

## **POLITICAL THOUGHTS OF IBN KHALDUN AND MACHIAVELLI: A COMPARATIVE STUDY IN A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE**

Humera Naz<sup>\*</sup>

### **Abstract**

The current study is an attempt to analyze the notions of of Ibn Khaldun and Machiavelli regarding the politics as propounded in their works entitled the *Prolegomena* of the *Kitab al-Ibar* and *The Prince* respectively. The article, as a description and an interpretation, tries to explore the milieu, meaning and significance of two thinkers, their ideas, and political cultures in which they existed. This article encompasses a succinct survey of the common ideas regarding the social philosophy with special reference to the state and sovereignty. On the other hand, an effort has also been made to compare both of the thinkers in the points of differences in their ideas as well. Although, Islam is one of the most powerful means of explaining human life and giving meaning to our activity and motivates individuals and groups. But rightly or wrongly, it is perceived as the antagonist of the Western values. Yet, an attempt has been made to compare the Muslim political thoughts with the works of the Western thinkers. Not least, we can see both Western and Muslim political thoughts in a new light by setting the philosophy of each side by side. This was the reason for writing this article. It will, I hope, prove reason for reading it.

**Key words:** Ibn Khaldun, Machiavelli, philosophical views, dawla, mulk

---

<sup>\*</sup> Humera Naz, Lecture, Department of General History, University of Karachi

In the modern age of the relapse and intellectual desolation, Muslim political thoughts are opening new vistas and avenues of intellect and pristine glory and progress. Regardless of the lapse of centuries, the intellectual legacy of Ibn Khaldun is unique among the works of Muslim thoughts and philosophy, still maintains its value, vigor and modernity and occupies a high place among the philosophies of political thoughts. Ibn Khaldun, whom the West discovered, studied and evaluated in the nineteenth century, not fully appreciated in the East.

Ibn Khaldun was the foremost among the Muslim philosophical thinkers and historians whose comprehension of history, its value and criticism have been greatly admired. My object of this article is to present in a clear, concise manner, the legacy of Ibn Khaldun which is the study of a distinguished personality in the history of Muslim thoughts, a great original spirit who anticipated the west in laying down the principles of history and sociology and is still the object of admiration and appreciation by Western research. It is not, therefore, out of place to compare some aspects of Ibn Khaldun's thoughts with the strikingly similar views of Machiavelli, although there is certainly no connection between the two thinkers, direct or indirect. Many of the causes of this similarity lay in the time and political and social environment in which both of them lived.

### **Ibn Khaldun: His Views on Politics and State**

Abu Zayd Abd al-Rahman bin Muhammad bin Khaldun Al-Hadrami commonly known as Ibn Khaldun (1332-1406 CE), a great Muslim historiographer and historian who is considered as one of the fathers of modern historiography, sociology and economics was born in Tunis, in times of great political turmoil. This great thinker served variously as political advisor, prime minister, and judge in several North African states and Muslim Spain. Ibn Khaldun's career was dependent on the good will of his superiors, and he changed job frequently when political winds shifted. He led an extremely eventful life, traveling to, among other places, Makkah, Damascus, Palestine, and Seville, and occasionally finding enough leisure time to teach, study and write. In later life he settled in Cairo, where he taught at Al-Azhar and was appointed Grand Malaki Judge. The great passion of his later years was writing a 'Universal history' whereby he sought to explain the chaotic politics of his day by discovering general causes for the rise and decline of states. (Ali: 1988)

The intellectual legacies of Ibn Khaldun are unique among the work of Muslim political thought and, notwithstanding the lapse of centuries, still maintain its value, vigor and modernity. His ideas have reflected their importance on the history of universal thought as much as within the Islamic realm. His thoughts are all self-created with genuine and innovative ideas. (Toynbee: 1995) It is due to the fact that although he lived during the 14<sup>th</sup> century his thoughts still manage to shed light among events of current times. Erwin I. J. Rosenthal (1988) is of the opinion that "Importance of Ibn Khaldun was not recognized in his own time, and until the seventeenth century did Muslim writers take any notice of him, while European scholars discovered him only in the last century."

