

A Comparative Essay on the Perception of State in Turkish Thought: Namık Kemal and Ibn Haldun*

Kemal Şamlıoğlu**

Abstract

State is a fact on which human sciences have mostly produced problems in theoretical context. This study is intended to deal with the views of Namık Kemal, a philosopher of Tanzimat, on the state from political, cultural and literary perspectives. While examining Namık Kemal's view of the state, especially Ibn Haldun, who tried to determine the theoretical foundations of the state on the basis of Islamic civilization, would offer a chance for a sample comparison. Determining a five-step anthropomorphic theoretical framework that would affect the western world, Ibn Haldun qualifies the state with the process of rise-and-fall like a natural human life. In this sense, the state is designed as a finite organic structure and is supposed to face a natural process of death or fall in the course of time. On the contrary, Namık Kemal suggests that the state could as well be sustained if man kept his conditions along with sustainable cultural and spiritual foundations. In a sense, the political theory that the state could keep alive with man is worth thinking over within the context of Namık Kemal.

Keywords

Namık Kemal, Ibn Haldun, state, man, literature.

* Date of Arrival: 23 January 2020 – Date of Acceptance: 27 April 2020

You can refer to this article as follows:

Şamlıoğlu, Kemal (2020). "A Comparative Essay on the Perception of State in Turkish Thought: Namık Kemal and Ibn Haldun". *bilig – Journal of Social Sciences of the Turkic World* 95: 27-46.

** Dr., Ankara Hacı Bayram Veli University, Department of Turkish Language and Literature – Ankara/ Turkey

ORCID ID: 0000-0003-4765-5592

kemalsamlioglu@hbv.edu.tr

*“Padishah needs competence for the rule,
If it falls to the vizier’s lot, woe to the whole.”*

Namık Kemal
Hürriyet/1869

Introduction

One of the intellectual contributions of Turkish thought to the theory of state in the Ottoman-Turkish historical transformation points surely to Namık Kemal, the intellectual thinker and writer of Tanzimat period. Given that Tanzimat coincided with the last great age of fall of Ottoman State, it should also be kept in mind that Namık Kemal was an intellectual who sought for a solution to this dire course of events. With this view in mind, the question of what the state is and how its sustainability is ensured led Namık Kemal to an analysis of the basic dynamics of the tradition of a sustainable state.

The situation of the Ottoman State in the 19th century presented the tragic historical examples of a state that entered the decline period with its own efforts regarding the existing conditions and foreign intervention. Regression in terms of geography, technological decline and inadequate institutionalization in terms of modernization moves, summarizes this situation that the state, which cannot turn the conditions in its favor, falls into its own state. Of course, until the Tanzimat stage, where the absolute monarchy continued, the Ottoman Empire adapted the theory of social strata and the national system to its social and religious-cultural characteristics (Karpas 2014: 17). This was the definition of a sociological system concerned with the basic sustainable dynamics of the state. However, the system in question was based on the alliance of a lot of social groups balancing and checking each other in spite of the air of absolutism filling in the court (Karpas 2014: 39). Such an absolutist system, not perceived as a strict centralism, determined and maintained the ruling character of the Ottoman State until and after the Enlightenment. In this regard Tanzimat, the period when the late-term effects of the French Enlightenment reached the Ottoman State, evolved towards a process whereby the earliest pains of change in the existing circumstances in administration were experienced.

Tanzimat is not only a period when a number of political changes were experienced, but also a process that was called forth by the crystallization

of the antagonism between the West and Ottoman's own sources with the worry of penetrating strongly into the West. The contacts with the West, though initially viewed as experiences on the point of compromise, made it historically necessary to put new theories into practice in the course of time. However, it should be emphasized that the Ottoman State, not having the western systematic political theories and philosophical tradition, had to build the cultural and thought elements of the French Enlightenment from one or a few theoretical perspectives. In this context, the absence of a system brought the period-centred and movement-based viewpoints to the fore, and the fact that in the things that shaped the mental world of the intellectuals for Tanzimat maintaining, interpreting and explaining these viewpoints, a lot of thinking systems were successfully aligned in such a form as to create duality in the mind brings us face to face with the fact that it was being appropriated in the form of compositionlessness that belongs neither to the East nor to the West. This shows that the Turkish intellectuals who could not decide between the East and the West could not catch up with the age and that a problem of authority toward the social practice existed. Accordingly, the Tanzimat intellectual not only placed new ideas into the world of thought in order to overcome the western xenophobia to their own age but also attempted to try all the practices of innovation from political institutions to the formation of art and culture.

It could as well be said that the effect of Tanzimat on the legal process led, of course, to the formation of a ground for search as far as the intellectuals were concerned. The emergence of such movements of thought as Ottomanism, Turkism, Islamism and Pan-Islamism, not showing a political fraction in the Ottoman thinking system by then and not based on public initiative, led the intellectuals to warn the State against the bad course of events; this shows that they started to view the problems through eclectic contents from some western theorists. This state could of course be seen as solution propositions coming to the fore on the sustainability of the State.

