The Problem of Fair Management in Politics: Religious Argument and Personal Interest Argument

Gokhan Mitroglou
University of Sakarya, Turkey
Email: gokhan.m98@gmail.com

Abstract

This study analyzes *politics* tradition in Sunn political thought in terms of exploring the problem of just ruling. In the relevant literature, the dominant approach considers *Siyāsatnāmas* as ethical advice in general and regards them as ineffective against an un-just ruler who has no ethical concern. This study criticizes this dominant view by claiming that in addition to the religious / ethical argument to promote a just rule, the *Siyāsatnāma* tradition develops a second argument designed specifically for an unjust ruler who ignores ethi-cal advice. This second argument is ignored by the dominant position about the *Siyāsatnāma* tradition. I have called it *self-interest argument* in this study. An unjust ruler's self-interest is to maintain, empower, and hand down his power to his descendants. The self-interest argument tries to convince a ruler who dismisses ethical advice to adopt just ruling by revealing that even for an unjust ruler the best strategy is just ruling to reach for his worldly aims.

Keywords: Kalām, Politics, Justice, Ethics, Self-Interest, al-Māwardī, al-Ghazālī.

— — — — — — — — — ◆ — — — — — — — — —

A.   INTRODUCTION

Traditional Sunni political thought consists of three schools: the theory of *Khilafah* developed by the scholars and statesmen, the F-elfi school developed by the Islamic philosophers, and the *Siyâsetname t*radition, which was also put forward by the scholars and statesmen.

The theory of caliphate examines the conditions of the caliphate, the method of election or the way the caliph came to power, the legitimacy, duties and responsibilities towards the society. While evaluating these issues, the theory of *Khilafah* bases on the general management principles present in the Qur'an and hadiths and develops and uses a number of new principles based on the solutions brought to the problems faced by the Islamic society over time (Ishaque, 1965).

The philosophical tradition has developed over time as a result of translation activities that started in the early periods of Islamic society, is not to be dealing with it must of establishing political philosophical tradition which overlooks the normative perspective and ideal models of state and society, the Muslim community in the political experience could be noticed very little (Battel, 1989).

 Political societies are works written to guide the rulers based on the ancient parables, stories, wise words and religious texts about the just rule in eastern societies,

especially in Indian and Iranian civilizations. Politics, which are also included in the Western political thought tradition, have been named as Sovereign Mirrors in the West Machiavelli's work called The Ruler is one of the best known examples of this tradition in the West.

Islamic society met this tradition, which is common in eastern societies, as a result of conquests. Although Iranian and Indian politics were originally translated, Muslim thinkers gradually wrote their own policies. Written by Muslims *siyâsetnâme*-line sooner is the Islamic version of this ancient tradition. The material used is not limited to the experience of the Islamic religion and the Muslim community, but also other materials, mainly Iranian and Indian. It consists of blending the political experiences of nations, the views of Greek philosophers and the historical experiences of pre-Islamic Arab and Turkish societies (Harmancı, 1999).

Both the moral virtues that the ruler will need in order to govern the society fairly and the practical management methods based on experience are presented in the politics. While the moral virtues are largely compiled from religious texts and the lives of the holy men, practical management methods are drawn from the experience of rulers who have been successful in establishing just rule in past societies (Downey, 2015).

Politics are generally seen as works consisting of moral advice in the literature. For example, according to Evkuran , in politics, "God has been taken refuge as the reference that will enable a ruler who is not under the control and control of any worldly power to act justly… . "Crone, on the other hand, "is the only remedy against oppressive rulers, hellfire, threats, and advices for the acquisition of virtues. Quite a few works of this kind have been produced, but it goes without saying that the impact of these works is limited". Cana tan 'According to studies *siyâsetnâ* "more normative style in written works "is" 'the situation'… rather than tell ' status should be 'expressed their return". Levend also says that politics are "among the moral works in terms of essential character". Bernard Lewis According to the studies *siyâsetnâ* "integrity of state officials, loyalty and piety to "reasons that there is also the need for "is filled with religious advice". The dominant approach based on *siyâsetnâ* studies without substantially sermons to each other again, the parable of the virtues lisa from tear occurs and by addressing the monarch's religious feelings by converting her moral conviction that it is possible the fair administration *siyâsetnâ* Malaria is the main character (Evkuran, 2006).

Again, this approach is based on thousands of years of human experience, which methods the fair administration has revealed that it is possible. The only thing a ruler has to do about the methods and techniques he must follow for fair rule is to follow this human experience. Therefore, the main obstacle to fair administration is not the ignorance of fair management techniques or procedures, but whether the ruler adopts these ancient methods, the accuracy of which has been tested for centuries. According to the politicians, the biggest obstacle before the rulers to adopt

and implement fair management methods is the ruler himself is itself. In other words, the main factor that determines whether the ruler will turn to just or cruel rule is whether he is a virtuous person. In İnalcık's words, in politics, just administration is based on the personal moral qualities of the ruler. It is possible to establish a just government if the ruler is just, gentle and forgiving in character. That is why politics is inseparable from morality, politics are also a moral book, a magazine of moral advice" (Putnam et al, 1994).

While the virtuous ruler puts forth every effort he can for a just rule, a virtuous ruler obeys the wishes of his soul and is dragged into a government that results in cruelty. Abu Hâmid Muhammad al-Ghazali clearly states that the advice given to the ruler will work if the ruler has faith: "These news and stories are merits… they are useful, if they have faith, they are impressive".

