

DEPÓSITO LEGAL ZU2020000153
*Esta publicación científica en formato digital
es continuidad de la revista impresa*
ISSN 0041-8811
E-ISSN 2665-0428

Revista de la Universidad del Zulia

Fundada en 1947
por el Dr. Jesús Enrique Lossada



Ciencias de la Educación

NÚMERO ESPECIAL

Año 12 N° 35
Noviembre - 2021
Tercera Época
Maracaibo-Venezuela

A Comparative Study of Hobbes and Nizam Al Mulk Tusi on the Idea of Authoritarian State

Mehdi Masoudi Ashtiyani *
Maghsood Ranjbar **
Darab Foolady ***

ABSTRACT

Man is a social being that always needs the contribution and help of other humans for survival. On the other hand, due to the difference of opinions, tastes, interests and objectives, they have conflicts with each other. Then, they assault each other in order to protect their personal interests and sometimes this hostility endangers the existence and health of the person and in some cases the survival of the society. This is why we need some laws to guard the society and ensure the survival of mankind and protect the rights of all individuals. These laws will put an end to the conflicts and differences and this is of course possible within a framework. Accordingly, given the importance and place of the problem of governance and its related issues including the ruler, people and law, as the most important concern of the political thinkers, the current essay seeks to study the political thought of Khajeh Nizam Al Mulk Tusi and Hobbes and the foundations of their political ideas and compare the place of the ruler, people and law in the political thought of these philosophers.

KEY WORDS: Authoritarian State; ruler; Thomas Hobbes; Khajeh Niza Al Mulk.

* Ph.D, Department of Political Science - Political Thought, Ashtiyani Branch , Islamic Azad University, Ashtiyani, Iran.

** Faculty of Islamic Azad University of Qom Branch, Qom, Iran.

*** Faculty of Islamic Azad University of Ashtiyani Branch, Ashtiyani, Iran.

Recibido: 05/05/2021

Aceptado: 01/07/2021

Un estudio comparativo de Hobbes y Nizam Al Mulk Tusi sobre la idea del Estado autoritario

ABSTRACT

El hombre es un ser social que siempre necesita la contribución y ayuda de otros humanos para sobrevivir. Por otro lado, debido a la diferencia de opiniones, gustos, intereses y objetivos, tienen conflictos entre sí. Luego, se atacan entre sí con el fin de proteger sus intereses personales y en ocasiones esta hostilidad pone en peligro la existencia y la salud de la persona y en algunos casos la supervivencia de la sociedad. Es por eso que necesitamos algunas leyes para proteger la sociedad y asegurar la supervivencia de la humanidad y proteger los derechos de todas las personas. Estas leyes pondrán fin a los conflictos y las diferencias y, por supuesto, esto es posible dentro de un marco. En consecuencia, dada la importancia y el lugar del problema de la gobernanza y sus temas relacionados, incluidos el gobernante, el pueblo y la ley, como la preocupación más importante de los pensadores políticos, el ensayo actual busca estudiar el pensamiento político de Khajeh Nizam Al Mulk Tusi y Hobbes y los fundamentos de sus ideas políticas y comparar el lugar del gobernante, el pueblo y la ley en el pensamiento político de estos filósofos.

PALABRAS CLAVES: Estado autoritario; gobernante; Thomas Hobbes; Khajeh Niza Al Mulk.

Introduction

Humans are in conflict with each other due to their difference in opinions, tastes, interests and objectives. Then, they assault each other in order to protect their own interests. To this end, for survival of the society and the mankind, we need some laws that would protect the rights of all individuals in the society and in some conditions these laws could serve as a means for put an end to the conflicts and differences. Thus, thinkers since the time immemorial have offered their political ideas within the framework of a branch of practical philosophy better known as the politics or the art of management of society. They have also developed theories of the foundations and principles of power and government, tasks and characteristics of the rulers, place of people as well as the issue of laws governing their relations. In every political system and constructive ideas emerged from it, there is an independent and specific perspective of man, world, society and the relations that have formed them. It is based on this perspective that intellectual principles of an era can be analyzed and systematized. On the one hand, various theories of political system based on the notions that are considered in this study (ruler, people

and law), define different structure and function for Islamic state. The first reason of this difference is the type of view of the thinkers of the key issues of politics and governance. This in turn has its origin in their culture and the social norms according to which they have lived. Generally speaking, they are influenced by the social, moral and political conditions of the society. The other problem lies in the different views of key notions of politics and political thought and philosophy like ruler, people and law. These notions are ensnared by tendencies and needs, wishes, conceptions and human mental backgrounds which are rooted in culture and civilization and have been raised in their particular temporal and spatial forms and particularly in the era of the two thinkers considered in the current study (Hobbes and Khajeh Nizam Al Mulk Tusi).

Most Muslim thinkers believe that one of the basic features of ruling is absolute governance is exclusively for God (Tabatabaei, 1993: 71, 90). On the other hand, problem of governance and its related notions (as the subject-matter of the present study), have made a considerable part of the political thought particularly the realist philosophers focused on themselves including Hobbes who has discussed this problem based on his own particular methodology, philosophy and linguistic, temporal, spatial and cultural conditions. The status of Hobbes in current texts of philosophy and politics and society is influential and high because he has explained the most key discussion of political philosophy and politics, i.e. power and state, in a systematic and comprehensive way (Yunisi and Akbari, 2015: 93). Based on the geometrical method and totality of his political ideas, Hobbes has founded a systematic science the very foundation of which is grounded in human will and reason. This Hobbesian initiative turned him to the founder and pioneer of modern political philosophy. Hobbes contends that political society and government is the result of neither the realization of the Divine providence and will nor the cultivation of virtue in individuals, rather he considers them to be grounded just in the personal interests and expediency of humans. On the other hand, Abu Ali Hassan Ibn Ali Ibn Eshaq Tusi better known as Khajeh Nizam Ali Mulk Tusi, as one of the renowned Iranian Muslim ministers due to his colorful role in Seljuqi government, special religious attachments, special view of caliphate and his interested denomination, his specific relations in Abbasid caliphate and returning to Iranian traditions in Islamic state, can be considered as one of the

