldûn. (Massimo Campanini, ed., *Studies on Ibn Khaldûn*, (Polimetria: Milano), 2005, pp. 49-50.

come together in agreement to press their claims, and hearts become united therein. False desires lead men to mutual jealousy and widespread the differences. Men, however prefer the truth and reject whatever is false, thereby advance toward God. Jealousy disappears; cooperation and support flourish then. As the result of the number of its supporters, religious propaganda gives another power to a dynasty at its beginning.¹⁸² This in turn, amounts to similar result that religious propaganda cannot materialize without a strong group feeling.

Ibn Khaldûn discusses decreasing influence of religion in societies. 'It is urgent to apply restraining laws.'¹⁸³ Since, restraining power gets the most essential element instead of religious laws. After restraining power invokes, the religious law (*sharia*) ought to be a branch of learning. Ibn Khaldûn demonstrates here,

It has thus become clear that governmental and educational laws destroy fortitude, because their restraining influence is something that comes from outside. The religious laws, on the other hand, do not destroy fortitude, because their restraining influence is something inherent. Therefore, governmental and educational laws influence sedentary people, in that they weaken their souls and diminish their stamina, because they have to suffer their authority both as children and as adults.¹⁸⁴

Here upon this ground, Ibn Khaldûn recapitulates 'man' in bidirectional way by the words of God from Qur'an. "We led him along two paths. And inspired the soul with its wickedness as well as its fear of God."¹⁸⁵ Accordingly, Ibn Khaldûn presumes that the 'evil' is one of the features of the wicked one, which is closest to man with injustice and mutual aggression. He was well aware that men ought not to be dominated. Rather they must be moderately governed by external force. In other

¹⁸² Ibn Khaldûn, 2005, p.126.

¹⁸³ Ibid., p.96.

¹⁸⁴ Ibid., p.96.

¹⁸⁵ Ibid., p.97.

words, in response to the evil residing in men, they ought to be restricted by laws for the sake of society.

Ibn Khaldûn strongly believes that the foundation of powerful dynasties is religion. Religion itself subordinates the differences which *asabiyyah* articulates.¹⁸⁶ Dynasties of wide power and large royal authority are based either on prophecy or on truthful propaganda. The fragmentation of individuals ceases only in case of sharing a common truth they believe and they desire to believe. Namely, an authority results from superiority and superiority from group feeling. Ibn Khaldûn writes as a believer. There is a moral imperative in his interpretations of *asabiyyah* as the organizing principle of society.¹⁸⁷ As Ahmad stresses, it is difficult to understand *asabiyyah* as a value-free concept. When insisting of social organization is a result of necessary conditions, Ibn Khaldûn seems to reflect a moral order. On the other hand, *asabiyyah* as a strong group feeling is a defensive force more than being offensive to either religion or worldly rank. Ibn al-Khatib and Rosenthal agrees that Ibn Khaldûn was aware that *asabiyyah* could be applied to praiseworthy emotions, e.g. patriotism.

In the same way, John Locke gives moral references for verifying equality. For instance, improving a land through appropriation is good “...in effect, there was never the less left for others because of his enclosure for himself: for he that leaves as much as another can make use of, does as good as take nothing at all.”¹⁸⁸ He refers to God’s will and praises the good features of man concerning the social and political actions. He says, “He gave it to the use of the industrious and rational and

¹⁸⁶ John W. Anderson in *Conjuring with Ibn Khaldûn* declares that Asabiyyah seems to be a concept of relation by sameness, opposed both to the state (*dalula*) based on relations of differences or complementary and to religion, which alone supersedes it. (Bruce B. Lawrence, ed., *Ibn Khaldûn and Islamic Ideology*, (Leiden: The Netherland) 1984, pp.111-120).

¹⁸⁷ Akbar Ahmad, “Ibn Khaldûn and Anthropology: The Failure of Methodology in the Post 9/11 World”, *Contemporary Sociology*, 34, 6-Essays, on Ibn Khaldûn, 2005, p.593.

¹⁸⁸ John Locke, 2003, p.114.

labour was to be his title to it, not to the fancy or covetousness of the quarrelsome and contentious.”¹⁸⁹

Private property right for Ibn Khaldûn is a problem of justice and similarly, for John Locke private property right is validated by the decree of God. The only difference is the religion which grounds their beliefs. John Locke states, “God made of the world to Adam, and to Noah, and his sons; it is very clear, that God, asking David says, Psal. cvx. 16, ‘...has given the earth to the children of men’ given it to mankind in common.”¹⁹⁰ And Locke adds, “God has given us all things richly, 1 Tim. vi. 17”¹⁹¹ In fact, John Locke dictates that ‘the penury’ of the condition of man and the command of God make him to labour and to subdue the earth.

¹⁸⁹Ibid.

¹⁹⁰Ibid. p.111.

¹⁹¹Ibid. p.113.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

Ibn Khaldûn and John Locke are the influential political symbols in history. They were the consultants of the political figures of their times in the east and the west. *Muqaddimah* is a detailed story of the rise and the fall of the different nations throughout the history. On the other hand, the *Two Treatises of Government* is a detailed analysis of the relation of the government and the state. Similar to Ibn Khaldûn, John Locke is a versatile thinker. He unveils the available and unavailable conditions for the subsistence of a government.