It will be quite interesting to note that the philosophical views of Ibn Khaldun are available to us not through any regular and independent work on philosophy but in an introductory volume on the 'methods of history' called *Muqaddima* i.e. *The Prolegomena*, which he wrote before he launched upon his voluminous history of the world entitled the *Kitab al Ibar*. (See Ibn Khaldun: 1969) In the *Prolegomena*, he writes, "I give in this book all I could learn of this Berber country, either directly or indirectly as my object is to write only the history of North Africa, the condition of its generations and nations, as well as its kingdoms, for I am not aware of the conditions of the East and its nations and the current historians are not sufficient to help me in realizing my subject in a proper way." (Ref. Toynbee: 1965)

Ibn Khaldun's introduction, in English translation of the *Muqaddima*, sets forth a theory of history and society together with a method, his 'Science of Culture'. Being the founder of the 'Science of Sociology', Ibn Khaldun had a unique distinction of treating history as a science and supporting his facts with reasoning. Before him, history was mere chronicle of events, recorded in a haphazard manner without caring to distinguish between the real and the unreal. Toynbee regards him as the most illuminating interpreter of the morphology of history that has appeared anywhere in the world so far. (Ibn Khaldun: 1969)

He not only attempted to consider the problems of history, but also developed a 'science of history' or a 'science of culture'. (Mehdi: 1957) The object of the following study is to examine the philosophic foundation and principles of Ibn Khaldun's new science of culture as the study of the various aspects of human societies as well as to explain the precise nature of these principles and their applications in the field of history. He also examines the works of major Muslim historians, shows the necessity of the new science of culture and distinguishes it from other practical sciences.

Ibn Khaldun was greatly revered as a sage of the age and his contemporaries acknowledge him for his steadfastness and political acumen for combating political abuses and ills in his age. His importance consists in a number of novel insights of permanent value and significance. He discusses various Islamic political institutions in the light of the history of the early Islamic state. The state (*dawla*) in the sense of political success was the focus of Ibn Khaldun's empirical historical interest.

Mohsin Mehdi (1957), a renowned political scientist describes state as, "A civilized state comes into being through the establishment or conquest of cities by a primitive people welded together by solidarity and religion and aiming at the satisfaction of natural desires, the actualization of their potentialities, and the completion of the life began in primitive culture. As is the case with other aspects of civilized culture, once a civilized state comes into being, it follows the natural and necessary law of growth, maturity and decline. If not retarded by the lack of necessary initial force or some other accident hindrance from outside, it passes through five distinct stages each of which has its own essential attributes."

Likewise, the concept of the state is also clearly present in the work of Ibn Khaldun. He goes on saying that "there is the secular or semi secular concept forms the basis of the state which is not a prophetic mission but '*mulk*' or 'Dominion' pure and simple,

although even here religious precepts may play an important part.” (Ibn Khaldun: 1969) His notion of the dynamic of new states and political movements, which he calls *Asabiya* or social solidarity, arises in simple societies where economies of necessity produce an ethos community. (Sherwani: 1942) Here the unity of purpose or group mind must be the sense of unity and resolve to work together for the definite purpose which goes a long way toward making strong and free nations. This phenomenon explains the successful foundation of heterogeneous nations.

Ibn Khaldun presents theories regarding the importance and necessity of Urban life for the emergence of state, ‘*Asabiya*’ as the principal driving force of political action, realization of the casual interdependence of the several factors of social life in the power-state: economic, military, cultural and religious, the parallel existence of an ‘Islamic state’ from the ‘Power state’, fundamental recognition of the vital part which religion should play in the life of the state and incumbent casual law for the state which determines its development. (Sherwani: 1942) He upholds considered the ‘*Sharia* state’ as definitely superior to the ‘Power state’.