most significant political theorists and perhaps the most prominent one in the field of power and governance in Seljuqi era. Political thinkers like Khajeh Nizam Al Mulk who were the protectors of the heritage of Iranian tradition and the institution of ministry sought to design a system via their practical and realist techniques which they had learned from Iranian-Islamic heritage and tested by experience in which consultation, justice and construction of Iran is of paramount importance (Eslami and Khajeh Sarvi, 2013: 2). Accordingly, given the importance and place of the problem of governance and its related issues including the ruler, people and law as the most important concern of the political thinkers the current essay seeks to study the political ideas of Khajeh Nizam Al Mulk Tusi and Hobbes, and the foundations of these ideas, and then compare the place of ruler, people and law in the political thought of Hobbes and Khajeh Nizam Al Mulk Tusi.

1. Theoretical Foundations

1.1. Politico-social Conditions of Hobbes' Era

At the beginning of the sixteenth century, Spain established an Empirical system in Europe and through military propaganda and under the pretext of "Ottoman Threat". In practice, Spain in this way had dominated a considerable part of the continent. Political and intellectual activity for understanding of the logic and nature of such a policy led to the emergence of a new series of political writings in this era. Translation of ancient works was flourishing and this had also been influenced the political literature. Political scientists of this era sought for their patterns in ancient political thinkers like Cicero and Seneca and their source of inspiration was the ideal of political virtue in past masters. The changed conditions of life in modern age not only had discredited the maxims of traditional ethics rather casted serious doubts of the validity of the moral tasks (de landtsheer, 1999: 217-238).

The precious experience that was the result of the futile religious wars led to the acquisition of this vision in the European countries that despite unresolvable differences and disputes in their worldviews they should live together in peace. In late sixteenth century, many works of the ancient skepticists and stoicists were used and skepticist ideas were completely popular. They thought that if man faces a dilemma for making decision that is critical for his existence, he should immediately give priority to his own existence (Tuck, 1998: 19-22). This

idea of “self-preservation” [Conatus] turned to a central notion in the political philosophy of Thomas Hobbes. In early years of the seventeenth century, the major catastrophe in England was the internal disputes of the constitution and the role of parliament before the king. Civil war was the main incentive of Hobbes for systematic reflections on the nature of power and the place of government and political conditions that are embodied in his writings (Hobbes, 2006: 14). According to Hobbes, difference of religious sects not only has had grave consequences as regards the theological problems rather in their interferences in political affairs (Hobbes,2006:28).

1.2. Foundations of Political Thought of Thomas Hobbes

Human picture by Hobbes: Some Hobbes scholars have underlined the importance of the first part of Leviathan that is devoted to the anthropologic discussions and described it as the basis of his political philosophy (laubach,1998: 83). Man for Hobbes is no more than an animal. Like Aristotle, Hobbes seeks for the special difference of man with other living creatures in human reason. However, contrary to Aristotle, Hobbes believes that man makes use of this reason as a means for satisfaction of his own instincts (Hobbes,2006: 75). Hobbes identifies three main causes for conflict in human nature: first, competition, second, lack of confidence and third, acquisition of fame (hobbes,2006 ,96). For Thomas Hobbes, human effort for power has turned to a central point in political theory and question of formation of political system first and foremost represents the question of the correct way of the use of power.

State of Nature: Hobbes defines “natural right” based on human freedom for preservation of his own life relying his power. In his political theory, Hobbes seeks to offer an argument of the necessity of the existence of government. “State of Nature” for him is the opposite pole of “State of Society” in which a regulating power governs .“Natural Law” is a general necessity that has its origin in human vision and his autonomous reason. In “State of Nature”, man is entangled in a deadend: on the one hand, an unconditional freedom and instinctual power persuades him to preserve himself in his struggle for acquisition of power and on the other hand, he is continuously grappling with the anxiety and fear of a violent death resulted from the state of war of all against all. This critical state renders the establishment of a government necessary for mankind .

The objectives of Hobbes from raising the concept of social contract: The objectives that Hobbes seeks to achieve through raising the concept of social contract can be summarized in three categories: 1- Security: In *Leviathan*, Hobbes argues that the main function of the government is protection of *salus populi public security*” (Bashiryah,2003: 71). This is more understandable in view of the era in which Hobbes lived (Qaragozlu, 2008: 443). Hobbes believed that the only solution for putting an end to these conflicts is establishing an authoritarian regime that ensures the security of the citizens of the society (Tuc, 2000: 95); 2- Ownership: thus, according to Hobbes, in State of Nature due to the lack of a government, we cannot have a notion of the existence of ownership. “The ownership laws must be wholly decided by the ruling body because in the State of Nature there is no ownership and then, ownership is a creature of the government and the latter can supervise its creation as its wants” (Russell, 1990: 109); 3- presentation of a rational definition for establishing government instead of the emphasis on the natural law with divine will: relying on the theory of social contract Hobbes considers the will of individuals as the basis of the formation of governments. Each one of the individuals by resigning their natural right in order to reach their intended objecties proceed to found a government (Uzar, 2010: 57). Hobbes sought to analyze the government as a system that has a rational justification. Individuals should follow this system not in a passive form rather in active way. They have to consider such information intelligible (Puladi, 2007: 39). By raising the theory of social contract, Hobbes struggled to fulfil the following objectives: A) Laying the groundworks of political and moral philosophy for the first time based on a scientific basis; B) Participation in establishing social peace and good will for setting the scene for the accomplishment of their social task” (Strauss, 1986: 396).