Ibn Khaldûn is the last prominent scholar of the first phase of the Islamic history. In *Muqaddimah*, he designated characteristics of civilisations with governing laws and their principles. Chiefly, he derives those governing rules from basic conceptual abstractions of the practical history and socio-political events experienced in human society. He is a sophisticated thinker who separates inhabitants as *badawa* and *hadâra* with respect to their customs and living conditions. In fact, hadara life is the aim of *ûmran* but it brings about the decline of the state as well. He formulates a new concept for his time, which is *asabîyah* as a primary element governing the rise and fall of civilizations. *Asabîyah*, as a group feeling is broken down within details in urbanized societies over a period for Ibn Khaldûn. Akbar Ahmad believes that Ibn Khaldûn's ideas foreshadow those of our time. He interprets today's conditions, which is based on an exaggerated, and even obsessive loyalty to the group. That is usually expressed through hostility, often violence and Ahmad calls it *hyper-asabîyah*.

Ibn Khaldûn explicates natural stages for dynasties. The first natural stage of a dynasty requires overthrowing of all opposition and the appropriation of royal authority from the preceding dynasty. Afterwards, the ruler acquires complete control over his people. He objects to sharing the authority and claims royal authority all for himself. Besides, the ruler leads men to build their own houses, and contentment and peacefulness become the rule. The fifth stage is the time of wasting on pleasures, amusements and squandering on governors. Glory, luxury, tranquillity and peace, which political power comprises, thus trigger the decline of the state.¹⁹² In the same vein, John Locke criticizes the arbitrary applications of the government. He only trust a government based on convention and trust. In addition, deterioration of a state is due to the exaggeration in taxation for Locke.

Ibn Khaldûn, whom many scholars regard, is the first analyser of economic structure in the Medieval Islam. He praises trade relations and the man in production. He insists on the idea that the ruling authority must be vigilant in maintaining the social rules. Moreover, he criticizes state intervention since commercial activity is not a profession of a statesman. Besides, he encourages investment in education and innovation. In the same vein, John Locke defends freedom and rejects the state intervention in the civil society. He emphasizes the importance of the ideas of the people who live in a society. Government should be aware of the problems and the needs of the members of the society.

Ibn Khaldûn and John Locke justify their sayings by means of the decree of God as a natural law. As mentioned before, Ibn Khaldûn searches the natural law that governs the development of the society. Therefore, he carefully observes social, economic, political and historical facts. Similarly, in Lockean political theory, natural law is the eternal sunshine of political bodies entering into civil society.

¹⁹² See Ibn Khaldûn, 2005.

Ibn Khaldûn unveils the property and market relations concerning needs, value, labor, luxury, the specialization in profession and the role of government in trade. Labor and effort begin with man's physical environment and the influence of nature upon him. This is followed by a discussion of primitive social organization, the character of leadership in it, and the relationship of primitive human societies with each other, as well as their relationship to the higher, urban form of society.¹⁹³ Ibn Khaldun's discourses are extraordinary. They embrace more than the Muslim socio-cultural milieu.¹⁹⁴

Various political theories endeavour to validate existing systems. Some theories and their theorists, however, are main tools for social change i.e. anarchist and the socialist theories.¹⁹⁵ When compared with Ibn Khaldûn's position, Lockean thought is a guiding spirit for both economic and political areas of a social system. John Locke wrote the *Two Treatises of Government* in a political atmosphere characterized by political repression, the combat and the subversive activities of these individuals.

John Locke reveals that numerous nations of the Americans are rich in land, but they are poor in all 'the comfort of life'. John Locke supports appropriation and says, "...let him plant in some inland, vacant places of America, we shall find that the possessions he could make himself..."¹⁹⁶ John Locke seems reluctant to restrict private property that he decrees, "...the exceeding of the bounds of his just property not lying in the largeness of his possession, but the perishing of anything uselessly in it."¹⁹⁷

¹⁹³ See Ibn Khaldûn, *Muqaddimah*, trans. Franz Rosenthal (Routledge & Kegan, 1981), p. 847.

¹⁹⁴ Zaid Ahmad, 2005, p.101.

¹⁹⁵ Small, 2001, p.4.

¹⁹⁶ John Locke, 2003, p.115

¹⁹⁷ Ibid. p.120

As mentioned before, Jeremy Waldron in *God, John Locke and Equality* posits that the original position of equality for John Locke is original communism.¹⁹⁸ Alexander and Penalver in *An Introduction to Property Theory* refer to Waldron by saying the state of nature firstly is so-called ‘negative communism’, in which no one has any initial rights to resources and therefore no one owes anyone else any duties. Secondly, he adds, there is an affirmative ‘original communism’; everyone has equal rights to access the world’s natural resources therein.¹⁹⁹

Ibn Khaldûn’s logical and innovative explanations of historiography, sociology, geography and economics are parallel to modern thinking. Considering labor as a commodity, Ibn Khaldûn is regarded as a precursor of Karl Marx.²⁰⁰ He divides the total product, the gains, into used and unused parts and calls the used part ‘sustenance’. This notion is similar to ‘necessary labor’. Ibn Khaldûn divides of total product labor into sustenance and capital accumulation. For various scholars this division is similar to Marxian notion of ‘necessary’ labor. Ibn Khaldûn claims that labor is the substantial part of the value, yet it seems that labor is not the sole factor that determines the value of the product. In terms of the transformation of ûmran, the price of the labor changes as well.