Especially through the modernisation process concerned, Ottomanism came to be a movement coincident with this process and Namık Kemal penned some works on this political content. The Imperial Edict of Tanzimat and the Ottoman Basic Law in particular laid the legal and political foundations for Ottomanism and brought about the re-evaluation of the system of

Ottoman nation, one of the most developed forms of classical empire pluralism with politics (Çolak 2006: 128). Namık Kemal's anxiety over the politics inspired by the Young Turks' political movements was reflected in his below statements as translations from Montesquieu in the newspaper *Hürriyet*:

In his book on the spirit of the law, the famous Montquieu of France classifies the types of government under three titles as public and state legitimate and state-independent. (...) In short, our state was a government-legitimate, but the ummah could not always fully enforce the law of politics. (Namık Kemal 1869: 2-3)

Accordingly Namık Kemal, inspired by the ideal of converting the autocracy, the administration of absolutism, into constitutional administration in a process from his own generation into the Young Turks' era (Mardin 2017: 20-21), was inclined towards attaching the Ottoman state tradition to the fact of Ottoman nation and developing a resistance to the phases of historical disintegration that could be taken as a threat to the State in the 19th century. As far as Namık Kemal was concerned, the life that he dreamt of was existent in old times, and therefore he always wrote highly of Islam and Ottomans. It was for this purpose that he wrote his works *Devr-i İstilâ*, *Osmanlı Târihi*, *Selahaddin-i Eyyûbi* and *Fatih* (Ergun 2018: 106). It could be noticed here that Namık Kemal based his cries for the State on a strong historical ground, which strengthens the idea that the historical form that is perhaps ideal in this sense could set a model for the sustainability of the State as well.

Viewing Namık Kemal and the background of his idea of the State from another angle, one can face another dimension of Ottoman modernisation lacking in method and purpose. Of course Namık Kemal is the product of the age in which he lived. The chance for a very wide interaction urges one to understand Namık Kemal in his own age. Yet if one looks at Rıza Nur's statements under Namık Kemal's historical works, the moves and conflicts of the intellectual of the age in search will not go unnoticed: "The innovation movement had already begun. Tanzimat was made, but could not provide the desired thing completely. The intellectuals wanted to do the innovation completely and to establish the Constitutional Monarchy for this purpose, to save the state from falling apart." (Rıza Nur 2017: 370). For there appear

a lot of details missed by the Tanzimat intellectuals in expecting the political regime change to sustain the state. The most important of these is that they did not take into account what kind of contexts would come to light in the things concomitant with the western political and cultural theories. Viewing an historical anecdote of it from Namık Kemal's angle, it would be noticed that the Ottoman intellectuals who identified themselves with the state preferred not to destroy but to reform the structure, which was not clear and exact in terms of the new elements from the West. Considering, for example, that Namık Kemal, upon reading the first Turkish translation of Karl Marx in the newspaper *Hakayülvekeyi* in 1871, wrote to his friend Mr. Reşat in the newspaper *İbret* about Socialism that "The supporters of the municipal office have aimed at the healing of the human community" (Oktay 2003: 201), it is puzzling in terms of these searches that there were a variety of conflicts as regards the perception of western ideas preoccupying the minds of Ottoman intellectuals. In an age in which public reforms were accelerated for the sustenance of the state, Namık Kemal recommended making use of Islamic law and fiqh in arranging the system of consultancy and constitutionalism and even produced traditional ideas to the extent of demanding each article of Ottoman Basic Law (Kanun-i Esasi) to be grounded on a fatwa, and this presents another dimension of the issue (Tanpınar 2003: 426). In this regard, the fact that Namık Kemal who, not unlike most of the Tanzimat intellectuals, failed to develop an intellectual program, was in search of an idea of state and sustenance, makes it necessary to treat the issue along with the delicate modernisation relationships of the age.

State

In its basic definition, the state is the form of a political unity that builds a field of dominant power and exercises the authority through perdurable institutions. Thomas Hobbes compares this case to the leviathan, a big giant, and considers it a finite/mortal being that finds peace and defence for itself in the shadow of the idea of an infinite God (Hobbes 2019: 155). Max Weber, however, qualifies the state as a body that arranges the legal means of violence and also proves to be part of the holistic development of rationalism for the development of capitalism's soul (Weber 2017: 71). Especially Plato's search of a holistic ideal and his attempt to systematize the total inclusive