Liberalist roots of Thomas Hobbes' Thought: “Hobbes' idea of the doctrine of social contract and the mechanism of the evolution of the government is one of the most important liberalist grounds of his thought. One should take even a further step and state that his vision of the category of government and contract is one of the significant sources of liberalism. He should be considered as one of the founding fathers of liberalism” (Kadiwar, 2007: 93). One of the principles of liberalism is the emphasis on rationality and the principle of wisdom. The roots of this principle of the school of liberalism can be sought for in Hobbes' insistence on decision

making of individuals living in the State of Nature for saving themselves from it (Bashiryah , 2003: 46). Hobbes believes that “individuals are equal and freedom is the natural right of every individual. Free individuals with their vote create a government that is supposed to protect their interests” (bashiryah, 2003: 83). On the other hand, Hobbes should be considered an individualist. He regards the society to be an individualist. He describes the society as a whole composed of individuals the basis of which is the conclusion of an agreement or treaty with the human individuals and it is supposed to serve them as a means in order to fulfil their intended goals. Thus, “Hobbes believes that a liberal society is a society that has been designed to allow every individual to pursue his plans as long as they are not in conflict with the law” (Feldman, 2001: 19).

Thomas Hobbes on Justice: We can speak of being just or unjust only when a contract has been already concluded among the individuals in the human society. This Hobbesian notion of justice can be inferred from his third natural law. According to Hobbes, justice is meaningful when there is a contract among the individuals and action or refusal of action according to the content of this contract is taken to be the measure of the justice.

1.3. Life and Politico-Social Era

Qaderi compares him with Baramakeh and considers him to be among the distinguished figures who was equally involved in practical politics and political action (Qaderi, 2013: 122). The solution and theory offered by Khajeh for construction of this new form was reflected in his valuable work “Book of Politics”. Book of Politics was a political statement of this unity and its theoretical and practical program the goal of which was the renovation of the ancient structures of ruling in Persian City State in Islamic era and domination of the Turkish slaves (Tabatabaei, 1996: 75).

Book of Politics or Syar Al Muluk is considered to be the most fundamental writing of Nizam Al Mulk in transition of the political thought of Persian City State to Islamic era (Tabatabaei, 2006: 1). He was the powerful minister of Alp Arsalan and Malek Shah Seljuqi for thirty years (Ghazali, 1972: 183). In the life of Khajeh during his ministry of Alp Arsalan one sees a black point that, in the words of Tabatabaei, is in conflict with Khajeh’s views of the illegality of killing the companions of King and taking advantage of their services (Tabatabaei, 1996: 21).

This issue is related to the removal and then assassination of Amid Al Mulk Kundri the minister of Alp Arsalan (Zahir Al Din Neishaburi, 1953: 23). Khajeh at the beginning of the ministry of Alp Arsalan was honored by the title of Nizam Al Mulk (Ravandi, 1985: 127; Basorth, 2013: 62-5). Nizam Al Mulk during the ministry of Alp Arsalan by his satisfaction succeeded to establish the Nizamyah schools that later became a global phenomenon (Minovi, 1988; Bandari Isfahani, 1978). After the murder of Alp Arsalan in 996 AD his crown prince Malekshah Seljuqi took the throne and he reappointed Khajeh Nizam Al Mulk as the head of ministry. Nizam Al Mulk was stabbed and assassinated by one of the Esmaeili fanatics on Saturday, October 20, 1092 during the third expedition of Malekshah to Baghdad in Nahavand (Beihaqi, 1982: 76).

1.4. Foundations of Political Thought of Khajeh Nizam Al Mulk Tusi

Source of Power: First important point as regards the presentation of the institution of monarchy by Nizam Al Mulk is that he shrewdly does not refer to Caliph as the head of Islamic community and does not speak of the religious relations between the Seljuqi ruler and Abbasid caliph. Apparently, since its very inception Khajeh has taken it for granted that the main source from which Shah acquires his power in theory and practice is not the institution of caliphate. Rather the monarch acquires the right to rule his servants upon the divine confirmation (Sharif, 1991: 228-229). Many of the most fundamental stories of the Book of Politics through which Khajeh has raised his ideas are related to the Persian kings including Behran, Gour, Just Anooshirvan, Afridoon, Ardashir and others. Of course, Khajeh intends not to allow the idea of caliphate to be traced back to the dawn of Islam and he introduces the monarchical system of Ancient Persia as the unique pattern of political power to the caliphate (Tabatabaei, 2007: 24 and 25). The main task of the Shah in the society is the establishment of order instead of chaos and creation of peace and justice. Nizam Al Mulk adopts a monarchical stance as to the description of the nature of political power and by referring to the divine origin and inheritance based selection of the monarch does not pay any attention to the people's choice and in one sense he prescribes the authoritarianism in society.