### ***Asabiya*; a binding force for the state**

Ibn Khaldun maintains that the state (*dawla*) has its foundation on this great moral principle, the sense of oneness or Group Mind known as ‘*Asabiya*’. The state as such is the natural result of human life which requires association (*ijtima*) and organization. (Rozenthal: 1988) Man is a citizen by nature. Natural help is necessarily required for his basic needs and man must unite with many of his kind to secure his protection and defense. This association is necessary for mankind, otherwise their existence and God’s will to make the world habitable with them would not be perfect. (Ibn Khaldun: 1969)

There is no doubt that the mission of Divine Messenger or Prophet has potentiality of a tremendous binding power and (if the mission is successful) it may lead to the creation of a firm *Asabiya* and finally of the state. Ibn Khaldun is strong of opinion that religion is the only one of the binding forces which helps in the formation of a state. (Ibn Khaldun: 1969) He was able, by noting the difference in the effects of two Arab invasions of North-West Africa, to arrive at illuminating general conclusions about the relations between politics and religion. (Toynbee: 1965)

As the society grows, subgroups appear, loyalties become divided, and subgroup with the strongest solidarity (*Asabiya*) becomes dominant. Chieftainship turns into kingship. The king consolidates his power through force. National solidarity disappears and decline begins. (Ibn Khaldun, p. 293) Decline leads ultimately to the disintegration of the state and civilization if not checked by the appearance of a new group is unlikely to rise within the state. Rather, a less advanced people with rising solidarity typically take over the state and change its manner of life. Eventually they also will generate the same process which led to the decline of the state they conquered. (Toynbee: 1965)

Though *Asabiya* is indispensable for empire building, is not sufficient by itself. Royal authority can be obtained only by making use of some religious coloring, such as prophecy, or sainthood, or some great religious event in general. Powerful and authoritative dynasties originated from religion based either on prophecy or on truthful

propaganda. (Toynbee: 1965) Ibn Khaldun perception of the inadequacy of secular sociological explanation of history of Muslim empires led him to include God among the dramatis personae of history which gives history a new dimension.

In this spirit Ibn Khaldun examines the criticism of '*Asabiya*' that it consists of descent and pride of descent. He finds that '*Asabiya*' properly applied and understood is desirable, provided it is directed towards truth of the cause of Allah. He gives religion if not the first at least of very important place in the existing state. He may have suggested a reason: the role which religious teaching plays in '*Asabiya*', the driving force behind tribalism. (Black: 2004) The state is fulfilled 'form' of '*Asabiya*' and Ibn Khaldun emphasizes the compelling force within a group with '*Asabiya*' to become *dawla* (state).

Ibn Khaldun anticipated critical themes in modern political thought. He turned from considering how things ought to be to studying states and societies as they "really are" a full century and a half before Machiavelli. (Black: 2004) His empiricism is manifest in his analysis of the Muslim empires of his own day.

### **Niccolo Machiavelli: His concept of State**

Niccolo Machiavelli the great political thinker and statesman, was born at Florence in 1469 and died in 1527. He worked for some time as foreign secretary to the Government of Florence, and was charged with many political missions in Italy, France and Germany. When the Medici resumed their rule in Florence in 1512, he was arrested, being accused of conspiracy, and suffered torture. He was then released through the intervention of Pope Leo X. He abandoned political life and wrote many work, among which his famous the '*Prince*', Florentine History, Studies about Titus Livens, and many political treaties and dramas are famous. (Villari: 1878)

More than a century after the death of Ibn Khaldun, Machiavelli wrote a book which occupies in Western thought the same high place as the '*Prolegomena*' of Ibn Khaldun occupies in Muslim thought. This is the '*Prince*', a wonderful piece of political and social study, characterized by much vigor and extreme originality.