civics in the political program that he used in defining the state reveals the threats of totalitarianism to the open public. The idea of creating a society in which every citizen will be genuinely happy may mean that the limits of social belonging closed to a social change shall be determined by the state ideology from another angle (Popper 1989: 164). This is because Plato expresses a pluralistic ideal expectation as follows: “We establish the state for it to provide happiness to the whole society, not for a given class to be happier than the other(s)” (Eflatun 1962: 170). Ebenstein regards the state not as an inevitable result of the right politics’ and government’s negligence and sleight as well as fear and faith with a view to Plato’s treatment of the issue as a political science, but as the object of definite and regular scientific thoughts whose laws could be established (Ebenstein 1996: 17). In this sense Alexis de Tocqueville states: “If it were true that laws and value judgments were enough to sustain the democratic institutions, would the societies have another choice but a one-man despotism?” (Tocqueville 2015: 495). It goes without saying that these are theoretical definitions of state with a western appearance. Viewing the issue from the aspect of Turkish thought, the old Turkish state in the ancient times was dominated by the thought that the founder khan and his offspring had a God-given right to rule the state; the collapse of the order was attributed to the destruction or disintegration of the state (Bıçak 2010: 69). Hilmi Ziya Ülken, examining the state rhetoric of the Ottoman period in his work *Hakimiyet*, speaks of the state of degrees as the inevitable result of a morality of love and points to the existence of modern domination centres by involving the communism and liberalism models like the state of dynasty and that of election in the State of Miracle (Keramet), a priority afforded by the human values (Ülken 2018: 18-24). From this perspective, the main problematic starting point of the theoretical principles regarding the way of processing on the point of ideal sustainability of state rhetoric has become the questions of how the state should keep prosperous and permanent.

For the sake of bringing a comparative outlook to the issue, it appears that Ibn Haldun combines the main factor creating the state and enabling its sustenance with the concept of Asabiyyah in the philosophy of state. The concept of Asabiyyah, which is defined as the blood tie between individuals and preservation of the existing and present one against the external and outer ones, is the dynamic force that forms the state, society and civilization

and combines them under the title of culture to enable their sustenance. Similarly, Namık Kemal and Ahmet Cevdet Pasha, focusing on the concept of state in a modern way, came up with ideas similar to Ibn Haldun's philosophy of state and stated that the main source in forming the state is the spirit of Asabiyyah and that a nation emerged and was shaped with this spirit, keeping the individuals together and allowing the creation of the civilization peculiar to the nation.

According to Pasha, the combination of state, society and civilization under the roof of a culture is indeed an outcome of "nation asabiyyah" (solidarity and unity between the members of a clan). Yet "nation asabiyyah" is replaced by "religion asabiyyah" (solidarity and unity between the members of a religion) as the state expands in frontiers, because "nation asabiyyah" is based on a certain class and racism. In this sense, Ottoman State is based on "religion asabiyyah". In other words, a structure based not on blood but on faith points to the structure of the Ottoman State (Meriç 2002: 40, 41). This case lays stress on the strong effect of faith tie on the sustainability of the state. To Pasha, the Ottoman State established a peculiar justice system based on ecclesiastics and tacit law with its structure based on the unity of faith. "The state which can survive with the strong proceeding of this justice system attributes, with this understanding, the preservation of the body and recovery of a bodily sickness to justice" (Gencer 2012: 247). Thus Ahmet Cevdet Pasha, referring to the state of law with the above issues in mind, regards the regular and just proceeding of law as sustainability.

The subject of the modelling and sustainability of the state was the most-discussed one among the post-Tanzimat Turkish intellectuals. The effect of the western ideological ideas on the Ottoman intellectual reveals the need for grounding the structure of the state on different political fractions such as Ottomanism, Turkism, Pan-Islamism and Islamism under the conditions of the age. These views and recommendations, intended to enable the sustainability with this mission, manifest themselves as the Ottoman's struggle to preserve its existence against the West while also producing thoughts and ideas based on western civilization.

The question of whether the ideology on which development, unity and sustainability will be grounded should be nationalism and racism or unity of faith preoccupied the agenda of post-Tanzimat Islamist and Turkist journals.

In Shaykh al-Islam Musa Kazım Efendi's article "İslam ve Terakki" in *İslam Mecmuası*, he argued that Islam rejects nationalism and this nationalism and sexism should be rejected for the survival of the state:

One of the important conditions of Islam is brotherhood, which is of prime importance for the survival of a nation. For human is civilized by nature, but he is unable to obtain even one of the numberless things that he needs, so if a nation is to survive, it should build a very strong and sincere brotherhood among its subjects. (...) After the Islamic religion imposed this essential fact very strongly, it prepared the reasons for its eternal preservation. Among the reasons that would preserve the Islamic brotherhood forever is legitimization of "zekat" (alms) and mutual help as well as the strong ban on enmity and animosity, backbiting, slander and lie, separation and brigandage, division, sedition and malice, nationalism and racism. (Kara 2017: 126-127)

Survival of the state is deemed as possible with the increased social welfare and solidarity in accordance with the Islamic belief and with the rejection of statements and utterances that would destroy fraternal law and the divisive concepts that would lead to hostility and antagonism. In this sense, bringing the epistemological framework of a political movement that would sustain the state into question reveals an intellectual concern aiming to decelerate or totally eliminate the phase of disintegration.