To conform to the soul of a person means that the animal aspects of human nature rule the person. Subjecting to the desires of the soul, not only in the government of the country, but also in the daily life of an ordinary person, will result in persecution both against himself and his environment. The justice of a person against his ego is to "always encourage the ego to prosper, to ban him from ugly deeds … He does not go far in terms of correcting the states of the *lust* and finds the middle of the extremists… Justice cannot be expected from a man who oppresses his soul". Do- with worthy, fair governance "is based on the ruler's personal and moral virtues". Therefore, the provision of the ruler with moral virtues and the suppression of the desires of his soul is the pre - condition of a just government throughout the country. Since the behavior and attitude of the ruler will set an example for state officials as well, the critical factor that determines their shift to tyranny or towards justice is the ruler himself. But a virtuous ruler will prefer these methods, and a virtuous ruler will inevitably turn into a cruel ruler because he is subordinate to his soul, and will set a bad example for other officials (Ozdemir, 2013).

This approach, which considers politics to be mostly religious advice, leads to the conclusion that politics will remain ineffective in the face of a cruel ruler who does not heed any religious advice and is caught up in the desires of his soul. If the ruler is a virtuous person with religious sensitivity, he will strive for just rulership, which offers the opportunity to escape from the torment of Hell and to succeed the prophets. Such an administrator for *siyâsetnâ* studies, *spiritual carrot* and *stick* d with expressions is it. The reward the righteous ruler will receive in the hereafter is carrot, and the severe punishment the cruel ruler will deal with is a stick. But the purpose of religion founded-otherwise occur rather than worldly power, fame and property, a ruler across *siyâsetnâ* studies, if widespread as alleged, if only the manager of religion appeals to the emotions, the waiting lenen result - monarch to persuade a fair management - will not be realized. This situation will lead to a vicious circle. Therefore, this dominant approach leads to the conclusion that politicians cannot offer a solution to the problem

of fair and good governance in the face of a ruler who has no religious sensitivity and moral concern and is subordinate to his soul. Bernard Lewis emphasizes this conviction by arguing that the moral advice offered by politicians is *palliative* solutions (Turk, 2017).

This approach, which considers politics as moral advice and religious argument, ignores another approach present in politics. The second, neglected, approach, which has no purely moral concern and whose purpose is earthly power, property and fame (Monroe, 1997).

It was developed to offer a solution to the problem of a cruel ruler subordinate to his soul. Contrary to popular belief, politicians took the question of the ruler, who had no moral concern, seriously, and without appealing to any religious argument, they developed a second argument that would appeal to the ruler's sole self-interest and compel him to rule with justice. As the common view ignores this argument, it also fails to appreciate the value of politics.

In this study, the solution offered by the *siyâset name* tradition to the problem of justice in a cruel sovereign subjected to his soul will be discussed. In the following chapters, firstly, the process of transition from fair administration to strong authority as the legitimacy criterion and target of the administration in traditional Sunni political thought will be presented. The transition from fair management to strong authority will enable us to identify the functional context of politics. Second, we will analyze the most prominent part of politics, the religious argument that encourages strong authority to rule with justice. Finally, we will analyze the self-interest argument that religious counsel will not work, and the cruel sovereign subjected to self-interest will lead the self-interest to just rule. To illustrate this two arguments Abu al- Maverdî (d. 450/1058) and examined Ghazzali instance think (Yazar, 2019).

B.   METHOD

Research was conducted using qualitative methods. With this qualitative method, researchers attempt to reveal the universal essence of phenomena personally experienced by a group of individuals in depth. Data was collected through several techniques, including observation techniques, focus group discussions, and documentation studies. Data analysis was carried out through three analysis processes, namely coding, merging codes that emerged into themes, verification of themes through theory and follow-up interviews, and drawing conclusions (Creswell, 2010).

C.   RESULT AND DISCUSSION
1. Transition from Fair Management to Strong Authority

In the first phase of traditional Sunni political thought, both the way in which the caliph came to power and the qualities he should have are from the original principles of governance of Islam and the Prophet. It was formulated based on the

practices of the Prophet and the four caliphs. Management principles according to this model; justice, council, merit, the bey 'at (contract) and choice. Having the Caliph D is partners qualifications include: Justice, knowledge, piety, being healthy physically and mentally, be brave and be committed, to the Quraysh tribe. This model, which can be called the original theory of the caliphate of Sunni political thought, has taken a permanent place as the original model in the works of Sunni scholars who contributed to the Sunni caliphate theory (Kösoğlu, 2004).

According to the common opinion of Islamic thinkers, with the words of Ibn Khaldûn (d. 808/1406), with Muâviye, the transition from religious politics to mental politics. According to Ibn Khaldun, in religious politics, which is the source of the original theory of caliphate, "caliphate is the supplication and mandate of the owner of the sharia (Prophet Muhammad) for the protection of religion and the ruling of the world with religious politics". With the expression of religious politics, Ibn Khaldn, as he describes in the above quote, means that the pre-Muawiyah period was an administration in accordance with the original administrative principles of Islam and that the fundamental principle of the state was religion. In mental politics, both the management principles are different and the basic principle of the state is not religion but worldly fame and property (Unsal, 2009).