The relationship between the king and people: Among other political theories of Nizam Al Mulk one can refer to his idea of the relationship between the king and the people. As previously mentioned, the basis of the political analysis of Book of Politics is the ideal monarchy

of the Persian city state. The king is chosen by God and the first feature of such a king is justice which is a royal quality. He considers the just king to be the owner of the divine stature, on the one hand, and writes: “But since the king has a divine status, if he has sufficient epistemic capability he will be prosperous in both worlds” (pulad,2007, 89). On the other hand, he compares the king with the headman of the world: “And the Sultan is the headman of the whole world and all the kings are his servants” (puladi:2007, 195). With such a comparison, the difference between the divinely vested king and the Sultan is lifted and with an even intensified legitimacy which is given to the caliphate and monarchy, it becomes even more established (puladi:2007, 15).

Justice: As to the ideal king, Khajeh insists on two major points: one of them is the observation of justice while the other is paying attention to religion and religiosity. The idea of simultaneity of religion and kingdom is traced back to Ancient Persia (Mansoori and Ghulami, 2011: 65). Khajeh believes that the kingdom does not continue to exist unless via the administration of justice: “Since the time immemorial, from the time of Adam up until the present time, in every relation and every land the priority has been given to the justice and fairness and people have sought to keep their own family in power for several years” (Mansoori and Ghulami, 2011,65).

Security: In Khajeh’s monarchical system, security is more grounded in the king as a person not in law and people. Since then many places in Iran have been invaded for several times and in these conditions Khajeh considered the security to be a necessity for the country. This security necessarily leads the king to the observation of law and creation of order and justice although frequent insistence of Khajeh on the observation of equality and lawfulness here is a strategy not a theme and the apex of the pyramid for preservation and establishment of the power has no way but forcing these hardships (Tabatabaei,1996,46).

Grounding Virtues and Sharia in Expediency: Khajeh did not approach politics from the point of departure of religion rather politics was indeed the science of power (statesmanship). In Book of Politics, Khajeh Nizam Al Mulk does not underline the role of Sharia rather he focuses on Sultan and Persianism (Mansoori and Ghulami, 2011). It seems that Khajeh instead of being in search of religionization of Seljuqi system was more devoted to Persianization of them.

According to Khajeh, the only consistent political thought is the politics of Persian city state (Tabatabaei, 2006: 95).

Divine Theory of Iranshahri (Persian City State): The theoretical foundation of Book of Politics contrary to the idea of Persian City State is an ideal monarchy. In this theory, the king, contrary to caliph and Imam – who are chosen either by previous Imam or by way of the vows of the elites – is the one chosen by God and has a Royal Glory” (Tabatabaei, 2006: 85). Given the content of parts of Book of Politics, one can claim that Khajeh Nizam Al Mulk has generalized the divine theory of royal kingdom to some of the caliphs and kings of Islamic era and this generalization instead of being originated in the ideological tendency of Khajeh or Seljuqi interest in Islamic doctrines is more an interpretation based on the political realism and an effort for attraction of the view of the ruling Sultan insofar as Khajeh writes: “They are willing to make permissible ten forbidden acts and trespass ten rights for the sake of one Haram Dinar without thinking of the afterlife” (Tabatabaei, 2006: 86).

1.5. Research Background

“State and Government in Medieval Islam” is a work by Lambton (2000). In this book the author provides a review of the political theories of Muslim jurists – from the dawn of Islam to late twelfth century – on state and government in Islam. He has also studied the influence of environmental, social and political factors on the formation and evolution of the thought of Muslims. In “Political Thought in Islam and Iran” by Hatam Qaderi (2013) the author discusses the history of political thoughts in Islam and Iran from the inception of the caliphate in Islam to contemporary era. In the current essay we have taken advantage of the second part of the latter book that is concerning the political thought of Sunni scholars including Khajeh Nizam Al Mulk to whom one independent chapter has been devoted in order to show the most important aspects of the political ideas of Khajeh including his theory of Persian city state.

Barry Hinds (2001) in a book entitled “Power Discourses: From Hobbes to Foucault” translated by Mostafa Yunisi into Persian has discussed the concept of power from the point of view of Hobbes in the second chapter. He believes that Hobbes has traced the roots of power back to people because in fact power to rule is originated from the resignation of the natural right of people to the ruling body. Hossein Bashiryah (1990) in an article titled “Basic Problems

in Political Philosophy” discusses the idea of political philosophy and offers a comparative study of the ideas of John Locke, Karl Marx, Aristotle and also Hobbes on human nature and contends that depending on the idea that is developed by these philosophers of human nature, their views regarding the government and its founding pillars and also the relationship between the ruler and people vary.

2. Place of Ruler, People and Law in Political Thought of Thomas Hobbes

2.1. Role and Place of Ruler in the Thought of Hobbes

According to Hobbes, everything and everyone are subordinated to the will of the ruler and the most important source of the legitimacy in the society is the ruler who has undertaken the power based on the social contract (Golafshan and Watheq, 2016: 181). In fact, Hobbes believes that the most important goal of the constitution of government is creation of order and security in society. Though this goal is acquired only via divesting citizens of their individual freedoms, it is still desirable (Hobbes, 2006: 189, 193). Hobbes believes that the most important source of legitimacy for the ruler is the public consensus. Thus, as long as the ruler provides the people's need for peace, this legitimacy lasts (Golafshan and Watheq, 2016: 183).

The social contract as the basis of formation of governance: If people insist on living always in “State of Nature” where the state of war and insecurity prevails, such a state cannot last. Then, to put an end to the war and insecurity and ensure human existence, the society based on a type of peace and coexistence takes form. This peace is established based on an agreement among the people and is called “Social Contract” (Hobbes, 2006: 38-41). In fact, the most important basis and element in the formation of social contract and society is State of Nature in which absolute insecurity prevails (Hobbes, 2006: 160-162). Based on Hobbesian theory of social contract, the ruler is not a party to the contract, rather he is the result of the social contract.