The leading figure of the post-Tanzimat Islamism, arguing that the sustainability of the state is again possible with the Islamic idea, is Babanzade Ahmet Naim, and he argued in his article entitled *İslamda Dava-yı Kavmiyet* in the journal *Sebilürreşad* that the essential factors in the disintegration and dissociation of the Ottoman State were the ideas of race and racism and that acting on this understanding would blow an attack on the peace and happiness of the nation. In these views, he seems to take sides with Musa Kazım Efendi:

The gender case - as Musa Kazım Efendi said, was rejected religiously. The term "religion" is the case of ignorance. It is the greatest blow to the permanence of Islam and the welfare and happiness of Muslims. Especially when almost all of the Islamic lands have turned into

infidels, a handful of Muslims here, like I am Turkish, I am Arab, I am Kurd, I am Laz, and I am Circassian, at the same time, weaken the conversation to the other - especially when the attacks of our enemies get closer to our hearts. And the civil society is also against the patriotism of those who hold the flag. Even if religion moves away from the field of faith, reason and understanding, the trouble that happens to our Albanian brothers is a great lesson and lesson for us... (Kara 2003: 291-292)

As can be seen, Babanzade rejected the ideas of nationalism and racism for the survival and peace of the state and prioritized the idea of Islam; he also argued that the power that kept the Ottoman State alive for six hundred years was the unity of faith based on this view.

Those who were tied to the Islamist view in that post-Tanzimat movements of thought served as a means to the sustainability of the state rejected nationalism for its emphasis on racism and sexism, and considered a religion and faith-based structure to be necessary for this sustainability. The idea of nationalism along with the French Revolution and various ideological concepts that would cover the Tanzimat from then on came to be seen as means prioritized for survival. Being against the Islamists who rejected the Nationalism with an emphasis on its dissociative aspect, those who put Nationalism as the foundation of the state's sustainability were of the opinion that a state based on race and racism was an important ground for survival. In his article *İslam'da Dava-yı Milliyet* in the journal *Türk Yurdu*, Ahmed Agayef (Ağaoğlu Ahmet) opposed the views of Musa Kazım Efendi and Ahmet Naim, and he argued that Islam rejects not Nationalism but Asabiyyah, and that Asabiyyah has nothing to do with Nationalism.

For the radical transformations in the public realm following the Ottoman state tradition, Şerif Mardin used the following remarks: "Images like state and public took place within the administration system of republic as symbols towards arousing respect – and fear – peculiar to them" (Mardin 2015: 356). Therefore, considering the instrumental forms that make up the state, continuity is the most important issue to be underlined here. Again Foucault says the following for the phenomenon of continuity in question:

Sustainability means that whoever wants to rule the state in a good way is supposed first to learn how to rule himself, his own goods and heritage; for him to rule the state successfully will only be possible after that. (...) This downward line that carries the same principles of ruling the state well to individual behaviours and management of the family starts to be called police just at this point. (Foucault 2016: 267-268)

Viewed from such a perspective, the fact that the ideas put forward in relation to the state and sustainability developed practices toward rendering the state, a whole of the organizations, sustainable make it necessary to evaluate the problem with modern data for our history of thought.

Namık Kemal and State

Ibn Haldun has a limited mass of reading in the Islamic social sciences methodology especially in terms of our age, and as such he is a philosopher who closely affected the sociological and political theories of the Eastern and Western thought. Ibn Haldun's anthropomorphic state theory, which is the product of a worthwhile systematic thinking structure, treats the state in the form of an organic development and death as a process of integration-disintegration; and he defines it in five stages; the first is the stage of victory, the second is the stage of autocracy, the third is the stage of conveyance, the fourth is the stage of law and Islamic principles, and the last is the stage of waste and strew (Hassan 2010: 268-269). Ibn Haldun brought the theory of state to a humane foundation and viewed the state as the organized and reflective attitudes of living beings as a voluntary mechanism. He said:

It should be known that a state passes through a variety of attitudes and some repeated cases. Those who keep the state alive acquire some temperaments and characters from the states of every attitude that they pose, and no fungible of it is found in other attitudes. For the quality in character is, by nature, subject to the temperament of the state in which it is. The cases and attitudes in the state do not exceed five for the most part. (Ibn Haldun 2018: 399)

Evaluating the state with the consequences of its natural life cycle, this theory has a rather consistent example in terms of methodology of history. However, this case is open to discussion when considered along with the

element of man making up the state in terms of the finite structure of the state and the stage of its inevitable disintegration. This is because an intellectual comparison of Namık Kemal, one of the intellectuals of Tanzimat, is to be made on the theory of Ibn Haldun when the state is considered with the human factor on which civilization is built.

Namık Kemal is, above all, a man who witnessed the age in which the Ottoman State was forced to collapse from all sides. His thoughts should not be examined with a discussion of a rhetoric innovation confined just to Tanzimat literature. As an intellectual directly involved in politics, he is, like most intellectuals, in an attempt to avert the nightmare into which the state fell with doctrinal approaches. While doing so, he does not separate the fancy of the existing state from the element of human. Basing the source of the idea of state on human, Namık Kemal refuses the presence of imperialist and upper administrations that might be an element of domination. From this aspect, he treats the historical time section of rise-and-fall in Ibn Haldun's theory in relation to the conditions pertaining to human (Bıçak 2010: 151). If the quality in the element of human can be sustained, the state will survive at all times.