Similar to Ibn Khaldun, the Sassani influence, which started with the Umayyads and continued with the Abbasids, which was pointed out by many western thinkers, made the patrimonial dynasty the standard system of Muslim societies. In the patrimonial system, the state and the country are seen as private property of the dynasty, and the people as subjects. The dynasty makes "order and stability" the dominant subject, while the caliphate is based on "community". State powers as a result of the process of modeling the Sassani. It was devoted to the ruler who was accepted as the owner of the state and was accepted by the people over time (Lewis, 1996).

As a result of the civil wars experienced in the early period of the Islamic society and the seizure of Muâviye by the force of the sword, the succession of his son Yazid to him and the spread of similar practices that could be considered as a deviation from the basic administrative principles of Islam, the ulama revised the theory of caliphate to provide legitimacy for the actual situation. As a result of this trend, a second pragmatic caliphate theory emerged as a model driven by internal and external threats faced by the Islamic society rather than being the product of a theoretical effort based on the basic sources of Islam. This second caliphate theory of the current state of public affair on the political nature and it have accepted legitimizing the principles as evil and priorities of the fair administration not to target that can provide the social order and stability, and Islam against both internal and external threats to protect the community stronger authority / administration gave to the target (Meneke, 2005).

In the beginning, while the legitimacy of the administration was to have the caliphate criteria, to come to power with an appropriate method and to rule with justice while in power, in time, strong authority became almost the only criterion of both purpose and legitimacy. The search for strong authority increased the obedience obligation of the subject while loosening the restrictions on the manager's grass orbit". Therefore strong but fair authority meets the requirement of a non-sovereign problem, they have to solve Sunni thinkers in the early stages of the Islamic society is one of the issues. The issue of how to ensure the legitimacy of the transition from fair administration to strong authority is an issue al-Ghazali emphasizes: Ghazali firstly allows the deportation of the cruel ruler if there is no danger of civil war: "This is the place for a person, without causing the birth of any sedition and quatrains (Ozkan, 2016). If it is possible to bring a person with the attributes of imam, it has to dethrone him. "On the other hand, al-Ghazali says that if there is a possibility of civil war, obedience is necessary against an unfair ruler who maintains stability and can protect the Muslim community against external threats. Ghazzali, in case of rebellion to manage the grounds that the fair will emerge strife the [civil war, anarchy], would result in a destructive altogether for society reveals dramatically: "rattling of swords will spread to all sides and that, she outbreak of famine in the country-cine, animals it will cause death and halt of industrial facilities. Meanwhile, the winner, go to deal with robbing, the majority of surviving in the shadow of the sword destroy possible- cake" (Binder, 1955).

The same approach was adopted by Mâverdî. Mâverdî had a legitimizing tendency especially regarding the way the ruler came to power. He said that the new administration was legitimate in order to prevent civil war if the ruler seized power by any means. Al-Ghazali 's "It is preferable that a ruler persecutes and tortures the people of sixty years rather than a society staying a year without a ruler and destroying each other "and Ibn Taymiyya (d. 728/1323) said, "With a cruel imam. Forty years is better than a night without a sultan" is a laconic expression of the Sunni approach to this problem that has been introduced since the time of Mâverdî. This approach has gradually become the standard solution to the cruel ruling problem of the theory of caliphate (Teymiyye, 1999).

The "dilemma" here is the following: The fact that the ulama gave a blank check to the ruler who provided order and stability based on the anxiety of *strife* and security-based approach, led to the problem of how to solve the justice issue. In the theory of caliphate, which regulates the conditions of being a caliph, the duties of the victory, the method of coming to power, there is no *institutional* arrangement to force an unfair ruler to rule with justice, on the contrary, there is no legitimacy problem on the condition that it ensures order and stability, because the theory of caliphate, "it focused on function rather than the institutional structure of the caliphate" (Arslan, 2014). Dev all the possibilities of enterprises, institutions, and classic three soldiers of the legislative,

executive and gathered in the person of the monarch as the principle of judicial power, and especially this power concentration to control the constitutional nite-ness and lack of institutional arrangements for the balancing determines the limits of the Caliphate theory. Therefore, the theory of caliphate developed since the period that started with Muâviye limited itself to order, stability and security. Khilafah theory, order and stability the problem exposes justice and security in this way to solve problems together - justice "two-lemi" face to face with the remains.

The ulema who contributed to the theory of caliphate are aware of this limit and the justice problem left open. Bernard Lewis says that both the ulema and the umma participate in the process of legitimizing the current situation with concepts such as necessity, bad evil or public interest, but there is an important difference between the two groups. Although *Umera* "does not have much difficulty" in recommending "absolute obedience" regardless of the circumstances, "Ulema has a very different concern." Obviously, they were less willing than the practical *umera* to both loosen the restrictions on authority and extend the limits of obedience. The great scholars of the Divine Law acted with deep religious loyalty and deep moral purpose. Their appeal that it was necessary to submit to pressure had a rationality of its own. This rationality was different from the rationality of the flattery of the courtiers, the pragmatism of bureaucrats, or the profitable opportunism of official religious officials" (Keskintas, 2018).

Al-Ghazali expresses the uneasiness and rationality Lewis spoke of as follows: "This is not a voluntary indulgence, but necessity makes things permissible. For example, we know that eating carrion meat is inconvenient, but dying is more harmful than this "and" the lightest of the two is better than the other".