The Ideal Government: Hobbes concludes that the best type of government is a government in which the sovereign power is at the hand of the absolute sovereign. According to Hobbes, power surrender to the government should be absolute and irreversible and unconditional (Sabzewari, 2007: 74-75). In other words, the best type of government is monarchy (rule of one person) because the glory and honor of the King is the same by all servants. He offers five reasons for choosing monarchy as the noblest form of governance that

could be summarized as follows: 1) interests of the absolute sovereign are in line with the people; 2) the sovereign shares his secrets just with himself and can take more powerful decisions than others; 3) monarchy is more consistent than democracy because one mind is guiding the society; 4) the possibility of civil war declines to the minimum because the sovereign cannot defy himself; 5) in monarchy the division of power is not possible (Hobbes, 2014: 201-205). Since in political philosophy of Hobbes the society must accept two alternative states of anarchism and monarchy, the latter is the best possible choice as compared to the state of nature and chaos .

Good Intention and Sovereign: According to Hobbes, necessity of the ruler and government is neither the administration of the divine providence nor the cultivation of virtue in individuals rather it is providing the individual interests not the “public expediency”. The most important expediency in the thought of Hobbes that serves human interest is saving the man from the State of Nature and giving the sense of security to him (Hobbes, 2006: 237). In fact, Hobbes believes that “personal interest” is the basis of the organized society and “personal interest” in the selfish sense rules the organized society as much as the State of War (Copleston, 1991, vol. 5: 60).

2.2. Ideal Government

Thomas Hobbes insists on the absolute sovereignty and is one of the most influential theoreticians of this idea. In his intellectual system, he has sought to prove the necessity of monarchy via political reasons and arguments. Then, to prove this idea he has offered different reasons among which five reasons underline the superiority of the absolute sovereignty while six more reasons highlight the tasks of the sovereign.

Hobbes defends the necessity of security in society and believes that the best form of government is monarchy because the honor and value of the king is in line with the servants. Monarchical system is magnificent when the subjects are not poor, humiliated and in war with each other. Moreover, the king due to having access to the professional consults takes better decisions than the democratic governments because the king is free to consult with whoever he wants in whichever time or place he prefers. However, in aristocracy or democracy, advice is always expected to be provided by a number of power-thirsty and wealthy people. Furthermore, in monarchy the sovereign can hold his decision as a secret until its implementation in

confidential way and in most cases he has more knowledge in the field of statesmanship. He justifies monarchy by referring to five reasons as follows: 1) interests of the absolute sovereign are in line with the people; 2) the sovereign shares his secrets just with himself and can take more powerful decisions than others; 3) monarchy is more consistent than democracy because one mind is guiding the society; 4) the possibility of civil war declines to the minimum because the sovereign cannot defy himself; 5) in monarchy the division of power is not possible (Hobbes, 2014: 201-205).

According to Hobbes in his *Leviathan*, monarchy is emphasized because “in authoritarian governments the sovereign is taken to be the perfect and absolute power in one land and all affairs of the country are in the hands of the king. In this type of government, governance is infinite, irremovable and inseparable. In this form of government, all authorities related to legislation, interpretation of law, administration of laws, judgment of the punishment of the violators of the laws, tax collection, military guidance and leadership, and even control of the norms governing the society are in the hand of the sovereign. All these authorities are inseparable part of the rights of the sovereign and if one of these authorities of the King is taken away the function and efficiency of the sovereign will decline in other areas. The law is the same judgment of the sovereign and the people do not have the right to revolt and criticize against the sovereign; the opposition minority have to either surrender or vanish” (Karimi, Fathi, 2017: 148). According to Hobbes, authoritarianism is necessary for realization of an ideal society. Hobbes considers the church to be a function of the government and he has devoted a considerable part of *Leviathan* to religious issues and church in order to defend Erastianism.

Therefore, since in Hobbesian political philosophy the society has to decide to surrender to either to anarchism (chaos) or totalitarianism for escaping from the return to State of Nature the best solution is monarchy in which the peace and security before all internal and foreign threats are ensured by the sovereign. What protects the sovereign is the radical and ruthless denial of all wrong doctrines that result in mutiny; the sovereign's existence does not allow such an atmosphere to be created. Thus, he is a totalitarian ruler (Karimi, Fathi, 2017: 292). The sovereign has the right to censure every type of belief because several voices in the society are the source of corruption. Hobbes based on his own political philosophy prefers such factors as

peace and security over against educational ideals and freedom. He never believes in the possibility of establishing a democratic condition. The relationship between the sovereign and people can be considered as a type of the mutual relationship of servitude and mastery. In this system, people follow the orders of the king and the latter devotes himself to the protection and security of these people. In fact, the goal of social contract, in which the power is surrendered to the king consists of ensuring peace, security and putting an end to the unending political disputes and civil wars (Karimi and Fathi, 2017: 149).

Hobbes has answered some criticisms of the absolute power of the sovereign. The most real objection that could be raised is that we should not expect people (who are essentially avaricious and motivated) to tolerate the state of lack of power. The answer of Hobbes is that the greatest problem in every form of government that can haunt people is the catastrophic events that occur with civil war. Moreover, the rulers have different missions. The task of the sovereign is providing people's security and the latter does not merely refer to the protection of life rather it is concerned with all joys and pleasures of the life which should be acquired by everyone via lawful personal efforts without creating any danger or harm for the country. Here Hobbes does not refer to the welfare state rather he is speaking of a completely individualist condition. The task of the ruler is providing certain conditions in which everyone can take full advantage of his own right of ownership (Hobbes, 2006: 43).