Muqaddimah and *Two Treatises of Government* are the magnificent works of their era. Ibn Khaldûn’s and John Locke’s positions concerning ruling authorities, rulers and private property are extremely similar. The center of their understanding is ‘man’ who is rational enough to decide concerning his benefits. For both, man is a political authority who has a power of logical reasoning. The ruling authorities are prominently limited by laws. Labor, even though discussed in different contexts by Ibn Khaldûn and John Locke, is the sole factor creating value. They both see a clear

¹⁹⁸ Jeremy Waldron, *God, John Locke and Inequality: Christian Foundations in John Locke’s Political Thoughts*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p.154

¹⁹⁹ Gregory S. Alexander, Eduardo M. Penalver, *An Introduction to Property Theory*, (USA:Cambridge University Press, 2012),p. 38

²⁰⁰ See Abdol Soofi,1995.

connection between property rights and justice. Finally, the private property right is the unquestionable and natural possession of men. Concisely, Ibn Khaldûn and John Locke are the magnificent thinkers of all times. They have already exceeded the cultural and political borders of human societies. Their political theories concerning state, society and economy are still quite relevant and noteworthy for modern political investigations.

REFERENCES

Ahmed, A.S. (2005). "Ibn Khaldûn and Antropology: The Failure of Methodology, In the Post 9/11 World", *Contemporary Sociology*, Vol 34, No.6, pp.591-596

Al-Azmeh, A. (2003). *Ibn Khaldûn, an Essay in Reinterpretation*, New York Central European University Press: USA

Alexander, G. & Penalver, E. (2012). *An Introduction To Property Theory*, USA:Cambridge University Press

Anderson, J.W. (1983). Conjuring With Ibn Khaldûn: From An Anthropologic Point Of View, *Journal Of Asian And African Studies* Vol. 18 No. 3-4 pp. 263-273

Appleby, J.O. (1976). John Locke Liberalism and the Natural Law Of Money, *Past and Present* No. 71

Ashcraft, R. (1980). In Revolutionary Politics and John Locke's Two Treatises of Government: Radicalism and Lockean Political Theory, *Political Theory*, Vol.8. No.4

Barthkus, R. & Hassan, M. (2010) Ibn Khaldûn and Adam Smith: Contributions to the Theory of Division of Labor and Modern Economic Thought

Boulakia, J.D. "Ibn Khaldûn: A Fourteenth-Century Economist" *Journal of Political Economy* pp.1105-1118

Dunn, J. (1969). *The Political Thought of John Locke: An Historical Account of the Argument of the Two Treatises of Government*, London: Cambridge University Press

Filmer, R. (Ed.) (1991). *Patriarcha and Other Writings*, J. Sommerville, New York: Cambridge University Press

Fromherz, A.J. (2010). *Ibn Khaldûn, Life and Times*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Garnsey, P. (Ed.) (2007). *Thinking About Property: From Antiquity To The Age Of Revolution*, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Goldie, M. (Ed.) (1997). *Political Essays, Of John Locke*, UK: Cambridge University Press

Khaldûn, I.(Ed.) (2005). *Studies In Ibn Khaldûn*, Massimo, C. Polymetrica: Monza

Khaldûn, I. (2005). *The Muqaddimah: an Introduction to History*, (F. Rosenthal Trans.) New Jersey: Princeton University Press

Ibn Khaldûn, I. (1981). *The Muqaddimah: Introduction to Muqaddimah* , [Http://Asadullahali.Files.Wordpress.Com/2012/10/Ibn_KhaldunAl_Muqaddimah.Pdf](http://Asadullahali.Files.Wordpress.Com/2012/10/Ibn_KhaldunAl_Muqaddimah.Pdf)

Khalid, C. (2008). “Ibn Khaldûn, In Spite Of Himself” *The Journal of North American Studies* Vol. 13, No.3, September, pp. 279-291

Locke, J. (1980). *Second Treatise of Government*, Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company

Locke, J. (Ed) (2005). “The Selected Political Writings of John Locke: Texts, Background Selections, Sources, Interpretations” Paul E. Sigmund, W.W. Norton: New York

Macpherson (1962). *The Political Theory of Possessive Individualism:Hobbes to Locke*. Canada:Oxford University Press

Mahdi, M. (1964). *Ibn Khaldûn's Philosophy of History*. New York: Phoenix

Nozick,R. (1974). *Anarchy, State And Utopia*, New York: Inc., Publishers

Rosenthal, A. (2009). "Un-Locking John Locke: History, Rhetoric, and Modernity" *The Review of Politics* 71 pp. 483–529

Simmons, J. (1992). *The Lockean Theory of Rights*, New Jersey: Princeton University Press

Soofi, A. (1995). Economics of Ibn Khaldûn Revisited, *History of Political Economy*

Toynbee, A.(1962). *A Study of History (Vol. 3): The Growths of Civilizations*, New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 321-328

Tully, J. (1980). *A Discourse on Property: John Locke and His Adversaries*, New York: Cambridge University Press

Vaughn, K. (1978). "John Locke and the Labor Theory of Value" *Journal of Libertarian Studies*: two No. 4, pp. 311-326

Waldron, J. (2002). *God, John Locke and Inequality: Christian Foundations in John Locke's Political Thoughts*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Widerquist, K. (2010). Lockean Theories of Property: Justifications for Unilateral Appropriation, *Public Reason*

APPENDIX A. TURKISH SUMMARY

Mülkiyetin doğası siyasal düşünce tarihi boyunca tartışılan en önemli ve tartışmalı konulardan biridir. Antik Yunan'da Platon, Aristoteles, Orta Çağ'da Aquinas ve Ockham, daha sonrasında ise Grotius ve Pufendorf olmak üzere birçok filozof sahiplik kavramı ve onun doğası üzerine çeşitli görüşler öne sürülmüştür. Bu çalışmanın konusu olan *Mukaddime* eseri İbn Haldun'un özel mülkiyet kavramına da değindiği en önemli ve bilinen eserlerinden biridir. Bu eserde İbn Haldun'un tarih çalışmalarına objektiflik temelli bir çok eleştiri getirmiştir. Toplumların geçirdiği doğal süreçleri incelemiş, dönemi için yeni ve özgün bu husustaki yaklaşımları doğuda ve batıda birçok kültür tarafından dikkat çekmiştir. Ayrıca günümüzde dahi önemli araştırmalara konu olmaya devam etmektedir.