Machiavelli has also been credited with formulating for the first time the "modern concept of the state", understood in the sense of an impersonal form of rule possessing a monopoly of coercive authority within a set territorial boundary. (Machiavelli: 1908) Certainly, the term '*lo stato*' (state) appears widely in Machiavelli's writing, specially in the '*Prince*', in connection with the acquisition and application of power in a coercive sense.

Machiavelli expounded the doctrine of the reason of state according which the good of the state itself takes precedence overall other consideration, whether morality or the good of citizens... as evidence that he was regarded as a 'theorist of the state' by his near contemporaries. (Viroli: 1992) Machiavelli's name and doctrines were widely invoked to justify the priority of the interests of the state in the age of absolutism.

### **The Political Ideas of Ibn Khaldun and Machiavelli: A Comparison**

Although, there is certainly no connection between the two thinkers, direct or indirect, it is not out of place to compare some aspects of Ibn Khaldun's thought with the strikingly similar views of Machiavelli. If there are not many points of material similarity between the two works, there are, on the other hand, many points of moral similarity. There is particularly a strong resemblance between the two spirits as regards the circumstances and environment where they were formed, their understanding of history and social phenomena and lastly their power of exposition and supplying the evidence of historical events. (Enan: 1969)

As both of the thinkers living in an age of transition, propounded complete integrated revolutionary ideas. But, though prematurely, broke new ground, not least in insight into the working of power politics. (Rosenthal: 1988) Some of the points of Ibn Khaldun's work enumerated constitute a signal contribution to political thought in general, far transcending medieval Islam. The political and the social circumstances, the time in which both of the great thinkers lived were a great cause of strange resemblance in their political ideas. The Italian principalities and republics, under whose aegis Machiavelli lived, offer in Italy the same political aspects and organizations as offered by the North African Kingdom in the days of Ibn Khaldun, (Toynbee: 1965) as regards their feuds and rivalries, their ambition to conquer one another, and the successive passing of their sovereignty and hands of different chieftains and usurpers. Machiavelli, in Florence and on other different political missions became able to study closely many of the important political events and upheaval took place at the time. Both observed and make from the events a material for study and reflection on the state and the ruler.

Ibn Khaldun is, however, richer in material, and wider in out look, than Machiavelli. He considers society in general and all the present phenomena as the subject of his study, tries to understand it and analyses them retrospectively. Finally he infers some general social laws. Rather, Machiavelli studies on the other hand, the state only or certain categories of states, qualities of a ruler, and methods of government. This limited study forms only little part of the much more comprehensive study of Ibn Khaldun. M. A. Enan is of the opinion that Ibn Khaldun studies the characteristics of the states from the social point of view. Machiavelli, on the other hand surpasses Ibn Khaldun in the fluency of his logic, the precision of exposition and conclusion, and the beauty of his style. (Enan: 1969) However, the points of similarity between the ideas of the two world greatest philosophers are given below.

#### **Ibn Khaldun's *Asabiya* and Machiavelli's *Virtu***

The third chapter of book I of the "Prolegomena" where Ibn Khaldun speaks about the general conditions of states, monarchy and monarchical functions (Ibn Khaldun: 1967) and even in this limited range, Ibn Khaldun surpasses Machiavelli greatly and discovers the theory of '*Asabiya*'. The state is a fulfill form of *Asabiya* and in the sense of political success was the focus of Ibn Khaldun's empirical historical interest. (Black: 2004) He did not concern of the state as an order separable from the society in which it arose.

According to Ibn Khaldun '*Asabiya*' is a term which is fabricated to express the corporate will of group. It enables that group, and specially its leader to realize their cohesive power in order to found and maintain the state. Machiavelli had not comparable term for it at first sight. But a consideration of his concept of '*Virtu*' in his book *The Art of War* makes a suitable comparison of it. (Rosenthal: 1988) '*Virtu*' is an Italian word would normally be translated into English as 'Virtue', and would ordinarily convey the conventional connotation of personal courage, skill and determination of an individual.