3. Place of Ruler, People and Law in the Political Thought of Khajeh Nizam Al Mulk

3.1. Role and Place of Ruler in the Political Thought of Khajeh Nizam Al Mulk

According to Khajeh, structure of political power is constituted of four angles: God, King, Religion and Subject. God is the absolute Owner and Sultan of the world and the world people who in some cases He vests one of His servants with the power to rule the subjects based on justice, fairness and religion revealed by Him. He is indeed the administrator of divine ordinances and injunctions and serves as a bridge between people and and Divine Will.

Khajeh describes the sovereign as the chosen representative of God in order to explain the source of his power. In the first chapter of his Book of Politics entitled "On People and Time and Praise of World Ruler Malekshah Seljuqi", Khajeh writes: "God in every era and age chooses

someone from among his people and equips him with the royal arts and assigns the affairs of the servants to him and orders him to put an end to the corruption and rule people based on justice and protect public security” (Tabatabaei,1996: 35). One should asset that this idea that Sultan is the protector of religion and realm has its origin in Ancient Persia and Khajeh by referring to this idea seeks to justify the reality that the security of religion and realm depends on the security of Sultan (Tabatabaei ,1996,124). By insisting on the idea of divine providence and belief in determinism in the world affairs including the divine source of the political manager of the time, i.e. Malekshah Seljuqi, and describes them as a measure for evaluation of the political behavior of the previous kings of Iran (Tabatabaei ,1996: 13). In the thought of Khajeh, the sovereign has an authority that he has received from God: “Divine God has chosen the King as the ruler of the people across the world who praise him ... These subjects just observe the orders of their ruler” (Tabatabaei ,1996: 139). In fact, Khajeh Nizam Al Mulk intends to isolate the role and place of people against the ruler and by referring to the Islamic foundations to secure the foundation of authoritarian rule of the Sultan more than before.

“This relationship is considered to be identical with justice and social order, security and stability. In line with this notion, the oppression of the subject means the refusal of following the orders of the king and this leads to the collapse of stability and security. Although the oppression of the sovereign is needed in the time of necessity and increases the power and paves the path for security and stability, with such a logic, security would never take form in its positive sense” (Ranjbar, 2006: 93).

Justice as conceived by Nizam Al Mulk is a radiation of mercy and compassion that the King has for the subjects. It seems that justice is a favor that is done by the ruler for the subject not a political and divine obligation the origin of which is people’s rights (Hedayati, 1999: 225). Khajeh Nizam Al Mulk understands the security of the society under the banner of Shah the one whom God has undoubtedly chosen. In monarchical system of Khajeh, security is more relying on the King not on the law and people.

In the Book of Politics, he has raised principles that can play a key role in explanation of the role and place of the sovereign. The most important ones of these principles consist of: Principle One, Khajeh believes that the ruler does not necessarily need to be intelligent; rather even a mediocre man can be effective. Principle Two. Giving different jobs to individuals based on their capability and merits and not based on relations and friendship; because good service is

contingent upon sufficient information on behalf of the ruler of the efficient and working forces. Principle Three. Never anyone should be vested with one more job; because his capability is limited and by accepting more than one job his weaknesses will be justified by irrelevant matter like busy agenda. Principle Four. Individuals must be given positions in different areas and people's long term stay in one job causes them to act passively and show no creativity and would treat the subjects cruelly. Principle Five. To establish a relationship with the people the sovereign must choose responsible people so that if it is necessary the responsible man is impeached (Azad Armaki, 1998: 49-50).

In fact, Khajeh Nizam Al Mul considers the existence of the ruler as the most important basis of social security because he is certainly the man chosen by God. He enumerates the tasks of the sovereign as follows: "... God makes him the source of peace and security of the subjects and puts an end to the corruption and deviation by him ..." (Tabatabayi, 1996: 23). In a system which is relying on the individual will, security is based on the individual not the law. The ruler is the manifestation of security (Hedayati, 1999: 225).

In his Book of Politics, Khajeh has outlined a set of principles that can help us to explain the role and place of the ruler including:

- 1) Principle One: Sovereign is not required to be intelligent rather even a mediocre person can be effective.
- 2) Principle Two. Giving positions to people based on their merits not based on the family relations and friendship because only with professional staff the ruler would succeed.
- 3) Principle Three. Never someone should be given more than one position because his capability is limited and by accepting more than one job he would justify his failure of accomplishing his own tasks with overloading.
- 4) Principle Four. People must be used in different positions in a periodical basis in order to avoid stagnation and oppression.
- 5) Principle Five. Ruler must choose committed people in order to serve the people in a more responsible way (Azad Armaki, 1998: 49-50).

Given the content of parts of Book of Politics, one can claim that Khajeh Nizam Al Mulk has generalized the divine theory of royal kingdom to some of the caliphs and kings of Islamic

era and this generalization instead of being originated in the ideological tendency of Khajeh or Seljuqi interest in Islamic doctrines is more an interpretation based on the political realism and an effort for attraction of the view of the ruling Sultan.

Last but not the least, it should not be forgotten that in his words Khajeh advises the King to listen to the consults because consultation strengthens his opinion and taste. Moreover, consultation helps the King not to become ensnared by egotism and hasty action both of which will be regretful. Khajeh introduces people like the religious scholar as the advisors for the Shah and notes that the latter should accept every week one or two scholars and listen to their advices as regards the permissible and impermissible, interpretation of Quran, Prophetic traditions and have dialogues with them. Khajeh believes that when the Prophet who was informed of the revelation was after advisors why a King should consider himself to be needless of advice and its benefits (Tabatabaei, 1993: 81, 124).