Viewed from this angle, Namık Kemal turns his face to history for the sustainability of the idea of state. He deals with the basic dynamics of history and especially Turkish Islamic history on model historical formations. His treatment of historical figures in his narratives and poems, except for the fictional epic characters such as Mr. İslam, Mr. Muhtar, İsmet Pasha or Mr. Cezmi-Derviş, and men of importance in historical biographies such as Celaleddin Harzemşah, Selahaddin Eyyubi, Fatih and Yavuz Sultan Selim gives an idea about how well the human capital in question could be disciplined and nurtured in terms of formation models. However, though Ibn Haldun's theory of state remarks that social development is unimpeded, he sees the natural lifespan of a state as finite along with corruption of the generations (Fahri 2000: 409). It is at this point that Namık Kemal's views of the sustainability of state differ from the theory in question as they are reduced to the state of the element of man. The reason is that he is in pursuit of reorganizing the value and model sphere of the past history with an absolute romanticism.

Emphasizing the Turkish people's essential qualities of upbringing, Namık

Kemal cannot think of the development and betterment in man's conditions as independent of the development of the state. For example, he uses the phrases and words for Fatih Sultan Mehmet, whom he prioritized in his biography studies: "He learned the Arabic and Persian and Latin and Greek and Hebrew languages of his time and studied his works and was well-informed about the benefits of this education and the past of the east and the west" (Pala 1989: 65). He also lists the formation qualities of the human resource modelled in the state as power force and adds: "At that time, he knew the government's affairs to a degree that could bring power to a system and facility that could possibly be based on the establishment of an unprecedented civil state and the current state and progress of the warfare." (Pala 1989: 65). It may be said that Ibn Haldun's inference on the state order pushed into a compulsory finiteness by his relationship with factual and taxonomic history does not coincide totally with those of Namık Kemal. For the Tanzimat thinker who repeated history as a strong founder source, therefore, the state is not only a problem of historical philosophy, but also a problem that can be reduced to human and a human philosophy from the aspect of sustainability.

To look at Namık Kemal's expressions in the newspaper *İbret* on the structure of power that he called government "Although some scholars do not accept this imperative, they say that if everyone has a perfect manners, general morality is sufficient to realize the wisdom of the sought-after dominant force in order to prevent hostility." (Özön 1938: 131), the success of a human action and personality power in managing the events is what Namık Kemal sought for in human centre. In its aftermath, he infers for the development of state dynamic: "Only the owners of the government, if they wish, will strengthen the state's initiatives through progress in the face of general ideas by showing some personal sacrifices on their side." (Özön 1938: 133). To Namık Kemal, personal effort and man-centred ability form the backbone of progress that might come into question as far as civilization is concerned.

On the other hand, in his article *Vatan* in *İbret* again, Namık Kemal makes an evaluation of the most important problem field of the state against history as an institution, namely the suspicion of fall and deadlock, and says as follows with his view of homeland included in the issue of sustainability:

For example the English, the French, the Germans, the Spanish, the Italians, the Russians and the Ottomans both love and certify the homeland today. Yet no homeland is absolutely assured of its future and fortune. (...) We, on the other hand, have feelings that will cause the racial and sectarian differences that are among the children of the country to dissolve in the future. (Namık Kemal 1873: 1-2)

While Namık Kemal makes a reference to the prosperous nations in terms of a continuation mentality, he makes a prophecy whose consequences have been affirmed from the aspect of Turkish history. It should also be noted here that when we look at the state formations that Namık Kemal examined and analysed under the theory of Ibn Haldun, he appears to have made a series of economic and sociologic analyses in terms of the migrant-settler, class, military organization and economic labour organizations over the models that he prioritized as Umayyad State, Abbasids State, Egyptian-Turkish State, and Andalusia small states, which were feudal states (Hassan 2010: 281-284). It is also noticed that there is a desire to base these justifications Onhappiness Century period, an un-utopian factual scientificness that is expected to be started from the historical source of prophet-king. However, while the nations with a state tradition that Namık Kemal listed in the above quotation are referred to as the English, the French, the Russians, etc. with their national identities, the definition of Ottoman State as the Ottomans as extra-national turns into a determination that was justified historically on the falling practices of Ottoman State his statement “We, (...) have feelings that will cause the racial and sectarian differences that are among the children of the country to dissolve in the future.”. Thus, the model analysed by the theory of Ibn Haldun differs clearly from Namık Kemal’s image of state whose sustainability is damaged. Likewise, the fact that harbingers of fall related to Kanuni’s era that the state could survive with the element of human was not seen in the state for while is expressed by Hammer as follows: The sustainability of these days of prosperity may be accounted for by the fact that Grand Vizier Sokullu and Shaykh al-islam Ebusuûd remained at their position” (Hammer 2014: 26). Hence, the presence of solution offers that could reverse the course of events around the sustainability mentality of the state reveals some prologues in the context of sustainability in Namık Kemal in contrast to what the social sciences text tells about Ibn Haldun’s theory. From such an angle, the way of ridding the state, a public means, of the fall, namely the flames that gradually cover the

chimney, is to make changes in the technocratic structure of the regime and make a division of authority in the power. Namık Kemal expressed his views on the problem of consultancy (meşveret) in his writing *Usul-i Meşverete Dair Mektubun Birincisi* in the newspaper *Hürriyet* dated 14 September, 1968, in which he revealed his thoughts on the system of consultancy treating the subject of gradual search and questioning of the sustainability in relation to the regime.