Bu tezin konusu olan özel mülkiyet kavramı İbn Haldun için Kuran-ı Kerim'e dayanan bir adalet meselesidir. Sadece bir adalet meselesi değil somut şekilde toplumların üretkenliğini teşvik edici en önemli unsurdur. Öyle ki, özel mülkiyet İbn Haldun'un tanımladığı en basit yaşam şekli olan bedevi yaşamlarda korunamazken, hadari kent yaşamında siyasal otoritenin kontrolü ve güvencesi altındadır. Özel mülkiyet güvence altında olmalıdır. Çünkü toplumsal medeniyetlerin devamı özel mülkiyetin ve ekonomik etkinliklerin bağımsızlığına ve siyasal otorite tarafından güvence altına alınmasına bağlıdır. Bu yüzden, özel mülkiyet zarar gördüğünde insanın ekonomik etkinlikleri de sekteye uğrar ve bu durum devletler için zorunlu bir çöküş getirir.

Benzer yaklaşımlar olarak ele alınacak John Locke'un *Yönetim Üzerine İki İnceleme* eseri, bu çalışmada özel mülkiyet kavramını incelemek için başvurulacak ikinci temel kaynak olacaktır. John Locke'un siyasi teorisi, İbn Haldun'a benzer olarak, özel mülkiyet hakkını çalışma ve emek faaliyetinin zorunlu bir sonucu olarak görmektedir. John Locke'a göre henüz siyasal topluma geçmeden önce özel

mülkiyet, doğa durumunda, doğa yasası tarafından güvence altına alınmıştır. Ayrıca Tanrı'nın insanlara bahşettiği dünyanın değerlendirilmesi gerekliliği ve insanın hayatta kalması zorunluluğu tezi, John Locke'un mülkiyeti temellendiren temel teolojik argumanlarıdır.

Bu çalışmada ilk olarak İbn Haldun ve özel mülkiyet anlayışı incelenmiştir. 1332'de Tunus'ta doğan İbn Haldun'un hayatı mistik bir gelenekten beslenmiştir. Kutsal kavramı ile bağlantılı olarak ele aldığı belirlenimcilik görüşü bunun en büyük göstergesidir. İbn Haldun yaşadığı dönemde Timur gibi birçok politik figürle karşılaşmış, kimilerine de geniş siyasi tecrübeleri sayesinde danışmanlık yapmıştır. Eseri *Mukaddime*'yi Mısır'da kaldığı dönemde yazmıştır. *Mukaddime* Orta Çağ İslam dünyasının son döneminin önemli bir ürünüdür. İbn Haldun bu eserde, coğrafi şartlarla sosyal hayatın ilişkisini ve cemiyet şekillerini incelemiş, din ve devlet hayatının sınırlarını anlamaya çalışmış, bedevi ve hadari hayat ilişkisini anlatmıştır. Buna ek olarak iktisadi hayatı ayrıntılı şekilde analiz etmiş, ilim ve edebiyat konularını da araştırmıştır. Hatta, İbn Haldun, Sosyoloji'nin, Tarih Felsefesi'nin ve iktisat biliminin kurucusu olarak da kabul edilmektedir.

Ünlü İbn Haldun araştırmacısı Franz Rosental'a göre İbn Haldun'un düşün dünyasında İbn-i Sina'nın rolü büyüktür. Toynbee ise İbn Haldun'un görüşleri üzerinde daha önce yaşayan herhangi bir düşünürün etkisinin olmadığını savunmuştur. İbn Haldun toplumlar, kültürler ve medeniyetler üzerine olan politik görüşlerini teorik ve pratik olarak temellendirmiştir. Çalışma metodu olarak olarak tümdengelimsel düşünce yerine bilimsel araştırma yöntemlerine benzer bir yol izlemiştir.

İbn Haldun'un *Mukaddime* eserindeki *asabiye*, *ümran* ve *mulk* kavramlarını sistemini üzerine kurduğu temel unsurlar olarak görürüz. Bu eserde *ümran* teriminin kullanımı üç temel kavrama denk düşmektedir. Birincisi basitçe toplum, ikincisi medeniyetin ulaştığı en yüksek aşamadır. Yani İbn Haldun, medeni faaliyetlere “umran” adını verdiği gibi, bu umranın araştırılması ve incelenmesini konu edinen ilme de “umran”