Although the Ulemâ prioritizes the establishment of order and security, it has not abandoned the open justice issue. On the contrary, it is seen that the ulema went gradually. Since a strong authority that will establish order, stability and security is considered as a pre - condition for fair administration, priority is given to a strong authority. After strong authority facility, although obedience and meşruiyet of justice must not, bring the matter to justice scholars agenda. Therefore, the ulema did not refrain from encouraging strong authority to rule with justice. Since the emphasis of the second caliphate theory, which was developed primarily to provide solutions to stability and security problems, is limited to order, stability and security, the tradition of *siyâsetname* comes into play to solve the issue of fair governance, which is the next step. The gap created by the theory of caliphate in the issue of justice is tried to be compensated by politics (Kubal, 2016).

2. The Role of Politics in the Solution of the Fair Management Problem in the Era of Strong Authority

In Islam, both the main criterion and the goal of the legitimacy of the government is a fair direction. According to Umar, while justice is the foundation of the property. According to Ali, "Justice is the religion of the state. "In fact, justice is the fundamental principle of not only government but also the whole universe in Islam. Allah has created the world to be just and sustains it in justice. As the founding principle of the universe, justice is the basic principle in one's relationship with the soul and in relationships between individuals. Justice in state administration is only one of the manifestations of this general principle (Crone, 2016).

Fair administration is not limited to judicial or legal justice in the narrow sense. Fair administration is both a goal and a criterion, from the sovereign's own self to his attitude towards state officials, from the state and society relations to establishing the peace and security of the people. "For Muslim thinkers… justice is ideal, it is the touchstone on which good governments and bad governments can be distinguished". Therefore, justice is the main issue in politics.

The management procedures required to establish a fair administration according to politics have been put forward with human experience and it is sufficient to follow them. Therefore, there is no problem in traditional Sunni political thought such as developing procedures to establish fair administration. The main problem in terms of fair administration is whether the ruler had the moral and religious feelings, thoughts and sensitivities that would enable him to adopt these procedures. This depends on the ruler not following the desires of his soul and choosing to be a virtuous individual. Therefore, the ruler must be taught what virtue is and how to obtain it. Religious argument in the *siyâset name-s* shows the way and value of being virtuous to the ruler. Once the ruler chooses to be virtuous, he will necessarily adopt a just rule and thus solve the issue of justice left open by the theory of caliphate (Duman, 1996).

Ghazzali *property to the Sultan (of counsel's - Mülûk)* titled his work explains the ways of being virtuous and value the detail. *Advice of's - Mülûk* ruler, be aware that the reign is a blessing bestowed by God, and it starts with self-cine recommendation fulfill the thanks, D-reg. Hz. It reminds us of the mortality of the world by saying that although Noah lived a thousand years, he was "as if he did not live". The main thing is the hereafter, the land of "eternal bliss and eternal blessing". Ghazzali life of this world is temporary variety of I- explains Malarla Summary: "The world is a range of (stop), an eternal house to stay (country) is not. Man is like a guest here" and "This world is a bridge. If a person does not consider this place as a bridge, if he spends all his strength in making this place ... he will forget where he will go" (Gazzâlî, 1993).

In the first part of the work, detailed information about belief and worship is given first. The existence, unity of Allah , that he is our creator, his might, the infinity of his knowledge, his being aware of everything, the institution of prophecy, the life of the

hereafter, worship, etc. After explaining briefly and succinctly, the meaning of justice for the ruler is strikingly revealed: "Know that God's forgiveness is near regarding what is happening between you and God … But in cases of persecution inflicted on the people, He will not remove the cost of this cruelty from you until the Day of Judgment. The danger of persecution is great. No ruler can escape His danger, except… who treats his people fairly. Therefore, you must know how to do justice ... how to have mercy on you on the Day of Judgment".

According to al-Ghazali, the blessing of the leadership that Allah bestows upon the ruler is an exceptional blessing and "one will attain an endless bliss. "Al-Ghazali explains the exceptional character of the opportunity offered to the ruler and the rank he will reach with hadiths: "The leader's just behavior for a day is superior to seventy years of worship "and" God will raise the righteous ruler to the schema in terms of deeds equal to the deeds of the whole people". Meeting the needs of the society is superior to the futile worship, and therefore, if the ruler is engaged in even futile worship, if the society has a need, he must abandon that worship and fulfill that need. Allah has made prophets and rulers superior to other people. According to Rosenthal, it follows that in al- Ghazali , "the imame-spirit founded on justice is the supreme form of worship" (Ghazali, 1996).

Just as a fair management is an exceptional blessing, cruel leadership is an exceptional offense and will receive the same amount of punishment. With the hadiths, al-Ghazali again reveals the severity of the punishment that the unjust ruler will face: "The most unpleasant and distant of people… God is the cruel ruler" and "The cruel ruler who will suffer the most severe torment on the Day of Judgment". The ruler is responsible for both his own cruelty and the persecution of state officials subordinate to him. Gazzâlî places such an obligation on the manager on the grounds that the behavior of the ruler will set an example for other officials and the public (Gazzâlî, 2016).