What does it mean if the people have the right to rule in the republic, as long as their right to rule is confirmed? Who can deny that right in the world? Another issue that the nation will sink us, nobody denies the moment. The will of the nation does not come to anyone's mind in us, but it does not mean that the right is superstitious with the possibility of execution. The Greeks wanted to make a will of the nation. Who are the Greeks? If the people of the Ottoman countries gathered somewhere, there is a need to use a microscope to see the Greeks. However, there are no hundred thousand people among them who want the will of the nation. They could not realize the will of the nation in Greece. Do not they know how much the Islamic nation in our land loves the Ottoman and sacrifices its head for the hair of a just sultan. Is the domination of the people unfairly disrupting the word? Actually, we are the dominant in our land. We all have a partnership with the government, but we gave the government's execution to the Ottoman with a valid word. We always want the Ottoman, we always demand legitimate administration. (Namık Kemal 1868a: 6)

Namık Kemal wrote again in the newspaper *Hürriyet* on the system of consultancy, which he considered as indispensable to the conversion and sustainability of the state and as very important in the system of state:

Because the New Ottoman Empire consists of requesting a consultation procedure. The purpose of consultation is justice. Justice, on the other hand, prohibits the sultan from persecuting someone. Where could he have let an ordinary person commit an evil that would mean the sultan's life? Consequently, the cheater who has such a verb has nothing to do with justice. Those who have no relationship with justice are not advocates. (Namık Kemal 1868b: 3-4)

From this perspective, a number of arguments have been put forward about the political formation, fit for reading as an alternative view of the theory of Ibn Haldun. A look at Namık Kemal's below-quoted words of praise for Ibn Haldun in his work *Osmanlı Tarihi* (*Ottoman History*).

The skill of Ibn Haldun by examining each of the Islamic states individually through the eyes of wisdom is astonishing the reasons and failures of important matters to fit several pages. However, in Ibn Haldun, some events of the centuries related to the subject are missing, but this is due to the incomplete resources, not Ibn Haldun's research and research error. There are some minor mistakes, but it can be said that no one comes out of the whole humanity by dominating. (Enginün ve Kerman 2011: 196)

shows that he accepted Ibn Haldun as proving its concession historian among the others such as Taberi, Ibn Esîr and Ebulfedâ. However, he went on saying these on the issue of anthropomorphic state:

Ibn Haldun is the founder of historical wisdom as he possessed the perfect science and wanted to put forward a method suitable for this science, to be a measure to distinguish the reality of the events from the wrong one, and also to have created the Mukaddime, which has a library character compared to the multitude and diversity of the information he has. For example, in Mukaddime, states have wrong ideas such as saying that they have a natural life. But these mistakes do not harm the quality of the book. Nothing turns out perfect even in the construction of the whole nature. Although he is incomplete in his work, Ibn Haldun has the honor of revealing a scientific principle that such happiness has not occurred to several hundred people in all human beings. (Enginün-Kerman 2011: 196)

It can be said that Namık Kemal did not doubt at all that Ibn Haldun's theory follows a wonderful social sciences method in relation to the scientific provisions. He, however, did not agree with Ibn Haldun's inferences on a limited geography and private society. In this regard, Namık Kemal had something to say about the natural conditions of the state. He wrote the following on these conditions in *Hürriyet* again:

With the treatment of the doctor, the human well-being needs the help of the elements, and the corrective nature of the state, which is ruled by a spiritual person by the measures of the authorities of the administration, depends on its chemical unity. Measures that will eliminate the injustices and waste and eliminate the insecurity of the people are possible only with the acceptance of the consultation procedure. (Namık Kemal 1868c: 1-4)

His views were because the alarm bells that had already started to ring for the Ottomans were harbingers of the fact that a lot of negative points related to the disintegration phase started to be seen in political arena. Viewed from such a perspective, there is something that disturbed Namık Kemal in Ibn Haldun's treatment of the state as a naturally finite being. The arguments of enduring existence that could be sought for in the body of Ottoman man were important for Namık Kemal.

Viewing the poems of Namık Kemal as a man of letters around the issue in question, the poems (manzume) like *Vatan Türküsü*, *Hilâl-i Osmanî*, *Hürriyet Kasidesi*, *Vatan Şarkısı* and *Vâveylâ* are full of a founder dynamic power's idea of history eulogized as a principle. Whereas Namık Kemal attributed to Ibn Haldun's compulsory anthropomorphic theory the frozen, interrupted and corrupted practices of progress and fall practices of the state that could be thought of as an organic political mechanism, considering that the founder and coordinator conscience determines the state organization grows sustainable with the fact of nation, these poems make insistent references to an awareness of nation and historical sustainability in Namık Kemal, or the founder nation character of Turkish Islamic tradition, thus proving worth examining and discussing.