adını vermektedir. İbn Haldun’a göre toplumları ve insanları birbirine bağlayan temel bir güç vardır. Bu güç *asabiye* bağıdır. Ona göre *asabiye* bağları genel olarak kan bağına dayalıdır fakat her zaman kan bağı gerektirmez. Bir grup için daha güçlü *asabiye* bağlarına sahip olmak, diğer hanedanlıklar arasında egemen olmanın yolunu açar. Çünkü *asabiye*nin ulaşacağı temel hedef siyasal otoritedir. Güçlü bir *asabiye* daha güçlü, içte ve dışta daha etkili bir siyasi otoriteyi getirecektir. *Asabiye* bağları ile bağlanmış bir grup yine aynı grubun içinden bir lider benimser. İbn Haldun’a göre liderlerin siyasal otorite olmasının tek yolu siyasal kuralları ve kanunları uygulayarak insanları harekete geçirecek gücü kendisinde taşımasıdır. Devlet otoritesinin en güçlü yeri merkezidir. Bu yüzden devletin sınırlarını gereğinden fazla genişletmek çöküşü hazırlayacak en önemli etmenlerdendir. İbn Haldun’a göre bir hanedanlıktaki grup üyelerinin sayısı arttıkça aradaki kan bağının etkisi artık yönetime olan koşulsuz bir inanca dönüşecektir. Bu Akbar Ahmad tarafından *hyper-asabiyah* olarak adlandırılmıştır.

İbn Haldun tarihsel süreçleri doğal ve zorunlu olarak yaşayan toplumlar için iki temel kategori belirlemiştir. *Bedevi* (Bedouin) ve *Hadari* (Sedentary) olarak adlandırılan iki yaşam formu, doğal olarak insan karakteri üzerinde de etkilidir. Bedevi yaşam ilkel yaşam dönemidir. İhtiyaçların ve üretimin temel ve basit düzeyde kaldığı yaşam şeklidir. İbn Haldun’a göre insanlık Bedevi yaşamdan Hadari yaşama doğru evrilmektedir. Hadari yaşamın ilk aşaması, göçebelik ve hayvancılığa dayanan insani toplumsal hayat ve örgütlenmenin en ilkel biçimidir. Hayvancılık alanının ve üretimin çeşitlendiği aşama ikinci aşamadır. Küçük yerleşim birimlerinde sebze ve tahıl tarımının yapıldığı yerleşik hayatın olduğu dönem bu dönemdir. Yerleşik olarak sanayi ve ticaret gibi dallarla uğraşan insanlar medeniyetin ilk aşamasını oluşturmuşlardır. Bedevi hayatta üretim ve üretim için harcanan emek sınırlıdır. Emek ve üretim arttığında ve üretim fazlası olduğunda yeni ihtiyaçlar ortaya çıkar ve Hadari hayata geçiş yapılır. İbn Haldun’a göre insanlar kendi başına varlıklarını sürdürecek kadar güçlü değillerdir. Bu yüzden işbirliği yapmak zorunda kalırlar ve ihtiyaçlarından daha fazlasını ancak bu vesile ile üretmeye başlarlar.

Ayrıca, İbn Haldun'un vurguladığı bir diğer nokta şudur ki, insanların bir bölümü kendi iyiliklerinin bilincindeyken, diğer bir bölümü ise bunun farkında değildir. Bu yüzden grupların içinden insanları bir arada tutan ve birbirlerine zarar vermelerini önleyecek bir siyasi güç tanımlanır. Bu güç *mülktür*. Mülk temsilcileri insanların güvence altına alarak, şehirler inşa etmek için ikna eder ve onları ekonomik faaliyetlerde bulunmaları konusunda teşvik eder. Bu gücü sayesinde Hadari hayatın sürdürülmesi, yaşamsal faaliyetlerin, sanatların ve zanaatların ilerlemesini ve bölgenin geliştirilmesi sağlanmış olur.

İbn Haldun hanedanlıklar için zorunlu ve belirlenmiş dönemler tanımlamıştır. Hanedanlıklara ortalama olarak 120 - 130 yıllık bir oluşma, gelişme, en yüksek noktaya ulaşma ve sonra çözülme süreci biçmiştir. Her hanedanlık genel olarak beş temel aşamadan geçer. Kuruluş aşamasında hükümdar her türlü karşı koymayı bastırır. Hakimiyet altına alınan grup geleneksel alışkanlıklarını yitirmemiş olan mütevazı ve kanaatkar insanlardan oluşur. Siyasi otorite karar alırken vatandaşları ile bir arada hareket eder. Otorite devresinde lider, kendi grubu üzerinde otoritesini tesis eder, nimetlerini kendisi için istemeye başlar. Grupta rakip olacak ileri gelenler yönetimden uzaklaştırılır. Rahatlık devresinde servet genişletilir, şan ve şöhret ön plana geçer. Siyasi liderin hem kendi grubunu hem de diğer grupları tam egemenlik altına aldığı dönemdir. Güçlü ordu, iyi çalışan sivil bürokrasi ve düzenli toplanan vergiler vardır. Taklit devresinde lider atalarının bıraktıklarını mirası ve onların yolunu takip etmek olduğuna inanır. Savurganlık devresinde lider mirası israf etmeye ve savurganlık yapmaya başlar. Hanedanlık yönetimini ehil olmayan insanlarla paylaşır. Bu aşamada devletin çözülme süreci başlar, giderler karşılanamaz ve yıkılır. İbn Haldun'a göre, devletin yıkılmasının en temel ve etken sebepleri lider, ekonomi ve ahlak sorunudur.