Similarly, Nizamulmulk (d. 485/1092) stated that he would be held responsible for all injustices, small and big, under the rulership of the ruler in the hereafter, and how heavy the responsibility of the ruler was, Hz. Umar, he explains it with a story attributed to Hz. While Omar deathbed, his father, his son, Abdullah, and ask when you can see ah. When Umar says that they will meet again in the hereafter, Abdullah expresses that he wants to meet sooner. The son of Omar, following the death "was not the first, second, third night he'll see me in the dream did not happen," Abdullah sees his father in his dream only twelve years after his death and asks why it was taking so long. Hz. Omar told his son Abdullah, "There was a ruined bridge around Baghdad, the officials neglected its repair, and the leg of a sheep came to a hole there and was broken. I have been busy with his case until now, "he responds (Meneke, 2005).

Al-Ghazali is clearly aware of the limitations of the religious argument. All otherworldly gospel and corpses work only if the ruler has faith and fulfills the

requirements of his faith. Otherwise, the religious argument is ineffective: "These news and stories are examples… beneficial, impressive if they have faith". Therefore Ghazzali, detailed religious argument after *Mullen k Sultan their* work entitled the". Justice and Politics "sub - personal interests ar in the section shall apply to güman and ruler asks the question: "to remain in power for a manager, to have an independent life of the country depends on what?" (Blaydes et al., 2018), This question reveals the ultimate interest of the unfair ruler, since the ruler, who will not take into account the religious argument, can only be persuaded by his personal interest. Gazzâlî says that the answer to the question is fair administration. Like r hereafter if he wants to get the reward you get for worldly fame is the same answer: Fair management. In other words, both the virtuous ruler and the manager who is subject to the desires of his ego, can achieve their goals with the same tool, even if their goals are different. The ruler's ability to be strong both in his country and in the international arena depends on fair administration: If the manager removes the cruelty and torture among his people, if he treats them justly, he will be ruled in his land and will prevail over all his enemies player. "Cruel administration will produce the opposite consequences. Both the power of the state in the country will weaken, it will not be able to trust its ruling people and will also be worried about it, and it will also become weak in the international arena: "… your country will be destroyed, your people will become poor, then you will be the president of a ruined country and the ruler of a poor people. Your name will remain bad in the world" (Gazzâlî, 2016).

The self-interest argument is found in much more detail in Mâverdî. Maverdî, *Mutiny lam 'in the world and Religion Literary* (*Adab' MS - world and would -you*) Fourth Part of a work entitled 'What human nature (nature) and begins with the description of the state administration: Human nature, the necessity of social life for the people, It deals with issues such as social order and stability's need for strong authority and the qualifications of the ruler of this chapter "The World Created by al-Qaeda's " downstream if the title has a perfect example of self-interest argument. Mâverdî lists six pillars: "The religion in which people fully obey; powerful sultan; widespread justice applied to all; general safety; broad ambition; constant abundance and cheapness" (Çifçi, 2012).

According to Mâverdî , justice is the main factor that causes a series of positive thoughts and behaviors in society. Likewise, injustice leads to a series of negative thoughts and behaviors. Fair administration leads to love and "constant obedience "towards the ruler on the one hand, and on the other hand it causes the spread of love, friendship, safety and solidarity among people (Kösoğlu, 2004). "As long as there is justice and mercy, friendship and peace will continue between people". Fair administration leads to the happiness of people and allows them to enjoy what they have in a "safe" manner and with peace of mind. Therefore, society's obedience to the state and its rulers should not be based on fear, obedience based on fear is based on a

rotten foundation and it is not possible to build a strong state on it, because "these countries are more subject to confusion and revolutions. " Fair administration causes sincere obedience and even love towards the state in the society, and also prevents the emergence of negative views and attitudes towards the state among individuals. Thus, both the people make sure of the ruler and the manager makes sure of the public. Because Omar ruled with justice, he was able to lie "outside in a reckless and modest way" and sleep "in safety". People's government, the state also public confidence in the social order have to peace is the most inexpensive and effortless way. Widespread social trust reduces the burden of public finances by making it unnecessary for the state to resort to coercive measures in a society. Mâverdî exemplifies that justice will ensure the voluntary obedience of the people without leaving the need for the use of force with an issue regarding Alexander: "Which one is superior to justice and heroism?"The government responds as follows: "If justice is done, there is no need for heroism" (Maverdi, 1994).

Mâverdî calls the trust that fair administration creates between individuals and between the state and society as "general safety and trust: "With it, the souls find peace; efforts develop; the innocent are sheltered and the weak find consonance. Because the comfort of the fear and the peace of the fear cannot" (Mâverdî, 1994).

"Public safety and confidence" and the desire to win in human nature, Maverdî 's phrase-water "wide e must " mobilize: Large ambitions "being thrown to the people's heart acid The reconstruction of the world by God " to win, increase the welfare and life in abundance is desirable. The broad ambition "is wide enough to encourage people to acquire things that human life is not capable of, to realize world desires that are not expected to be achieved in life. "If it were not for the desire to win in human nature, which is wide enough to exceed its lifetime, "not everyone would be content with preparing the needs of the day and supply something for tomorrow" and the world would be "a ruin" since the development we observe in all areas of the world life would not be possible (Mustafa, 2017).