Conclusion

All in all, it could be said that although the Turkish state tradition's political experiences of different geographies of thousands of years have provided centuries-old examples of the idea of an ideal state that is resistant to history in a sense and has not lost its continuity in the public sense, it has not allowed a single type of state to date: Ibn Haldun's theory of anthropomorphic state is of the quality of a political theory proved and certified against the scientific history as far as Turkish political thought and experience are concerned.

However, Namık Kemal argued that the state could achieve a historical sustainability if the necessary conditions could be ensured with man in the centre, thus offering an alternative view of Ibn Haldun's theory. The essential starting points to which Namık Kemal objected may be attributed to the fact that he tested Ibn Haldun's generalizing inferences on local regions. His narrative texts reminding frequently the founder dynamics of the Ottoman State, i.e. *Cezmi*, *Vatan Yahut Silistre*, *Âkif Bey*, *Celâleddin Harzemşah* or his studies on Ottoman history are ones that reveal the basic practical offers for solution inspired by his historical consciousness; they also reveal that they form the principal sides which keep the consciousness of state and land alive. Of course, new quests and methods in the face of the problems of the modern age are not only a methodological problem area of social sciences; it also represents the responsibility of the human being, a political entity, the most basic quality of life concern in the name of the state.

References

- Bıçak, Ayhan (2009). *Türk Düşüncesi I Kökenler*. İstanbul: Dergâh Yay.
- Bıçak, Ayhan (2010). *Türk Düşüncesi II Kaygılar*. İstanbul: Dergâh Yay.
- Çolak, Yılmaz (2006). "1990'lı Yıllar Türkiye'sinde Yeni-Osmanlılık ve Kültürel Çoğulculuk Tartışmaları". *Doğu Batı Düşünce Dergisi* 38.
- Ebenstein, William (1996). *Siyasi Düşüncenin Büyük Düşünürleri*. Çev. İsmet Özel. İstanbul: Şûle Yay.
- Eflâton (1962). *Devlet*. Çev. Sabahattin Eyüboğlu ve M. Ali Cimcoz. İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.
- Enginün, İnci ve Zeynep Kerman (2011). *Yeni Türk Edebiyatı Metinleri-4 Eser Tanıtma ve Önsözler (1860-1923)*. İstanbul: Dergâh Yay.
- Ergun, Nüzhet Sadeddin (2018). *Namık Kemal'in Hayatı ve Şiirleri*. İstanbul: Historia.
- Fahri, Macit (2000). *İslâm Felsefe Tarihi*. Çev. Kasım Turhan. İstanbul: Birleşik Yay.
- Foucault, Michel (2016). *Entelektüelin Siyasî İşlevi*. Çev. Işık Ergüden, Osman Akınhay ve Ferda Keskin. İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yay.
- Gencer, Bedri (2012). *Son Osmanlı Düşüncesinde Adalet*. Ed. Halil İnalçık, Bülent Arı ve Selim Aslantaş. Ankara: Kadim Yay.
- Hammer, V. Joseph (2014). *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Tarihi II*. Ed. Mustafa Güçlü. İstanbul: İlgi Kültür Sanat Yay.
- Hassan, Ümit (2010). *Ibn Haldun Metodu ve Siyaset Teorisi*. Ankara: Doğu Batı Yay.
- Hobbes, Thomas (2019). *Leviathan*. Çev. Hamiyet Ünal. İstanbul: Litera Yay.
- Ibn Haldun (2018). *Mukaddime*. Ed. Süleyman Uludağ. İstanbul: Dergâh Yay.

- Kara, İsmail (2017). *Türkiyede İslâmcılık Düşüncesi*. İstanbul: Dergâh Yay.
- Kara, İsmail (2003). *Din ile Modernleşme Arasında Çağdaş Türk Düşüncesinin Meseleleri*. İstanbul: Dergâh Yay.
- Karpat, Kemal (2014). *Osmanlı Modernleşmesi Toplum, Kurumsal Değişim ve Nüfus*. Çev. Ceren Elitez. İstanbul: Timaş Yay.
- Mardin, Şerif (2015). *Türk Modernleşmesi*. İstanbul: İletişim Yay.
- Mardin Şerif (2017). *Yeni Osmanlı Düşüncesinin Doğuşu*. İstanbul: İletişim Yay.
- Meriç, Ümit (2002). *Cevdet Paşa'nın Toplum ve Devlet Görüşü*, İstanbul: Timaş Yay.
- Namık Kemal (1868a). "Usul-i Meşverete Dair Mektubun Birincisi". *Hürriyet* 12.
- Namık Kemal (1868b). "Yaşasın Yeni Osmanlılar". *Hürriyet* 11.
- Namık Kemal (1868c). "Ve şâvirhüm fi'l-emr". *Hürriyet* 4.
- Namık Kemal (1869). "Sadâret". *Hürriyet* 36.
- Namık Kemal (1873). "Vatan". *İbret Gazetesi* 121.
- Oktay Ahmet (2003). *Toplumcu Gerçekçiliğin Kaynakları*. İstanbul: Everest Yay.
- Özön, Mustafa Nihat (1938). *Namık Kemal ve İbret Gazetesi*. İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.
- Pala, İskender (1989). *Namık Kemal'in Tarihî Biyografileri*. Ankara: TTK Yay.
- Popper, Karl Raimund (1989). *Açık toplum ve Düşmanları I-II*. Çev. Mete Tunçay. İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.
- Rıza Nur (2017). *Namık Kemal Hayatı, Divanı, Eserleri*. Ed. Mehmet Soğukömeroğulları. İstanbul: Doğu Kütüphanesi.
- Tanpınar Ahmet Hamdi (2003). *19 uncu Asır Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*. İstanbul: Çağlayan Kitabevi.
- Tocqueville, de Alexis (2015). *Amerika'da Demokrasi I*. Çev. Özcan Doğan. Ankara: Doğu Batı Yay.
- Ülken, Hilmi Ziya (2018). *Hâkimiyet*. Ed. Ali Utku. Ankara: Doğu Batı Yay.
- Weber, Max (2017). *Protestan Ahlakı ve Kapitalizmin Ruhü*. Çev. Gökhan Rızaoğlu. İstanbul: Roman Oda Yay.