3.2. Relations between King, People and Law

Among the other political ideas of Nizam Al Mulk, one can refer to his views of the relations between the King and the people. He considers the just king to own divine glory on the one hand and writes: "But since the King has a divine glory if he takes advantage of knowledge he can be prosperous both in this world and the other world" (Tabatabaei, 1993:96, 124). On the other hand, he compares the king with the headman of the world: "And the Sultan is the headman of the whole world and all the kings are his servants" (ibid: 195). With such a comparison, the difference between the divinely vested king and the Sultan is lifted and with an even intensified legitimacy which is given to the caliphate and monarchy, it becomes even more established (Tabatabaei, 1993: 81, 124). It seems that Khajeh instead of being in search of religionization of Seljuqi system was more devoted to Persianization of them. According to Khajeh, the only consistent political thought is the politics of Persian city state (Tabatabaei, 2006: 95). Khajeh believes that the King should not issue continuous orders in different areas, because in this case the value and stature of monarchical orders break and the deterrence effect that is expected from the royal judgment for the wrong doers and oppressors would lose its function. One of the tasks of the court staff is their role in execution of an order or addressing an improper situation (Tabatabaei, 1993: 97, 124,).

Khajeh Nizam by underlining the divine right of throne strengthens the basis of authoritarianism. It is God who chooses the king not the people. Likewise, it is God who vests him with the royal arts, then he does not need the acquisition of the statesmanship. Thus, a person like Sultan Sanjar Seljuqi without having the literacy of writing and reading by relying on the idea that God has chosen him as the king rules the country for more than forty years and issues every order that he considers necessary and no one dares to object (Halabi, 1989: 217-218).

Conclusion

One can conclude that Hobbes has developed his thought based on the Social Contract while one of the key features of the political thought of Khajeh Nizam Al Mulk is that he has sought to pay attention to the Persian theory of monarchy before the dawn of Islam and combine it with the idea of caliphate. The words and behavior of Khajeh together suggest that they do not have their origin in religiosity rather are based on political analysis and approach. By distinguishing between the religious and moral roots of power, Hobbes established the foundations of the formation of modern power based on analytic and empirical bases. Thus, he considered the political power to be something that should be established and is of a totally human nature not a divinely grounded phenomenon. He believes that ruling government has not been designed to stop the competition between humans in their businesses rather they are supposed to ensure this way of life. The only cost that people should have paid is the necessity of observation of the laws set by the ruler. Hobbes justifies the notion of social contract by stating that if a wise man encounters the state of nature he would immediately reach the conclusion that he must leave his rights along with other individuals in the society. Of course, this requires to be handled based on an agreement or contract according to which all human individuals accept to surrender their rights but this agreement will not work because since the humans are avaricious some of them might seek to retain their right due to some considerations. Here there should be a person whose existence gives meaning to surrender of the individual rights and makes it binding. The contracts without swords are mere words and do not ensure the security of anyone. The person or a body of persons to whom the rights are resigned represent the ruler. Making the decision about the scope of power of the sovereign is upon the

latter himself because without it the sovereign cannot have sufficient power for implementation of contract and protection of peace. The message of Hobbes for his contemporaries was that if they do not assert their full obedience to the sovereign they will be exposed to the danger of falling into the state of nature. Therefore, they must accept their full loyalty and commitment to the sovereign based on their own interests. Hobbes wanted to show his contemporaries that what they should do for establishing a relatively more complete political society that will be immune to internal chaos forever?: acceptance of authoritarianism.

According to Hobbesian political philosophy, as soon as the King reaches the throne he has absolute power. The minority opposition should either surrender or leave the battle ground. Then, whatever sovereign does is just because just behavior consists of the behavior based on the law and since the king adopts the laws whatever he does is identical with the law. The king has an absolute right for observation of all beliefs. The King is not only the legislator rather he is also the source of dispute resolution as regards the inconsistent laws.

Although Khajeh considers the King to be a creature who only follows the prescripts of the God and in his Kingdom does not require the guidance of others particularly the caliph, he does not show any interest in authoritarian monarchy rather the king in his eyes is a simple human creature with human features like bravery, good belief and righteous ethics whose statesmanship is supposed to be based on the Sharia. In fact, the king must rule the people based on their religious belief but the people do not play any role in his reaching to this position; because according to Khajeh, in the same way that Anoshirvan the Sassanid King owed his crown and throne to the God as well as the heritage of the father and sword, reaching the position of King is contingent upon the divine compassion, inheritance and powerful arms. Of course, the king is not chosen by the people but the people need to follow him due the effort that the Shah makes for establishing peace. However, if the peace leaves the society and the land becomes ensnared by chaos the people are still required to follow the orders of their sovereign. In the monarchical system drawn by Khajeh, security is more based on the the sovereign in person not on the law and people. However, Hobbes believed that the only way for putting an end to the conflicts is creation of an absolute authoritarian system in order to provide the security of citizens in the society.