In particular, Machiavelli employs the concept of 'virtue' to refer the cohesive force in all citizens of the state, particularly in the ruler, and expresses the determining factor of political action. Contrary to the collective nature of the *Asabiya*, (Rosenthal: 1988) however, virtue works as a driving force which spiritually exists in an individual. Yet its assimilation with the virtue of other, it serves the same purpose as *Asabiya* within the confinements of the state and effectively influences on politics. Fredrick Meinecke, a German scholar defines this term 'Virtue' as "heroism and capacity for great historical achievement and the founding of flourishing and powerful state." (Meinecke: 1923)

### **Concept of 'State' and 'Sovereignty'**

Machiavelli's methods and notions are certainly influenced by the environment and circumstances of the past, specially the events of his time which he observed and analyzed, and from which he concludes general laws, in the same manner as Ibn Khaldun did. Machiavelli studied the subject which has already been treated by the Muslim thinkers long before Ibn Khaldun. This subject of 'monarchical politics' had already been developed since the third century of the Hijira under the descriptive of the science of politics in a very limited sense, such as the study of the qualifications of ruler as well as his disqualifications or defects. They also developed the meaning of politics, legal and real position of the ruler, and the monarchical functions. (See Al-Mawardi: 1931)

Ibn Khaldun treats the same subject in his study about the general conditions of the state and monarchy, spirit of sovereignty and its kinds, definition of Caliphate and Imamate, along with the different laws and theories related to them and finally, about the monarchical functions. (Ibn Khaldun: 1967) Particularly, he deduced such inferences and reflections which his predecessors could never achieve.

On the other hand Machiavelli also works with a realistic approach, when he explains the qualities of a ruler rather his ideal qualities. Machiavelli describes his ideal Prince as he is in fact. He draws his conclusions from any success achieved or any failure suffered by the prince. The severity, cruelty and wickedness which characterize his political theories, and make it a striking example of treacherous policy, without conscience, deprived of all impartiality and abstention, and disregarding all human and moral considerations.

The spirit of Machiavellism can be understood in conceiving the state and the 'Prince'. Machiavellism based on realistic grounds which however may be rude or monstrous; occupy the first place in the foundation of the state and the policy of prince. Hypocrisy,

avarice, meanness, cruelty, terror, treachery, breaking promises, disregarding fidelity, friendship, honesty and religion, and crushing every moral and human ideal – all these are not condemned by Machiavelli, and are not considering as vices. (Machiavelli: 2009) Thus for him, the ideal prince and the ideal statesman are tyrants, who resort to the most ruthless and monstrous means in maintaining their power. (Enan, p. 171)

Yet, as Harvey Mansfield has shown a careful reading of Machiavelli's use of *10 stato* (state) in *The Prince* and elsewhere does not support this interpretation. Machiavelli's 'state' remains a personal patrimony, a possession more in time with the medieval conception of dominium as the foundation of rule. (Mansfield: 1996) Dominium is a Latin term that may be translated with equal force as 'private property' and as 'political dominion'. Thus, the 'state' is literally owned by whichever prince happens to have control of it. Moreover, the character of governance is determined by the personal qualities and traits by the ruler hence, Machiavelli's emphasis on virtue as indispensable for the prince's success. These aspects of the development of *10 stato* in the 'Prince' mitigate against the 'modernity' of his idea. Machiavelli is at best a transitional figure in the process by which the language of the state emerged in early modern Europe. (Mansfield: 1996)

Ibn Khaldun also devotes many chapters to the subject of state and sovereignty and studied it from wider and more far-reaching perspective, and greatly surpassed Machiavelli in studying the social perspective. The two thinkers, however, agree on many points. Such as the importance of history in order to understand the condition of nations, the effects of tyranny and arbitrary policy on the minds of people, the qualities of the ruler, the defense of the state and devotion of soldiery, the competition of a ruler with his subjects in the field of commerce and gain, his covetousness for the money of his subjects and the effect thereof inciting public anger, the creeping of anarchy into the state and the assault of soldiery on people's property and lastly, his remarks about the secretaries of the ruler (the Sultan). (Ibn Khaldun: 1967)