Türk Düşüncesinde Devlet Algısı Bağlamında Bir Karşılaştırma Denemesi: Namık Kemal ve İbn Haldun*

Kemal Şamlıoğlu**

Öz

Devlet, kuramsal çerçevede insan bilimlerinin en çok üzerinde problem ürettikleri bir olgudur. Bu makale ile Tanzimat düşünürü Namık Kemal'in devlete ilişkin düşünceleri, siyasî, kültürel ve edebî perspektifte ele alınmaya çalışılacaktır. Namık Kemal'in devlet düşüncesini incelerken, özellikle devletin kuramsal temellerini İslâm medeniyeti bakımından belirlemeye çalışan İbn Haldun, örnek bir mukayese imkânı doğuracaktır. Batı dünyasına kadar tesir edecek beş aşamalı bir antropomorfik kuramsal çerçeve belirleyen İbn Haldun, doğal bir insan yaşamı gibi devleti oluş-bozuluş süreciyle niteler. Bu bağlamda devlet, bir bakıma sonlu bir organik yapı gibi tasarlanır ve doğal bir ölüm süreciyle yüzleşmek zorunda kalır. Hâlbuki Namık Kemal, insan unsurunun sürdürülebilir kültür ve manevi temeller eşliğinde şartlarını koruması halinde devletin de, yaşayacağını ileri sürer. Bir anlamda devletin insan unsuruyla ayakta kalabileceğine ilişkin siyaset teorisi de, Namık Kemal bağlamında üzerinde düşünölmeye değerdir.

Anahtar Kelimeler

Namık Kemal, İbn Haldun, devlet, insan, edebiyat.

* Geliş Tarihi: 23 Ocak 2020 – Kabul Tarihi: 27 Nisan 2020

Bu makaleyi şu şekilde kaynak gösterebilirsiniz:

Şamlıoğlu, Kemal (2020). "A Comparative Essay on the Perception of State in Turkish Thought: Namık Kemal and Ibn Haldun". *bilig – Türk Dünyası Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi* 95: 27-46.

** Dr., Ankara Hacı Bayram Veli Üniversitesi, Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Bölümü – Ankara/Türkiye
ORCID ID: 0000-0003-4765-5592

kemalsamlioglu@hbv.edu.tr

Сравнительное эссе о восприятии государства в турецкой мысли: Намык Кемаль и Ибн Халдун*

Кемаль Шамлыюглу**

Аннотация

Государство - это факт, на котором гуманитарные науки в основном создают проблемы в теоретическом контексте. Это исследование ставит своей целью изучение взглядов философа периода Танзимата Намыка Кемалья на государство с политической, культурной и литературной точек зрения. При рассмотрении взгляда Намыка Кемалья на государство можно провести примерное сравнение с взглядами Ибн Халдуна, который пытался определить теоретические основы государства на основе исламской цивилизации. Определяя пятиступенчатую антропоморфную теоретическую структуру, которая повлияла на западный мир, Ибн Халдун характеризует государство как периоды взлета и падения, свойственные человеческой жизни. В этом смысле государство разработано как конечная органическая структура и должно столкнуться с естественным процессом смерти или падения с течением времени. Напротив, Намык Кемаль предполагает, что государство могло бы также поддерживаться, если бы человек сохранил свои условия наряду с устойчивыми культурными и духовными основами. В некотором смысле политическая теория, согласно которой государство может поддерживать жизнь человека, заслуживает рассмотрения в контексте Намыка Кемалья.

Ключевые слова

Намык Кемаль, Ибн Халдун, государство, человек, литература.

* Поступило в редакцию: 23 января 2020 г. – Принято в номер: 27 апреля 2020 г.

Ссылка на статью:

Şamlıoğlu, Kemal (2020). "A Comparative Essay on the Perception of State in Turkish Thought: Namık Kemal and Ibn Haldun". *bilig – Журнал Гуманитарных Наук Тюркского Мира* 95: 27-46

** Д-р, Университет Хаджи Байрам Вели, кафедра турецкого языка и литературы – Анкара / Турция

ORCID ID: 0000-0003-4765-5592

kemalsamlioglu@hbv.edu.tr