Mukaddime bu çalışmada bir politik ekonomi rehberi ve İbn Haldun ise bir ekonomi analisti olarak ele alınmıştır. *Mukaddime* başta tarih ve sosyoloji kitabı olarak görünse de aslında üretim, değer ve fiyatlar üzerine oluşturulmuş bir teoridir. İbn

Haldun'a göre yaşam koşulları, insan karakteri ve *asabiye* üretimi, değeri ve fiyatları belirler. İnsanın ihtiyaçlarını karşıladığı ilk sermayesi kendi emeğidir. Bedevi hayattan farklı olarak Hadari hayatta devlet mülkiyetin koruyucusu durumundadır. Boulıka'ya göre İbn Haldun üretimde uzmanlaşmayı benimsemiş ve bu uzmanlaşmanın üretimi artırdığını, üretim fazlası ve kâr oluşturduğunu iddia etmiştir. Diğer yandan, İbn Haldun'a göre bir toplumdaki insan sayısının artması üretimi de arttırır, o bölgenin cazibesini arttırır ve o bölgeyi geliştirir. Gözlemleri ile göstermektedir ki gelişmiş kentlerde dilenciler bile küçük kentlerden daha iyi durumdadır.

İbn Haldun'un emek ve ticaret üzerine araştırma ve analizleri dikkate değerdir. Ona göre Bedevi aşamada basit ihtiyaçların giderilmesi yeterliyken, hadarete geçiş ve üretimin artması ile yeni ihtiyaçlar ve paraya olan ihtiyacı da artar. Devletin tek para kaynağı vergilerdir ve bu kaynağın devamı için canlı bir ekonomik hayat gereklidir. İbn Haldun tüccarların faaliyetleri ve karakterleri üzerine de ayrıntılı şekilde analizler yapmıştır. Tüccarlar, diğer insanlardan farklı olarak pazardaki dalgalanmaları takip ederler ve ucuza alıp pahalıya satarlar. İbn Haldun ekonomi analizi yaparken emeğin değere ve fiyatlara katkısı üzerinde de durmuştur. Emek, İbn Haldun'un bakış açısı ile 'çalışma', önemli ölçüde değer yaratan temel unsurdur. Fakat İbn Haldun'a göre bir malın fiyatı sadece emek ile belirlenmez. Diğer bir deyişle, fiyatlar mal üretilirken harcanan emekten çok, temel olarak tüketim ve arza dayalı olarak değişmektedir. Örneğin, Bedevi toplumlarda zorunlu ihtiyaçların ücretleri daha fazla iken, Hadari medeniyetlerde lüks üretim ve sanatlara harcanan para daha yüksektir. Bu toplumlarda tüketicilerin talebi malların fiyatının yükselmesine neden olur. Ayrıca lüks üretim üzerine eğilerek, hayatlarını kazanan sanatçılar ve zanaatçılar da kendi emeklerine yüksek pahalar biçerler.

İbn Haldun'a göre ekonominin canlılığı devletin müdahalelerinin sınırlılığına bağlıdır. Devletin gelişimi ve çöküşü ile ekonominin gelişimi ve lüksün artışının da ulaşacağı bir üst nokta vardır. Bu üst noktadan sonra gerileme kaçınılmazdır. Hadari ümran'da insan karakterinin daha fazla tüketmeye olan hırsları toplumun gelirlerinde

yetersizlik yaratmaya başlar. Bu rahatlama ve aşırı lüks tüketim yöneticilerin sınırlamaları ile de önlenemezken gelirler de giderleri karşılayamaz duruma gelir. Devlet bu yüzden ek vergiler koyma yoluna gider ve aşırı vergiler üretim isteğini düşürür, ekonomik faaliyetleri sekteye uğratır. Devlet daha sonra ekonomik faaliyetlerin öznesi olmayı seçecektir. Bir tüccar gibi ucuza aldığı mallara tüketiciye pahalıya satmaya başlar. Sonuç olarak gerçek üretici üretimden, tüccar ticaretten vazgeçer. Bu girişimle de sonuca ulaşamayan siyasi otorite varlıklı kişilerin ve diğerlerinin malına el koyar. Yönetilenler ve yönetim arasındaki uyuşmazlık yönetilenlerin dış güçlerle anlaşma yapmasına, ekonomik hayatın durmasına ve devletin ortadan kalkmasına neden olur. İbn Haldun devletin çözülme sürecini ahlaki yozlaşmaya bağlamıştır. Devletin adaletsizliği, halkta bireyselleşme, din ve ahlak duygularının artması, meşru olmayan ilişkilerin yaygınlaşması sırasıyla tecrübe edilir.

John Locke 1632 yılında İngiltere’de doğmuştur. Siyaset felsefesi konusundaki çalışmaları ile dikkat çekmektedir. Yönetimin kökeni üzerine araştırmalarda bulunmuş, döneminin monarşik idealleri ile savaşımıştır. *Yönetim Üzerine İki İnceleme* filozofun en ünlü eseridir. Bu kitabında İngiliz düşünür Robert Filmer'ın *Patriarcha* eserini eleştirmiş ve "rıza" kavramı üzerinde durmuştur. Robert Filmer bütün yasal hükümetlerin monarşik olduğunu iddia etmektedir. Bundan önce böyledir ve bundan sonra da böyle olmalıdır. John Locke, yöneticilerin yönetenler üzerindeki gücünü, babanın çocukları üzerindeki gücünden, efendinin hizmetçisi üzerindeki gücünden, kocanın karısı üzerindeki gücünden ayırır. Ona göre mutlak otoriteyi gerektiren mutlak güç, mutlak monarşinin nedenidir. John Locke ise bir yönetime tabi olmanın tek yolunu "rıza ya da anlaşmaya dayalı itaat" olarak tanımlamıştır. Doğal itaat anlayışını çürütmeye çalışarak, tarihsel ve mantıksal olarak politik gücün amacının "toplumsal iyi" olduğunu savunmuştur.