Machiavelli appreciates the role of power and the will to power in order to establish, develop and consolidate the state in the same manner as Ibn Khaldun. In the third chapter of his 'Prolegomena' entitled 'The goal at which the 'Asabiya' aims is dominion (*mulk*)' Ibn Khaldun, strongly raises the concept that the state only exists by the will of power of the ruler or the groups which must be able to rely on a powerful 'Asabiya'. (Ibn Khaldun: 1967)

Machiavelli also discusses all the points either in his the 'Prince', or in his work on the history of Florence (*Istorie Fiorentine*), where many social and philosophical reflections are to be found. (Marriot: 1908) However, Machiavelli disagrees with Ibn Khaldun on some points, either in conclusion or in the way of exposition. But we may find many points of similarity between them. Ibn Khaldun was the first man to study the social phenomena, to understand and explain the events of history and to deduce from them social laws, in a remarkable scientific manner.



### Importance of Religion for a State

Ibn Khaldun and Machiavelli both acknowledge the importance of religion for the state and the connection between religion and power. In his discourse Machiavelli says, “If we read Roman history attentively we will always find how much religion contributed to obedience in the army, to courage away the people, to the preservation of morality and to showing the wicked... As the worship of God is the cause for the greatness of republics, so is its neglect the cause of their ruin...” (Ref. Rosenthal: 1988) Religion strengthens the state by its cohesive force. Ibn Khaldun states that religion without *Asabiya* is unable to impress people, impose its law on them and secure their obedience. Only authority backed by effective power can bring success in religious matters no less than in political affairs. Machiavelli (2009) says: “Only he should set out to conquer who has also ability and force...”

Machiavelli also has similar views in his evaluation of religion in relation to the state when he claims (*Discorsi* 11, 2) that Christianity makes man humble and submissive. Ibn Khaldun exempts pure Islam from such a charge, at any rate when the Caliphate corresponded in reality to its theory as laid down in the *Shari'a*. It is true this formulation happened long after the Caliphate has been transformed into monarchy (*mulk*), and for this reason Ibn Khaldun avers that once the Shari's had become a science to be studied at a time when religion had lost its impetus, the deference of the students towards their teacher resulted in a decline in manliness and self reliance.

But while Ibn Khaldun safeguards Islam as a religion and the Caliphate as the ideal state he would agree with Machiavelli as for the state (*mulk*) (Ibn Khaldun: 1967) is concerned, that is, the state (*mulk*) which is based on mixed government, and whose law contains both the ordinance of the Shari's and political statutes promulgated by the autocratic ruler. (Rosenthal: 1988)

Machiavelli is of the opinion that the fear of God with religion inspires in man makes him obedient to orders and laws, reliable in keeping an oath or a promise, and easy to rule. In his view, religion is also conducive to the formation of good army and the thing which preserves the state or ‘Religion, laws and army’.

Besides, similarity in many terms, there are some point of differences analyzed from the works of Ibn Khaldun and Machiavelli, which are discussed as below.

### Use of ‘Coercion’ in the interest of ‘State’

In the power state (*mulk*), the interest of state always consider as the overriding factor. Because the ruler is responsible for the state, its safety, good order and welfare, therefore in order to discharge his duties he must have sufficient power and authority. Machiavelli attributes the paramount importance to the interests of the state. But he would go much further than Ibn Khaldun, who held to Muslim ethics, was prepared to go. Political necessity in the interest of the state, demanded by ‘Reason of state’, made Machiavelli condone morally reprehensible actions, such as violence, treason, breach of faith and even murder. For Ibn Khaldun these are evils and bound to recoil not only on the perpetrators but on the state as a whole; they must prove injurious in the end.