Maverdî well in excess of the life of *large ambitions*, and human nature is the desire to win in the final over-mat altogether is the driving force of social development. Individuals who exceed their lifetimes, who act with long and broad ambitions lead to a vibrant and productive socio - economic and cultural life and a prosperous society that has ensured order and stability emerges. According to Mâverdî , the spread of welfare both eliminates some social problems and encourages some social virtues. Prosperity reduces the "imbalance between the rich and the poor" and prevents the "ha-sed and enmity" resulting from poverty … solidarity and solidarity among people increases… abundance and cheapness brings wealth and wealth brings generosity and security". As a result of justice and trust, "love among

people,… constant obedience to rulers occurs. The country becomes zoning. Property and wealth thrive. Generation increases. Also makes sure of his office".

After this stage the famous productive society *Justice Department*'s more revenue. A productive society enables strong state finances, strong finance provides a strong army, and a strong army allows a strong state. In Islamic political thought, the office of justice is commonly repeated with a shorter formula: justice leads to strong finance, strong finance to a strong army, and a strong army to a strong state. In Mâverdî, there is a more comprehensive justice department formula than the standard justice department formula. In Mâverdî , the links of the chain are completed and the parts that are omitted in the standard formula, from the change that justice, which is the foundation of the justice department, has brought about in individual psychology, to the widespread social trust and the desire to win, are also revealed. Mâverdî explained in detail that just administration will lead to widespread trust, widespread trust will lead to a long and wide ambition [desire to gain], a long and broad ambition that exceeds life, a productive and therefore prosperous society, and a productive society will lead to a strong finance, a strong army and a strong state.

In Mâverdî , justice triggers a series of positive emotions and behaviors, leading to a prosperous, peaceful and productive society and a strong state, while injustice activates a series of negative feelings and behaviors, driving the state and society into disaster. According to Mâverdî, "There is nothing more harmful than something that destroys the safety of people…"and "if the order of the world is broken, the blessing that people will see does not tolerate them, and the disaster to which they will be subjected leaves very painful effects. "While the administrators how fair people of the opposite process would be triggered if it is unjust to love volunteers have obeyed the-rack: "Manager of HA when people love him and he loves the people. When he is evil, he does not love his people, and his people do not love him either" and "When the ruler renounces justice, the people cease to obey him. "Disobedience" attracts dreadful misfortunes".

After this phase, it is emphasized that unfair administration will generally have two main consequences: First, because there is no "general safety and trust", the life that Allah puts on the nature / nature of people is a long and "broad ambition" or gain. his desire will not act, and on the contrary, people will live in fear and anxiety, unsure of their future and worrying that their labor will not be rewarded. Maverdî 'according to "fear and entooth, people to work the view and the individual savings ' that will and human needs-s and to which the whole human order the keep of-cage from the supply of essential substances, "society, both economic and in the country to leave to work in other areas it will lead to misery and backwardness by reducing its economic production and social development. Especially considering that economic productivity provides the material resources needed by all other social activities, the failure of individuals' broad ambitions beyond their lifetime to take action will lead to a total

social collapse. While the people are condemned to poverty or scarcity, the state will not be able to obtain the resources it needs in all areas from health to culture, from development to defense. As a result of fair administration, "just as abundance and cheapness ensure people's right", "famine caused by unfair administration" also prepares the causes and environment for mischief. "Maverdî 'according to" persecution until the world is not a distraction from the devastating and people's conscience in a short time".

The second consequence is the possibility of revolts, anarchy, or civil war, which will collapse the state. Injustice not only causes distrust and hostility between society and the state, it also drives the society into fragmentation and conflict within itself. Since the strength and survival of the state depends on fair management, which ensures the continuous abundance and social development, which depends on general safety and general security, mismanagement both sets people against each other and confronts society and the ruler and causes the destruction of the country. Ultimately, the ruler will worry about his own society and his state will be weak in the international arena. This is against the personal interest of the manager. Mâverdî's lesson to the ruler is clear: "There is nothing more harmful than injustice, and nothing more useful than justice. "The inevitable end is the loss of the ruler's state/power: "Property can continue with swearing; does not continue with the persecution" (Mâverdî, 1994).

3. Hobbes's Politics as a Modern Following the Tradition Of Politics Theory

An argument quite similar to the self-interest argument of the Sunni scholars is also seen in the understanding of authority, obedience, and good governance of Hobbes (d.1679), one of the founders of the model's political philosophy. Individuals dragged into a state of war from the state of nature, a fictional period before the state developed by Hobbes to explain the necessity of the state; Through *Leviathan* (Monarch / Ruler), which they have equipped with extraordinary powers to ensure order, stability and security , they escape from the state of war and turn into a society. Individuals are obliged to absolute obedience, provided that social order and security are maintained, because "the purpose of obedience is preservation, "but what will convince the Leviathan, where all power is concentrated, to rule with justice, and what can be done if it is not fair? As in the Sunni model, under Hobbes ' ruler, all state forces are gathered (union of powers) and no institutional arrangement has been designed to limit this power. Furthermore, Hobbes considers the unity of powers and the concentration of state powers in the monarch particularly necessary for social stability and security, because the "part of the sovereign power" (Inalcik, 1969).

He thinks that "the separation of powers" (the separation of powers) will annihilate the state: "… mutually divided powers destroy each other". The separation of powers and institutional arrangements that limit the power of the state are rejected because they will lead to conflict and anarchy in the state power, which is institutionally

fragmented, and then in the society. 84 As can be seen, Hobbes's way of legitimizing the unity of powers has a logic similar to that of Sunni political thought.