Yönetimi kökeninden çıkarmak için John Locke doğa durumunu analiz etmekle başlar. Doğa durumu mutlak eşitlik ve bağımsızlık durumudur. Bu eşitlik Tanrı'nın bütün insanların yaratıcısı olduğu tezi ile temellendirilmiştir. Ona göre doğa

durumunun ilk kuralı hiç kimsenin bir diğeri incitmemesi gereğidir. Doğa durumu bütün yaşayanları düzenleyen doğal hukuku içinde barındırır. Hobbes'un inandığı gibi bir çatışma ve savaş durumu değildir. Buna rağmen John Locke insanlığın yetersiz bir doğası olduğunu düşünür. Bu doğanın getirdiği karmaşa ve düzensizlikleri gidermenin tek yolu bir yönetim tayin etmektir. Yönetilenler mülkiyetlerini güvence altına almak için doğa durumunu terk edip bir sivil yönetimin idaresi altına girerler.

Doğa yasasının temel kuralı, insanın kendi varlığının mülkiyetine sahip olmasıdır. Bu yasa kendi emeğinin de sahibi olma durumunu birlikte getirir. Kişinin herhangi bir çabası, bir ürün üzerine harcadığı zamanı mülkiyet edinmek için yeterlidir. Çünkü emek doğa durumunda olana doğada olmayan herhangi bir şey kazandırmaktadır. Bu yüzden tüm insanların rızasını almadan da mülkiyet edinilebilir. John Locke'a göre emek değer yaratan en önemli unsurdur. Örneğin işlenmemiş bir toprak işlenmiş bir topraktan daha az değerlidir. John Locke paranın icat edilmesini övmüştür. Çünkü çürümeye yüz tutan ürünleri ve dolayısı ile emeği biriktirebilmenin tek yolu para kullanımınıdır. Ayrıca John Locke'dan daha önce İbn Haldun altın ve gümüşü parasal standartlar olarak belirlemiştir. Bu değerli madenler diğer ürünlerden farklı olarak, fiyat dalgalanmalarından etkilenmeyen temel parasal standartlar olarak görülmektedir.

Nozick *Anarşi, Devlet ve Ütopya* eserinde John Locke'un emek değer bakış açısını eleştirmiştir. Ona göre, doğaya eklenen her şey, her zaman onu daha değerli hale getirmeyebilir. Örneğin denize döktüğümüz domates suyu onu daha kullanışlı hale getirmez ve bu anlamda mülkiyeti temellendirecek bir hareket değildir. Ayrıca bir ürünün yalnızca bir kısmını geliştirirken harcadığımız emeğin ürünün tamamı üzerinde mülkiyet hakkı yaratmasını eleştirmiştir. Buna ek olarak John Locke Simmons, Dunn, Tully, Macpherson ve Waldron tarafından da haklar ve eşitsizlikler konularında eleştirilmiştir.

Macpherson Yönetim Üzerine İki İnceleme'yi sertçe eleştirmiş ve bu çalışmanın aslında sermaye birikimini övdüğünü, gelir eşitsizliklerini besleyen argümanlar içerdiğini ve sınıf temelli kapitalizmin önünü açtığını savunmuştur. John Locke'a göre gerçek vatandaşlar oy veren mülkiyet sahipleridir.

Tully mülkiyet hakları konusunda John Locke ve karşıtları hakkında kapsamlı bir analiz çalışması yapmıştır. Dunn'a benzer olarak Tully emeği pozitif ahlaki bir ödev olarak algılamaktadır. Bu faaliyet sadece yapma ya da etmeden daha farklı ve geniş bir anlam taşımaktadır. Tully'ye göre John Locke mülkiyet teorisi Tanrı, insan ve yaratma ilişkisi içerisinde ele alınmalıdır. İnsan, Tanrı'nın dünyadaki yansıması olarak akıllıdır ve egemen olabilecek düzeydedir.

John Locke teorisine getirilmiş en önemli eleştirilerden biri de mülkiyet edinirken ortaya çıkacak eşitsizlik durumudur. Bu durumun önüne geçmek için John Locke çeşitli şartlar ortaya koymuştur. Bunlardan en önemlisi doğa durumundan çıkarıp mülk edilecek ürün kadar iyi ve o kadar fazla ürünü diğerlerine de bırakmaktır. Waldron'a göre mülkiyet edinmek yalnızca hayatta kalmakla ilgili değil, aynı zamanda ahlaki bir sorumluluktur. Her nasıl ki Tanrı insanları yarattığı için onların sahibidir, emek de Tanrı'nın aktivitesine benzer olarak ürettiklerinin sahibi olmalıdır. Waldron, Tully ve Macpherson'un John Locke eleştirilerine karşı çıkmıştır. Tully ve Macpherson emeğin mülkiyet hakkı getirmesi ile ilgili durumunu bir gereklilik olarak yorumlamışlardır. Waldron'un okumasına göre John Locke'un bu cümlesi normatif değildir. Ayrıca Waldron'a göre John Locke toplum içindeki ekonomik eşitsizliklerinin yardımseverlikle çözülebileceğine inanmaktadır fakat radikal bir yardımseverliği savunmamaktadır

Richard Ashcraft Yönetim Üzerine İki İnceleme'yi devrimci bir teori olarak yorumlamaktadır. Bu kitap 1689 İngiliz Devrimi ve liberalizmin temel prensiplerinin siyasi bir savunmasıdır. John Locke Shaftesbury'nin politik amaçlarının temsilcisidir. Bu yüzden özgürlük, mülkiyet ve din kavramlarına bakışı çevresindeki siyasi faaliyetlerin rasyonelleştirilmesi ile ilgilidir.