Machiavelli recognizes that they are bad, but he deems them useful for the state and for that reason justifiable. (Machiavelli: 2009)

Machiavelli's ideal ruler is a composite of duplicity and knavery. His truth is fraud, religious destructions and complete annihilations of idealism; his ruler strives for vices, ruination and degradation. Quite contrary to the Machiavelli's attributes for his Prince, Ibn Khaldun's ruler struggles for stability and solidarity without any tinge of coercion.

In the sixth chapter of his book the 'Prince', he speaks of difficulty of preserving newly won power and says: "..... but when he must rely on himself and can use coercion, he rarely runs a risk. It is for this reason that all armed prophets had been victorious and all unarmed ones had perished." (Machiavelli: 2009) While Ibn Khaldun is of the view that the religions call (*da'wa*) is not complete without *Asabiya*.

### **Nature of Study and Observation**

There are some other differences between the two, Ibn Khaldun observes, analyses and infers as a historian of civilization. On the other hand Machiavelli is himself a political activist and reformer. He gave suggestions as a guideline for the unification of Italy. He was part of the Renaissance. (Rosenthal: 1988) Both he and Ibn Khaldun share as impartial empiricism, both seek the truth in examining political reality. But Ibn Khaldun inquires into the origin and development of the state in order to find and formulate underlying law.

### **Theory of History**

Machiavelli recognizes the causality of history and development in cycles. He is influenced Polybius in his concept of the cyclical change of constitutions. Whether unlike Ibn Khaldun, Machiavelli is not satisfied with discovering cause and effect in historical and political phenomenon; he wants to learn a lesson from the past in order to apply it to the present. While Ibn Khaldun constructed a general theory to explain general and political change using a wide range of historical and contemporary data from the Islamic world. His theory of history is neither cyclical nor evolutionary (linear), but wavelike (spiral). (Black, p. 181) He believes that the rise and decline of dynasties repeats itself again and again, driven by the same basic forces.

### **Conclusion**

It may not be apparently stated that Machiavelli was influenced by the works of Muslim origin in devising his political and social idea; no such inclination is reflected from his works. He was categorically an imaginative thinker, as was Ibn Khaldun as well. Each of the two great thinkers followed in their own approach and benefitted from their own inspiration. *The Prince* was a big deal of achievement among the notion propounded in the period of Renaissance as the *Prolegomena* was great development in Medieval Muslim thoughts.

However, different scholars stated their opinions in favor of any one of both. Such as, highlighting the superiority of the work of Ibn Khaldun, Professor Ludwig Gumplowicz (2000) writes that "At any rate, the priority must be rightly attributed to the Arab

sociologist (Ibn Khaldun) as regards those counsels which Machiavelli, a century later, gave to rulers in his *Prince*. Even in this cold manner of studying things, and in this very rude realism, Ibn Khaldun could have served as a model to the intelligent Italian who undoubtedly knew nothing about him.” On the other hand, Colosio (1951) comparing Ibn Khaldun with Machiavelli states that “If the great Florentine instructs us in the art of governing people, he makes this as a farsighted politician, but the learned Tunisian (Ibn Khaldun) was able to penetrate into the social phenomena, as a profound economist and philosopher, a fact which urges us to see in his work such a far-sightedness and critical art, as was totally unknown to his age.”

Thus, it concludes that Ibn Khaldun is richer in material, and wider in outlook than the Italian thinker. Ibn Khaldun considers society in general, and all the phenomena and tries to understand these phenomena and analyses them in the light of history and lastly, to conclude from their successive rhythm and their interaction, some general laws. But Machiavelli studies the state only and the personalities of the *Prince* or the Conqueror. Machiavelli on the other hand surpasses Ibn Khaldun in the fluency of his logic, the precision of exposition and conclusion, and the beauty of his style. Machiavelli reveals in his study a realistic rude spirit studying his Ideal Prince from a purely practical point of view as he must be, and about his ideal qualities. The two thinkers, however, agree on many points as both acknowledge importance of religion or the state and connection between religion and power, the value of history in studying the conditions of nations but there are many points of differences in their works including their theory of history.