The dilemma facing Hobbes is similar to that of the Sunni ulema: the legitimacy of the authority cannot be questioned on the grounds that the ruler is unjust, since the source of legitimacy is order and security, not justice. Hence, the problem of an unfair manager that ensures order and security is also Hobbes ' problem. While dealing with this problem, Hobbes tries to convince them of the necessity of absolute obedience by reminding them that civil war and anarchy are the worst situations people can face in the first stage, just like Sunni thinkers (Kilinc, 2019).

The background of Hobbes ' authoritarian model (strong authority) is the religious and ideological civil wars in Europe in general and Britain in particular. Hobbes witnessed both the sectarian wars that took place between 1618 and 1648, the so-called Thirty Years' War, which caused great destruction in Europe, and the English Civil War between 1642 and 1651. Hobbes sees civil war and anarchy as the most severe of evil and advises individuals absolute obedience to authoritarian rule/*Leviathan*, which is the lesser evil: "The greatest evil that can happen to the people… in any form of government "is civil war and anarchy." *Such a war brought on by troubles* " of the environment they will encounter individuals under the title of Hobbes described as follows:

"There is no place to work in such an environment; because the reward for the work is uncertain and therefore there is no room for tillage; neither maritime, nor the use of goods imported by sea, nor comfortable buildings… neither information about the earth… nor art, writing, nor society. Worst of all, there is always the intense fear and danger of death, and human life is lonely, poor, bad, savage and short lived".

In Hobbes 's model, administration with forty years of persecution is better than a war situation. Again Maverdî and Ghazzali as from the Hobbes ' in the manager's "legitimacy jaundice urine is ge- not Lishi obedient to him in the form of effective protection / security is providing supply-DIG. "Since the aim of obedience and the source of Leviathan 's legitimacy is order and security, not in an environment where there is no justice, but in the absence of order and security, the reason for Leviathan 's existence disappears and the people's obligation to obey falls. Hobbes says in the sub - heading "Under which circumstances nationals are freed from the obligation of obedience to their sovereign, "The obligation of nationals to the sovereign will continue ... as long as sovereign subjects can… protect them. "In other words, "if there is no protection, there is no obedience. " Since the reason for existence disappears, the ruler loses its power / state. This result is against the personal interest of the manager. The ruler's interest is the continuation of his power. Because rational and self-interested human nature determines the behavior of both the ruled and the ruler, Hobbes assumes that even if equipped with extraordinary powers, Leviathan will strive to maintain order and security, which is the source of his power . More water, Hobbes,

the manager with the sordid nature only authority owned but the interests IEPs (power of the) further replication of the most effective ways to not worry they will also work to fair administration of the plant, because "the sovereign's power and glory of nationality and comes from health". In Hobbes, as in Sunni political thought, social peace and prosperity is the guarantee of power, and the determining factor that makes this peace and prosperity possible is just management. Based on the assumption of self-interested human nature, considering that every ruler will want to not only protect but also strengthen his power, Hobbes thinks that at the final stage, the ruler will adopt fair management, which is not only the order and security of the society, but also the determining factor for peace and welfare. Hence, in Hobbes ' theory, the fundamental basis of stability and security is not institutional arrangements, but self-interested human nature that is fixed in both the governed and the ruler. Like Sunni thinkers, Hobbes finds the ultimate solution to the possibility of mismanagement of the director in human nature, not in institutional arrangements, and appeals to the personal interest of the ruler.

Hobbes differs from Sunni political thought in his claim that being virtuous will contribute to just governance. According to Hobbes, it is useless to give moral/religious advice to both the ruled and the rulers, as human beings do not have moral capacity by nature. In Sunni political thought, on the other hand, the religious argument is effective only for rulers who can defeat their ego. Hence, appeal to self-interest is both the final solution and common ground for just rule in Sunni political thought and in Hobbes.

D.   CONCLUSION

It is clear that, in addition to the religious argument for the problem of justice, politicians, whose outlines may leave the impression that the same issues and religious/moral advice have been hopelessly repeated for centuries, to the reader weariness, they have a very strong and convincing second solution. The second approach, which is neglected in the related literature, although it is present in politics, is based on self-interest and is a significant solution in terms of ensuring fair administration in a context where institutional arrangements are lacking.

In the argument of self-interest, in the case of a cruel ruler who is not virtuous and therefore necessarily ignores his long-term interests, it is targeted not by his religious feelings, but by appealing to his short-term worldly interest because he seeks worldly property and fame. Nef-sine subject to the ruler of the long-term interest - hereafter reward - according to behave expect based on whether or not what his short-term interests - the strong state and to his generation transfer by waiting to act according to diagnosis it to be fair management of the facility to promote is quite a reasonable approach. This approach is not limited to Sunni political thought, as shown in the example of Hobbes, one of the founders of modern political theory.

REFERENCES

1. Arslan, A. (2014). İlk Çağ Felsefeye Tarihi 1. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları (2013). İbni Haldun. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları (2012). *Felsefeye Giriş*.

2. Battel, L. (1989). Lewis, Bernard. The Political Language of Islam. Chicago (Ill.), University of Chicago Press, 1988, 178 p. *Études internationales*, *20*(4), 940-941.

3. Binder, L. (1955). Al-Ghazali's theory of Islamic government. *The Muslim World*, *45*(3), 229-241.

4. Blaydes, L., Grimmer, J., & McQueen, A. (2018). Mirrors for Princes and Sultans: Advice on the Art of Governance in the Medieval Christian and Islamic Worlds. *The Journal of Politics*, *80*(4), 1150-1167.

5. Cengiz, O. Şam TarihineAir Bir Bibliyoğrafya Denemesi.

6. Çifçi, O. Z. (2012). Mâverdî Düşüncesinde Din-Devlet İlişkisi. *Iğdır Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, *1*(2), 91.

7. Creswell, J. W. (2010). Research design approaches are qualitative, quantitative, and mixed. Yogyakarta: Student Library.

8. Crone, P. (2016). List of Patricia Crone's Publications. In *Islam, the Ancient Near East and Varieties of Godlessness* (pp. 247-254). Brill.

9. Downey, A. (2015). *Slavs and Tatars: Mirrors for Princes*. JRP Ringier.

10. Duman, A. (1996). Siyâsetnâme Geleneği ve Ebu Yusuf'un Harun Reşid'e Tavsiyeleri. *Bilge Adam, Yıl*, *4*.

11. Evkuran, M. (2006). Ehl-i Sünnet Kelâm'ında Siyaset Anlayışı-Vücûbu'l-İmâme (Yönetimin Gerekliliği) Ekseninde Bir Değerlendirme. *Marife*, *6*(2), 21-38.

12. Gazzâlî, A. H. M. (1993). *The Inner Face of Batinism* . Trc. Avni İlhan. Ankara: TDV Publications.

13. Gazzâlî, A. H. M. (2016). *To the Sultans of the Property*. Trc. Osman Şekerci. Istanbul: Growing Moon Publications.

14. Harmancı, M. (1999). *İslam felsefesinde siyaset teorisi (Farabi, Maverdi, Nizamülmülk, İbn Teymiyyenin siyasetnamelerine göre)* (Doctoral dissertation, Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü).

15. Inalcik, H. (1969). Capital formation in the Ottoman Empire. *Journal of Economic History*, 97-140.

16. Ishaque, K. M. (1965). Al-Ahkâm Al-Sultânîyah: Laws of Government in Islam. *Islamic Studies*, *4*(3), 275-314.

17. Keskintaş, O. (2018). *Adalet, Ahlâk ve Nizam: Osmanlı Siyâsetnâmeleri*. İletişim Yayınları.

18. Kılınç, Z. A. (2019). Siyâsetnâmelerde Adil Yönetim Sorunu: Dini Argüman ve Kişisel Çıkar Argümanı. *Cumhuriyet İlahiyat Dergisi*, *23*(2), 673-691.

19. Kösoğlu, N. (2004). *Hukuka Bağlılık Açısından Eski Türkler'de-İslam'da ve Osmanlı'da Devlet*. Ötüken Neşriyat AŞ.

20. Kubal, C. (2016). *Ordu'da Yetiştirilen 'Hayward'Kivi Çeşidinin Önemli Kimyasal Bileşenler ve Fiziksel Özellikler Yönünden Tanımlanması* (Master's thesis, Ordu Üniversitesi Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü).

21. Lewis, B. (1996). Islam and liberal democracy: A historical overview. *Journal of Democracy*, *7*(2), 52-63.

22. Mâverdî, E. L. H. H. (1994). Ahkâmu's-Sultaniyye, çev. *Ali Şafak, İstanbul, Bedir Yay*.

23. MENEKSE, Ö. (2005). İslam Düşünce Tarihinde Devlet Anlayışı: Mâverdi ve Nizâmülmülk Örneği. *Dinbilimleri Akademik Araştırma Dergisi*, *5*(2), 193-211.

24. Monroe, K. R. (Ed.). (1997). *Contemporary empirical political theory*. Univ of California Press.

25. Mustafa, K. O. Ç. (2017). Diasporik yaşamın psiko-anatomisi–IV: Müslüman-Türk göçmenlerin kimlik-anomi-sosyal dışlanma biçimlenmeleri üzerine nitel bir çalışma. *Balıkesir Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, *3*(2), 295-348.

26. Özdemir, A. (2013). Zekat ve vergi mükellefiyetinde firsat eşitliği ve adaletin sağlanmasi. *EKEV Akademi Dergisi*, *17*(56), 1-10.

27. OZKAN, A. (2016). *Al-Ghazālī and Rasā'il Ikhwān Al-Ṣafā': Their Influence on His Thought* (Doctoral dissertation, UCLA).

28. Putnam, R. D., Leonardi, R., & Nanetti, R. Y. (1994). *Making democracy work: Civic traditions in modern Italy*. Princeton university press.

29. Teymiyye, İ. (1999). Ebû'l-Abbâs Takıyyüddîn Ahmed b. Abdülhalîm. es-Siyasetü'ş-Şeriyye. 2. *Baskı. Trc. Vecdi Akyüz. İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları*.

30. TÜRK, H. B. (2017). Siyasetname Geleneğinde İktidarın Denetimi Sorunu: Nushatü's-Selâtîn Örneği. *Amme İdaresi Dergisi*, *50*(3).

31. Ünsal, A. (2009). *Hristiyanların islama bakışı (Washington DC Bölgesi örneği)* (Doctoral dissertation, Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimleri Enstitüsü).

32. Yazar, N. (2019). Ayet ve Hadislerin Siyasi Kavramların Açıklanmasındaki Önemi: Siyasetnâmelerden Yansımalar. *Cumhuriyet İlahiyat Dergisi*, *23*(2), 891-909.