References

- Ann Lambton (1993). *Continuance and change in Iran's middle age history*. Translated by Yagoub Azhand, Tehran: Nei pub.
- Azad Armaki, *Social thought of Muslims from Nizam al-Mulk Tusi to Motahhari*, Academic Center for Education, Culture and Research
- Bandari Isfahani (1978). *History of Seljuqi dynasty*, trans. Mohammad Hossein Jalili, Tehran: Foundation of Iranian Culture.
- Bashiryah, Hossein (2003). *Reason in Politics: Thirty Five Essays on philosophy, sociology and political development*, Tehran, Negah Moaser.
- Basorth, Edmund (2013). *Political history of Iran*, Cambridge history of Iran, vol. 5, edited by A. Boil, trans. Hossein Anoosheh, Tehran, Amirkabir, Eleventh Edition.
- Beihaqi, Abulfazl (2004). *Beihaqi history*, edited by Ali Akbar Fayyaz, Mashhad: Ferdowsi University of Mashhad Press.
- Beyhaqi, Abolfazl (2004), *Tārīkh-i Bayhaqī*, Edited by Ali Akbar Fayyaz, Mashhad: Ferdowsi University pub.
- Copleston, Fredrick (1991). *History of Philosophy*, trans. Amir Jalal Al Din Alam, Tehran, Soroush, second edition, 1991.
- De Landtsheer, J. (1999). *Justus Lipsius (1547-1606) and Lucius Annaeus Seneca*, *Annales Societatis Litterarum Humaniorum Regiae Upsaliensis*, 217-238
- Eslami, Rouhollah; Khajeh Sarvari Gholamreza. (2013). *Power technologies in Siyāsatnāmeḥ by Nizam al-Mulk*, *Strategic research of politics*, period 1, No 4, spring.
- Feldman, I (2001). *Freedman as motion*, University Press of America.
- Feldman, I. (2001). *Freedmon as motion*, University Press of America.
- Ghazali, Abu Hame (1972). *Nasiha Al Muluk*, Tehran, Parliament Press.
- Golafshan, Atefeh, Mahmoud Watheq (2016). *A study of the role of philosophical ideas in geopolitics (case study of geopolitics in the thought of Thomas Hobbes)*, *Journal of Geopolitics*, year one, no. 1, Spring 2016.
- Halabi, Ali Asghar (1989). *History of Iranian Philosophy*, Tehran: Zavar.
- Hedayati, Abolfazl (1999), *Political conducts of Nizam al-Mulk*, *Islamic government journal*, No 13.

- Hindes, Bari. (2001). Power speeches from Hobbes to Foucault, translated by Mostafa Younesi, Tehran: Shiraze pub.
- Hobbes, Thomas (2006). Leviathan, trans. Hossein Bashiryah, Tehran, Ney.
- Kadivar, Mohammad Ali (2007). Roots of liberalism and conservatism in the thought of Thomas Hobbes, Journal of Politics and Economics, no. 221, 222.
- Kanpouri, Abdurrazaq (1975). Life of Abu Ali Hassan Ibn Ali Ibn Eshaq Tusi or Khajeh Nizam Al Mulk, trans. Seyed Mostafa Tabatabaei, n., Heydari publishing house, second edition.
- Karimi, Bayan; Fathi, Hassan. Power genuineness: Plato and Hobbes, Occidental studies, Human science and cultural studies` research center, scientific and research journal, 8th year, No 2, autumn and winter 2017.
- Laubach-Hintermeier, Sonja 1998: Kritik des Realismus, in: Chwazzeza/Kersting (Hrsg) 73-96
- Mansouri, Ali and Ghulami, Maryam (2011). Comparative study of the political ideas of Abu Hamed, Journal of Sokhan, no. 15.
- Mansouri, Ali and Ghulami, Maryam (2011). Comparative study of the political ideas of Abu Hamed, Journal of Sokhan, no. 15.
- Minovi, Mojtaba (1988). Criticism of Mood, Tehran, Kharazmi.
- Neishaburi, Zahireddin (1953), Saljuq-nama, Tehran: Khavar.
- Puladi, Kamal (2007). History of Political thought in west, Tehran, Markaz.
- Puladi, Kamal (2007). History of Political thought in west, Tehran, Markaz.
- Qaderi, Hatam (2013). Political Thought in Islam and Iran, 13th edition, Tehran, SAMT.
- Qaragozlu, Mohammad (2008). Idea of Political Democracy, Tehran, Negah Press.
- Ranjbar, Maqsood, The concept of security in Middle Ages` thoughts, strategic studies, No 31, spring 2006.
- Ravandi, Mohammad Ibn Ali Ibn Soleiman (1985). History of Ale Seljuq, edited by Mohammad Iqbal, Tehran, Amirkabir, second edition.
- Russell, Bertrand (1990). History of Western Philosophy, trans. Najaf Daryabandari, Tehran, Sokhan.
- Sabzei, Mohammad Taqi (2007). Civil society as a social contract: comparative analysis of Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau`s thoughts. Public law Research, article 3, period 9, No 22, autumn.

- Sharif, Mohammad (1991). *History of Philosophy in Islam*, vol. 2, Tehran: Nashre Daneshqahi.
- Strauss, Leo (1986). *History of political philosophy*, The University of Chicagopress.
- Tabatabaei, Javad (2007). *Theoretical Decline of Iran*, Tehran, Kavir.
- Tabatabaei, Javd (1996). *Khajeh Nizam Al Mulk*, Tehran, Tarhe No. 4
- Tabatabaei, Seyed Javad (2006). *Decline of Political Thought*, Tehran, Kavir Press, 4th edition.
- Tuc, Richard (2000). *Hobbes*, trans. Hossein Bashiryah, Tarhe No, Tehran.
- Tuck, Richard (1998). *Hobbes*, Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought.
- Uzar, Atila (2010). *Government in the history of western thought: Arendt, Aristotle, Bukanan, Engels, Hayek*, trans. Abbas Baqeri, Tehran: Furuzan.
- Younesi, Mostafa; Akbari Karim Abadi Nouredin. (2015). Investigating Hobbes`s method in establishing the government with an emphasis on Leviathan book. *Journal of Philosophical Theological Research*, 16th year, summer, No 4.