One may ask whether Italian thinker ever knew anything of Ibn Khaldun's work on 'Monarchical politics', and whether he profited by them? It infers, with Gumprowicz, that when Machiavelli wrote his the '*Prince*', he knew nothing of Ibn Khaldun and his work. (Ibid) It is true that some shades of Muslim thought were known in Italy before Machiavelli and during his time. But we cannot infer that Machiavelli was influenced in formulating his political and social philosophy by any works of Muslim origin. He was undoubtedly an original thinker, as was also Ibn Khaldun. Each of the two thinkers paved his own way, and enjoyed his own inspiration. *The Prince* was a great conquest as *The Prolegomena* was a great conquest in the Muslim thoughts. However, it is their approach of analyzing human nature and their apprehension of the significance of force and power, supported by necessary power, which associates the Muslim historian of human had studied the history of Rome and of Christian Italy.

## References

Rosenthal, Erwin I. J. (1988). *Political Thought in Medieval Islam: An Introductory Outline*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 105.

Mahdi, Mohsin (1957). *Ibn Khaldun's Philosophy of History*, London: Parnell and Sons Ltd, p. 204.

Machiavelli, Niccolo (2009), *The Prince*, New York, Randy Dillon, 2009, p. 9

Ref. The Muslim World (2000), Volume 2, World Muslim Conference, Motamar al-Alam al-Islami; World Muslim Congress, p. 48

Ref. Sharif, M. M. (1951). *Muslim Thought: its origin and achievements*, Lahore, Sh. Muhammad Ashraf, p. 29.

## Selected Bibliography

Ali, Justice Ameer (1988). *The Spirit of Islam*, ed. II, Lahore, Publishers United.

Black, Antony (2004). *The History of Islamic Political Thoughts*, Karachi, Oxford University Press.

Enan, M. A. (1969). *Ibn Khaldun: His Life and Works*, Reprint, Sh. Muhammad Ashraf.

Ibn Khaldun (1967). *Muqaddimah: An Introduction to History*, Trans. Frozenthal, Franz, ed. N. J. Dawood, New York: Princeton.

Krieger, Joel (1993). *The Oxford Companion to Politics of the World*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Machiavelli, Niccolo (2009), *The Prince*, New York, Randy Dillon, 2009

Mahdi, Mohsin (1957). *Ibn Khaldun's Philosophy of History*, London: Parnell and Sons Ltd, 1957)

Marriot, W. K. (1968). *Niccolo Machiavelli's The Prince*, Reprint, New York: J. M. Dent and Sons Ltd.

Rosenthal, Erwin I. J. (1988). *Political Thought in Medieval Islam: An Introductory Outline*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sharif, M. M. (1951). *Muslim Thought: its origin and achievements*, Lahore, Sh. Muhammad Ashraf

Sherwani, Haroon Khan (1942). *Studies in Muslim Political Thought and Administration*, Reprint in 1965 (Lahore: Sh. Muhammad Ashraf Kashmiri.

The Muslim World (2000), Volume 2, World Muslim Conference, Motamar al-Alam al-Islami; World Muslim Congress

Toynbee, Arnold (1965). *A Study of History*, Reprint, London: Oxford University Press and Thame's and Hudson Ltd.

Vellari, Pasquale (1878). *The Life and Times of Niccolo Machiavelli*, Trans. Linda Vellari, London: T. Fisher Unwin.

Velori, M. (1992). *From Politics to Reason of State: The Acquisition and Transformation of the Language of Politics c250-1600*, Cambridge University Press.

The New Encyclopedia Britannica (1995). Vol.VI, 15<sup>th</sup> edition, Chicago.