Simmons'un analizleri mülkiyet haklarının devredilebilir olup olmaması ile ilgilidir. Simmon'a göre haklar Tully'nin anladığı şekilde devredilmez değildir. John Locke köleliğin önüne geçmek istemiştir fakat rızaya dayalı olarak hak devirleri mümkündür. Çünkü dğer ihtimali kabul etmek insanların çocuklarına miras bırakma hakkını da engeller.

İbn Haldun ve John Locke yöneticilerin keyfi uygulamalarını eleştirmişlerdir. Yönetici durumunda olanlar, İbn Haldun için kendi durumunun daha fazla hakimi iken yönetilenler daha az hakimdirler. John Locke için de durum benzerdir. Bazı insanlar daha rasyonel ve endüstriyelken, bazıları daha az rasyonel ve endüstriyeldir. Ayrıca ikisine göre de, özellikle ekonomik faaliyetler konusunda, devlet gereğinden fazla müdahaleci olmamalı, yüksek vergiler toplayarak toplumun yapıtaşı olan vatandaşlara gereğinden fazla baskı yapmamalıdır.

İbn Haldun ve John Locke çalışmalarını temellendirmek için dinsel emirlerden faydalanmışlardır. İbn Haldun'un *Mukaddime*'nin her bölümünün sonunda Kuran'ı Kerim'den referanslar verdiği görülür. John Locke ise özellikle doğa durumunu ve doğal hukuk teorisini açıklarken Tanrı buyruklarına işaret etmiştir. İkisi için de ortak bir varsayım Tanrı'nın dünyayı yaratmış olduğu ve insanlara bahsettiği gerçeğidir. İkisi için de insan için hayatta kalma durumu doğal bir zorunluluk değil ilahi bir emirdir. İnsanın doğaya üstünlük kurması ona bahşedilen rasyonel yeteneği sayesinde. Bu üstünlüğün kurulmasını sağlayan Tanrısal bir ayrıcalıktır. Bu durumu anlatırken *fıkr* kavramını kullanmayı tercih etmiştir. *Fıkr* insanları bir araya getiren ve toplulukların kurulmasını sağlayan temel güçtür. Bu ayrıcalık sayesinde İbn Haldun'a göre insan Tanrı buyruklarını anlayabilir. Locke'a göre ise doğal hukuk kuralları da insanın bu kabiliyeti sayesinde erişebilir hale gelir.

İbn Haldun ve John Locke çalışmalarını oluştururken dönemlerinin yerleşik varsayımlarını eleştirmiş ve geleceğe ışık tutan yeni kavramlar oluşturmuşlardır. İkisi de insan kavramını temel alırken Antik Yunan'ın benimsediği politik bir varoluş

tanımlamışlardır. İbn Haldun'a ve John Locke'a göre insan politik bir otoritedir. Kendisine ve çevresine dair iyiliklerin ve faydaların farkındadır. İbn Haldun'a göre makamlar özel mülkiyetin korunması açısından önemlidir. Bu yüzden kendini beğenmek, üst makamları övmek zararlıdır ve fakirlik getirir.

Ibn Haldun ve John Locke toplumları bir arada tutan iki temel kavram kullanmışlardır. İbn Haldun için bu kavram *asabiye* iken John Locke için *rıza*'dır. John Locke'a göre siyasal toplumu oluşturan temel unsur kendi çıkarlarının farkında olan insanların *rıza*'sından başkası değildir. İbn Haldun ve John Locke'a göre devlet için bozulma aşaması lükse ve israfa dayalıdır. Yöneticilerinin yönetilenlerden kopması ve keyfi kararlar alması devletleri çöküşe götürecektir.

Ibn Haldun medeniyetlerin karakteristiğini onları yöneten kurallarla bağlantılı olarak ele almıştır. Temel olarak o, bu kuralları insanlığın pratik tarihinden ve yaşanan sosyopolitik olaylardan çıkarımlamıştır. John Locke ise doğa durumunda bütün insanlığı bağlayan bir doğa yasası tanımlamış, siyasi toplumların da bu yasa ışığında yapılacak yasalarla yönetilmesi gerektiğine inanmıştır. İbn Haldun da John Locke da çalışmalarını çoğunlukla politik iç karışıklıkların etkisinde ve önemli siyasi figürlerin desteğiyle yapmışlardır.

APPENDIX B. TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU

ENSTİTÜ

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü	<input type="checkbox"/>
Enformatik Enstitüsü	<input type="checkbox"/>
Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü	<input type="checkbox"/>

YAZARIN

Soyadı : ÇAL
Adı : CANAN
Bölümü : FELSEFE

TEZİN ADI: IBN KHALDÛN AND JOHN LOCKE: A POLITICAL
INTERPRETATION OF SOCIETY – A ROAD TO
PRIVATE PROPERTY

TEZİN TÜRÜ : Yüksek Lisans ☒ Doktora ☐

1. Tezimin tamamından kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir. ☒
2. Tezimin içindekiler sayfası, özet, indeks sayfalarından ve/veya bir bölümünden kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir. ☐
3. Tezimden bir bir (1) yıl süreyle fotokopi alınamaz. ☐

TEZİN KÜTÜPHANEYE TESLİM TARİHİ:

