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EL-GHAZZALI ON THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF POLITICS


TUS

It is said that the great poet, Firdausí, the millenary of whom has just been celebrated, was born in a village named Shádáb, meaning fertile, in the district of Tús in northern Persia; it is not for us to discuss here whether the author of the Sháhnáme was or was not born there, but there is no doubt that the district which produced Firdausí was certainly one of the most fertile districts of Persia in that it produced a vast number of intellectual giants within a comparatively short span of time. The town of Tús is now practically a heap of ruins, having given place to the more renowned Meshhed close by, the burial place of the eighth Apostolic Imám, 'Ali er-Rídá', and of the well-known Abbasid Khalífah Hárún al-Rashíd, but the name and work of the savants which the district produced will live for ever. The list of renowned men who were born there would be too long for our purpose; suffice it to say that, besides Firdausí it includes such names as Nizámul-mulk, the political theorist and statesman, Naṣíru'd-dín, the mathematician and ethical writer, Abú Ja'far, the legislist, and finally, the two Ghazzálís, father and son.
more at home with the hubbub of a busy city-life, finally retiring to Tüs and founding a khânqâh and a private school there. The master died on the 14th of Jemadi II, 505 H./19th December, 1111 C.3

POLITICAL BACKGROUND

It has already been recounted elsewhere4 that this epoch was a turning point in the history of western Asia. The Pontifical successor to the Apostle of Islam was still on the throne of Baghdad, but this throne had none of the magnificence of Hârun's or Mâmûn's days, and it had been shorn of all the worldly power which should have been the right of the successors of es-Saffâh. The period of el-Ghazzâlî's life is covered by the reigns of 'Abdu'l-lâh Abû Ja'far Qâ'im bi Amri'l-lâh,5 'Abdu'l-lâh Abû'l-Qâsim el-Muqtadi bi Amri'l-lâh,4 and Ahmad Abûl-'Abbas el-Mustazhir bi'l-lâh,5 but as has been stated above, since the rise of the Seljuq' power, these Khalifâhs were no more than mere puppets at the hands of the Seljuq Sultâns and had been forced to give all worldly authority in their hands. Persia and the adjacent countries were ruled directly by the Seljuqs right through Ghazzâlî's life. He was born during the rule of Rûknu'd-dîn Abû Tâlib Tughral Bâg,6 lived through the time of 'Adhdû'd-dîn Abû Shuja' Alp Arslân,7 Jalâlû'd-dîn Abû'l-Fadl Malik Shâh,8 Nâsitû'd-dîn Mahmûd9 and Ruknu'd-dîn Abûl-Muazzâm Barkîrûq,10 dying in the reign of Ghiathu'd-dîn

(1) Vide, Subkî, vol. IV, pp. 101 ff.,

where his works are described as well as fully criticized, and a complete list of such Apostolic Traditions given as are not regarded as authoritative. Also vide Ghazzâlî's letters Makâtibât Imam Ghazzâlî [edited by Sir Syed Ahmad Khan, Akbarabad (Agra) 1310 H.], where we can have an insight in the inner mind of the Master in the evening of his life, and his fearless enunciation of principles even when writing to the Sultan or his Minister. It is a delight to read there communications, most of which are in Persian.

(2) Sherwani: Political thought of Nizâmî'l-Mulk Tâ'î, Hyderabad, 1934, pp. 1 ff.

(3) 457 H./1073-C.—457 H./1075-C.
(4) 457 H./1075-C.—457 H./1094-C.
(5) 457 H./1094-C.—512 H./1118-C.
(6) 457 H./1093-C.—455 H./1063-C.
(7) 455 H./1063-C.—465 H./1072-C.
(8) 465 H./1072-C.—485 H./1092-C.
(9) 485 H./1092-C.—487 H./1094-C.
(10) 487 H./1094-C.—498 H./1104-C.

EL-GHAZZÂLÎ ON THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF POLITICS

Abû Shuja' Muhammad.1 The days of his study and authorship were taken up by civil wars among the claimants to the Seljuq throne after the death of Malik Shâh, instigated by the sons of Nizâmî'l-mulk named Fakhrul-mulk and Muwayyidul-mulk, a civil war which continued for years and which ended in a kind of political paralysis in the Seljuq dominions, its division in a number of small States and its final extinction soon after Ghazzâlî's death. In fact the end had really been approached in the time of Barkîrûq himself, when only the central portion of what was once the all-pervading Seljuq Empire had been left to the Sultan.

POLITICAL MACHINERY OF THE SELJUQS

Here it would be well to give a short account of the machinery of administration perfected by the great Nizâmî'l-mulk during the rule of his Seljuq patrons. The highest governmental offices were five in number, "The foremost office was presided over by the Wazir, the second by the Mustaufi ('Accountant-General'), the third by the Tughrâ-î, the fourth by the Mushrif and the fifth by the 'Aridû'l-Jaish (Controller-General of the Army). [We clearly see that these offices have different names to those current in the time of the Abbâsids, the office of the Mustaufi corresponding to the Diwânû's-zimân, that of the Tughrâ-î to the Diwânû's-rasâ'il wâl-inshâ, and that of the 'Aridû'l-Jaish to the Diwânû's-Jaish wa-sh-Shâkirîyeh. Comp. Von Kremer, Cuturgeschichte des Orients, I, 198 et suiv. As regards the Diwânû's-Mushrif, it seems to have been a part of the Ministry of Finance like the Diwânû's-Mustaufi.] These names, however, convey only a vague and hazy idea of the duties of these officers. Thus the word Tughrâ-î signifies one who applies the Tughrâ or the Turkish seal on the ordinances of the Sultan, but his office was really the Chancellory of the Empire, . . . . . . and its chief took the place of the Wazir when the Sultan was out hunting . . . . Entering the service as a simple kâtib or clerk, and having served in the subordinate offices, one was appointed the 'Aridû'l-Jaish, and was promoted to the deputy-Mushrifship and Mushrifship, finally rising step by step to the exalted office of the Grand Wazir."12

GHAZZÂLÎ'S WORKS ON POLITICS

It is necessary to bear the political background well in mind because el-Ghazzâlî's political writings have a constant

(1) 468 H./1104-C.—511 H./1117-C.
(2) Histoire des Seljouks de l'Iraq, par el-Bondari, d'aprês Imad ad-dîn al-hâkim al-Iṣfahâni, ed. Houtsma, preface, pp. viii. ff. Also, Arabic text of the same, Ta'wârikh Âl-i-Seljûq, Leiden, 1889, p. 100.
reference to them. His Munqith mina’d-dalâl (‘Deliverance from waywardness’) is really the exposition of the psychological revolutions which took place within him, finally culminating in his great work, the Ihyâ‘ul-Ulûm, which he completed during his travels, revolutions which were synchronous with the political turmoil which converted a world-wide Empire into a petty west-central Asiatic State. His Tibru‘l-Masbûk (‘Molten Gold’), a politico-ethical hand-book for royal guidance, was meant for Ghiathuddîn Abu Shuja’ Muhammed, son of his patron, Sultan Malik Shâh. In the same way, although it is related in the introduction to another work, the Sirrû‘l-‘Alamain (‘The Mystery of the Two Worlds’) that the book was written at the instance of “a number of the kings of the earth in order that I might compose an unrivalled work to facilitate the fulfilment of their ambitions,”’ there is much of local colour in it, and it is addressed not to kings in the plural number, but to ‘O King’ and ‘O Ruler,’ so that we might rightly conclude that it was really meant for the edification of the ruler of his native land more than anyone else. Besides these works, which form an infinitesimal part of the labours of the Imam, his political thought is interspersed in a number of other works, such as the Fâtihatul-Ulûm ‘Introduction to the Sciences,’ containing a division of the sciences into different branches and their definitions, the Kimiyâ‘i Sa‘dât, ‘The Alchemy of Goodness,’ which is really a précis of the Ihya, the Iqtişâd fi‘l-I’tiqâd, ‘Moderation in Belief,’ on the basis of royal prestige, and Kitabul-Wajiz, ‘Handbook on the Fiqh,’ while references to the political aspect of human life are too numerous to be recounted here.

(1) Iłâniyâh Press, Cairo, 1903 H.
(2) Maimanîyah Press, Cairo, 1902 H., 4 vols.
(3) Ed. el-Harzâvi, Castâliyâh Press, 1277 H.
(4) Sirr, p. 2.
(5) Hzunâniyâh Press, Cairo, 1324 H.
(6) The edition used by me is the Bombay edition of 1314 H. There is an English translation by H. A. Homes, printed in N.Y., where the name of the work is wrongly rendered as ‘the Alchemy of Happiness.’
(7) Adabiah Press, Cairo.
(8) Cairo, 1317 H.
(9) In this paper we have limited ourselves to the more compact references to Politics and to his more prominent doctrines, which are sometimes repeated in his works. Ghazzâli’s works have been computed to nearly 70 books of varying sizes; vide Makâniyâh, Letters to the King, p. 7.

PERCEPTION VERSUS EXPERIENCE

Coming back to el-Ghazzâli, we find that the central pivot of all his philosophical argument is that he replaces the rule of intellectual perception by personal human experience, and makes materialism by spiritual elation. He was against the incursion of semi-Hellenistic trend of thought, and was by nature a sceptic, carving a way out for himself and paying

(1) Bryce, quoted in Pollock, History of the Science of Politics.
(2) Dunning, Political theories, Ancient and Medieval, cap. viii.
(3) Ibid., cap. ix.
(4) Thus Dante, while trying to prove the omnipotence of the Holy Roman Empire, argues that as old Rome was competent to judge Christ, who represented all mankind, so Rome’s successor, the Empire, proceeds directly from God without the Pope’s mediation. Vide Pollock, op. cit., cap. ii.
little heed to the accepted doctrines of his age.\(^1\) He is thus regarded as a *mujaddid* or ‘reviver,’ and *Imām* or leader, by millions of Muslims to-day, for he combated the pagnistic trend of his day and was the torch-bearer of rationalistic Muslim renaissance. “The equal of Augustine in philosophical and theological importance, by his side the Aristotelian philosophers of Islām, Ibn Rushd and all the rest, seem beggarly compilers and scholastics.” Even when he was barely 20, he began to ponder over the problems of life and death, becoming an absolute sceptic while with Nizamul-Mulk, doubting his own senses and even his mental faculties and thus rejecting intellectual perception as the criterion of truth. He thus retraced his steps to the only criterion left for him, i.e., his personal experience and the experience of those who had gone before him and whom he regarded as trustworthy. His ethics, his way of life, his outlook of the things round him, began to be dictated by the writings and sayings of Prophets, saints and *savants* in whom he pinned his faith. Thinking about the problem of life and death more deeply, he clearly perceived the hollowness of the worldly life and the eternity that was in store after death.\(^3\) As is natural with a mind like this, and in common with the great writers of his age, he gives a great importance to historical learning, the Traditions of the Apostle of Islām, the history of the Islāmīc peoples and the stories current in those days about Persia and Greece, especially the Greece of the Alexandrine epoch. So far as political theory and practice is concerned, he is clear that Politics are a necessary adjunct to one’s life and are closely allied to Ethics, a science which leads to the good of man. But he is perfectly clear that whatever rule of conduct may be set up for man’s life in this world, it must necessarily be for a very short space of time, and should, in any case, be taken as the means for the edification and completion of life in order that man may be able to prepare himself for the life hereafter with greater diligence and concentration. Here it must be borne in mind that he is perfectly clear about the happy means of conduct which would lead to the betterment of the human race, and refers to the belief of the Apostle of Islām that a man should not leave off this world nor should he entirely curb his worldly desires, but instead of this, he should find out the real object of everything of this world and should act always in such a way as to have the limited utility of the action in his mind.\(^1\)

‘Mundane’ and ‘Celestial’

It is necessary to bear this in mind as it is generally thought that Ghazzālī’s sphere is that spirituality only and he has nothing to do with mundane affairs. As a matter of fact he clearly says that God has made this world “a place for work and labour,” and quotes the Apostle of Islām, who, beholding a working man, remarked that if he was working to keep himself from begging, or in order to support his aged parents and young children, he was doing something to please the Almighty, while if he was working to compete with others in their wealth and be proud of it, then he would only please the Devil.\(^2\) He also quotes the Apostle admonishing his Companions to take to trade and commerce, for in it are said to be nine out of every ten parts of our nourishment.\(^3\) He goes on to quote the saint, Ibrāhīm Nakhīf who preferred a truth-telling trader to a hermit, and the saint Sulāmān Durrānī who admonished his friends to prepare their food before offering their prayers.\(^4\) In another remarkable sentence Ghazzālī interprets the Apostolic precept طلب العلم فرضا على كل مسلم to mean that it is the duty of every man and woman who carry on a profession to gather knowledge about that profession in order that they might keep away from all possibility of wrong.\(^5\) Still, one must have an eye to the fact that this world is merely a passing show, the first home in which is the mother’s womb and the last the pit of the grave, so that it is incumbent on every man to live a life of purity and cleanliness to whatever station in society he might belong.\(^6\) He says that the word ‘worldliness’ has two

---

\(^1\) Vide Munqidh, p. 4: 

١٠٠٠ تناول بفطير إلى طلب العلم فرضاً على كل مسلم ومضمونة معاني العصيدة الماردمة


\(^3\) These mental evolutions are set down in the Munqidh with great fidelity.

---

\(^1\) Ihyā‘, II. 6. v.

\(^2\) Ibid., II. 1. i., quoting a Tradition cited by Abu Dāwūd and Ahmad.

\(^3\) Ibid.

\(^4\) Ibid.

\(^5\) Ibid., II. 1. ii.

distinct connotations, one of the meanings attached to it being that the person who indulges in it leads a luxurious and abundant life and is in the habit of increasing his means to much more than he really wants, while in the other case he is content if he is able to get means of his sustenance. The two connotations are really quite distinct to one another, and Ghazzâlî is of opinion that while the first is the very negation of religion, the second is its complement, and without the proper organization and working of mundane affairs, man cannot seek even his celestial happiness, for if there is political turmoil in the land entailing in a lack of law and order there would be no peace of mind to serve the Almighty according to His dictates.

DIVISION OF SCIENCES

We now come to his enunciation of the political theory and a detailed justification of the organization of the People into a body-politic. He leaves no stone unturned to explain this in its purest form and to describe his way of political conduct in all its explicitness. His views on Politics are interspersed in a number of his writings, and (as we have seen above) over and above that he has devoted independent works to this science, which shows the importance which he credited to this branch of human life. He gives the science of Politics a proper place in the general scheme of the Sciences, which he divides as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unconnected with Religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metaphysics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arithmetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geometry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astronomy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) El-Iṣṭiṣād fī-l-ʾIṭiqād, p. 105.
(2) Munqîd, p. 13. Also vide al-Kutub al-ʿulūm, Cairo, 1322 H., cap. iv & v., where the place of Law and Politics and the relation of sciences which deal with man as a person (such as medicine), and with man as a member of a society, is indicated in great detail.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE STATE-IDEA

Ghazzâlî’s enunciation of the necessity of the State is so remarkable and so entirely modern that it would be better to reproduce it here almost verbatim. “Man is created in such a manner that he cannot live all by himself but is in constant need of others, wishing that someone else, human like himself, should always be with him. He needs this company for two reasons, firstly, for the sake of procreation, for this is impossible without sexual intercourse with a person of the opposite sex, and secondly, that he might be helped in

This division may not be complete from our point of view, but viewed from the criterion laid down by el-Ghazzâlî about connection with religion, it is by no means illogical. The remarkable thing is that, writing as he does in the early part of the twelfth century, when the West had not even begun to probe into the niceties of political implications, he has the courage and the breadth of vision to include Political Science as one of the chief sciences. He defines Politics as a science “which deals with the proper order for the State affairs of the mundane category,” a definition which is as modern as any definition can be. He goes on to say that “It is derived from God’s books as revealed to the prophets or from the orders of the saintly persons in the days of yore.” This perhaps requires a little explanation. We have mentioned above that Ghazzâlî’s whole theory rests on the efficacy of past experience, the highest form of which is the experience derived from revealed Divine words. Moreover it must be remembered that in those far-off days the sole impetus to the political awakening of the people had come from the teachings of the Apostle of Islam and his successors, and it should not surprise us that Ghazzâlî should base his theory mostly upon the precedents set up by the élites of God Himself.

(1) Pollock, op. cit., cap. i., has given us a division of the Sciences and this corresponds with Ghazzâlî’s division in its basic principles to a remarkable extent.
(2) Munqîd, p. 17.
(3) Ibid.
(4) As we have mentioned elsewhere (Sherwani, 'al-Mâwerdi,’ p. 7), this doctrine of basing Law and Politics on God’s Word kept on in Europe for centuries, and is actually found in Year Book 34, Hen. VI, 50 (1356 C.), quoted in Holland, jurisprudence, p. 64: “Scripture est commun ley sur quel tous manières de leis sont fondées.” [The Scripture is the Common Law on which all kinds of laws are based].
the preparation of his effects, food, clothing and proper education and bringing up of his children. Sexual intercourse results in the birth of offsprings, and it is naturally not possible for a person to shut himself up with his wife and children, for this would make life a burden to him. It is therefore in the nature of things that there should be co-operation with a very large number of persons each of whom should indulge in a certain trade or industry. Then again these traders or handicraftsmen cannot be independent of each other; for instance it is impossible for the tiler to till his land independently of others, for he would need instruments of agriculture entailing in the services of carpenters and blacksmiths, while the preparation of food would necessitate the work of the grinder and the cook. All this goes to prove that man cannot live alone but wants others' help at every step. Then again it is necessary to build houses to withstand the elements of nature, and the need for protection against external intruders would make people live together and build walls round their joint habitation. This means the establishment of Cities, and it is in the nature of human conduct that when men live together and deal with one another, a certain amount of squabbles and quarrels necessarily follow, and if they were left to their lot they would destroy each other by continuous feuds and wars. Moreover there are some who are too old or too ill to work, and it is necessary that they should be looked after. Now if all were to be given charge of cases like these, then no-one will be really personally responsible for anyone's welfare. Under these circumstances a number of new arts and industries spring up, e.g., measurement in order to ascertain the amount of land in dispute, warfare and arms in order to save the City from intruders, Fiqh or canon law in order to organize the people and make everyone keep within proper bounds, and lastly, arbitration and Government in order to deal with quarrels and feuds. All these things are necessary for the political well-being of the people and each of them requires the superintendence of

(1) This and other extracts in this paragraph are taken from *Ihyā*, III, 6, v.

(a) *Bild*, from *beled*; Greek, *polis*, city, or State.

(b) Cf., the theories of the Englishman, Hobbes and the Frenchman, Rousseau about the warring elements in a condition of pre-State. Both wrote centuries after el-Ghazzālī. The great difference lies in the fact that Ghazzālī does not indulge in the fanciful theories of the Social Contract.

(4) This is one of the arguments adopted by Aristotle to combat Plato's theory of communism. *Vide* his *Politics*, Fowett's tr., II, 5.

men of special qualities who should have attained a certain amount of knowledge, discretion and power of guidance. It is natural that when they will be busy in their task they will not be able to indulge in other occupations, and it should be borne in mind that they, like all others want their daily bread. So far as the financial arrangements are concerned, Ghazzālī is quite explicit that there should be a Collector of revenue who should make the collections 'with leniency and justice,' an Assessor who should ascertain the amount of revenue, a Treasurer who should have charge of the revenues collected, and a Paymaster who should disburse the amounts sanctioned. He says that it is of the utmost importance that a "King or Emir" should be at the helm of affairs who should be able to make appointments to all these offices, to see that justice is done in financial matters, send armies to the fields of war, distribute alms among his soldiers and appoint commanders to lead them. There are a number of other duties to be performed such as the defence of the country, appointment of clerks, writers, magistrates and treasurers, and to fix their emoluments. He goes on to divide the population of a country into (i) farmers, husbandsmen and handicraftsmen, (ii) men of the sword, and (iii) those who take money from the first grade in order to distribute among the second, and whom he calls the Men of the Pen. After this he propounds some extremely modern theories of economic exchange and proves the immense superiority of a fixed currency on the old system of barter, going on to the importance of the mobility of commodities in internal and external trade, and then to coinage bimetallism and trimetallism.

Apart from this, Ghazzālī gives another reason for the establishment of Kingship. He says that it is impossible to have a permanent organization of worldly affairs without a ruler or a sultan, and as without such an organization it would be impossible to act according to Divine commandments with peace and order, such political organization has the sanction of the *Law of Islām*. He says that without a ruler to whom the people should habitually be obedient, there would be "continuous turmoil, a never ending clanging of the swords, a recurring state of famine and cattle diseases and an end to all industries and handicraft." Further, it is natural that men should be divided in different ranks and grades with

(1) This is the Hellenistic ideal. In independent Greek States, the citizen's only concern was Politics and Warfare, while the rest of the work was carried on by other freemen and slaves.

(a) *Ihyā*, III, 6 v.
mental contrasts and varieties in individual opinions, so that it is of the utmost necessity that a strong ruler should sit at the helm of affairs and keep the body-politic properly organized under his control.¹

One is amazed to find the great modernity of the arguments propounded in the synthesis of the State-ideas, and it is refreshing to note that after accepting the Aristotelian doctrine of the social nature of Man, Ghazzālī, instead of falling into the dry heap of a patriarchal theory² faces blunt facts of human association and develops the idea little by little till he reaches the doctrine of Sovereignty with all its implications. Instead of the negativity of Hobbes, Ghazzālī adopts the positive method of arguing out facts, and while Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau and others deal with an imaginary man who really never existed at all, his Man is a living, honest, working man such as meets us every day of our lives. Interdependence, which is in the nature of human beings, is the basis of Ghazzālī’s argument, and this entails a pivot, a centre of the whole machinery, in the shape of a sovereign. The Austrian theory of Sovereignty, propounded nearly seven hundred years after Ghazzālī,³ was not such a great step forward, and if the Master had done nothing else than propound his theory of the State, he would have deserved to be ranked in the forefront of the leaders of political thought.⁴

STATE, LAW, CONSTITUTION AND RELIGION

He indicates that there are two aspects of human conduct, individual and social, and it is only when man is regarded as a social being that the need of such sciences as Law and Politics arises. He is precise with regard to the distinction between Law, which dealt with the relation among individuals for the settlement of their disputes, and between the Ruler and the People for fixing the criterion of the rule of justice. He says that if men were to exercise justice among themselves there would be no need for Law and lawyers, but instead of that they are led away by their desires without regard for

¹ Iqtīād, p. 106.
² Vide Aristotle, op. cit., I, i & ii.
³ For the Austrian theory vide Sidgwick: Elements of Politics, App. A.
⁴ European writers (in common, perhaps with most of the writers on Political Science, both eastern and western), are cognisant of Ghazzālī’s political thought. e.g., Vide A. C. Lord, ‘The Principles of Politics,’ preface, where the author is bold enough to assert that “the theory of Politics is the peculiar product of western thought.”

others’ right of property and the right to live, with the result that it is necessary to have recourse to a system of Law, a science which deals with human affairs, marriage and crimes,⁵ and to a ruler who puts limits to their conduct according to the Law in vogue.⁶ Thus the ḥāṣib is one learned in the law of the administration and he should know how to act as an intermediary between men who might indulge in quarrels; moreover (as one well-versed in Constitutional Law) he is the teacher of the ruler and his counsellor in matters of administrative importance.⁷ He goes on to indicate the exact relation between the State and Religion and says that they are like twin sisters, Religion being the foundation of human society and the ruler of the State its preserver, so that if the foundation weakens the whole structure would fall down, and if the ruler were to retire there would be no one to preserve the foundation.⁸ Here the interdependence of the two greatest institutions of the social man has been made clear by the use of a simple metaphor, and an equilibrium has been struck which is thoroughly in keeping with the ideal practised in Ghazzālī’s days.

BIOLOGICAL SIMILES

Among the modern notes in Ghazzālī there is one which reminds us of Herbert Spencer where he likens the different elements of the State to the organs of a living body.⁹ “Friend,” he says, “You should consider the city as a Physical Body, the professions its Limbs, the ordering magistrate its Desire, the police officer its Anger, the king its Heart and the minister its Common-sense. The king requires the assistance of all these organs to carry on the work of the State, but Desire, by which is meant the magistrate, sometimes indulges in falsehood and exaggeration and works against the dictates of Common-sense, the minister. This Desire wants

¹ Ghazzālī, Fāṭihatu’l-ʿUlām, op. cit., cap. iv.
² Vide Locke, Treatises on Civil Government, Bk. II, cap. vii, where he comes very near Ghazzālī’s argument in making Life and Property two of his main foundations of Civil Society. Locke wrote more than 600 years after Ghazzālī.
³ Fāṭihatu’l-ʿUlām, cap. 5. It should be noted here that the Master is perfectly clear about the great importance of Constitutional Law and explicitly indicates its superiority over the ruler himself.
⁴ Ibid., p. 44. Hobbes, writing in the middle of the seventeenth century, prefaced his ‘Leviathan’ with a picture, reproduced in the Clarendon Press edition, where the State-monster, the Leviathan, has a sword in one hand and an orb with a cross in the other!
to annex all there is in the State in the shape of revenue. The police officer, Anger, is very sharp and is of wayward habits, always wishing to kill, or at least wound others. The king is in the habit of consulting his minister and keeps recalcitrant magistrates under his control. It is only when the king, Heart, takes counsel with the minister, Common-sense, and control Desire and Anger, making both subservient to Common-sense, then, and only then will the State be managed well. On the other hand, if Anger and Desire succeed in incarcerating Common-sense, then the whole Body politic will be destroyed, and the king, Heart, will have to see a very bad day. It will be seen that these similes are, in a way, superior to those adopted by Herbert Spencer nearly a thousand years afterwards, for while the latter merely compares the Body politic with the Body physical, Ghazâlî, working under a religio-ethical spell, derives ethical conclusions from the comparison and makes solid political capital out of it.

**Ghazâlî’s Method**

Except for analytical passages like this and the argument about the development of the State-idea, Ghazâlî mostly adopts the historical method along with so many of his contemporaries. Like Mâwerdî and Nizâmû’l-mulk Tûsî, he gives numerous historical and Traditional instances if he wishes to carry a point he has enunciated, but in contradistinction to Nizâmû’l-mulk, he prefers to probe the truth mostly in the Traditions of the Apostle of Islam, his Companions and successors, and it is not often that he relies on Greek, Persian or Indian stories, although these are far more frequent with him than with his predecessor, el-Mâwerdî. He is not content with putting before his mind’s eye the lessons of the days gone by, but actually admonishes the Seljûq Sultan that he should “hear the sayings of the kings, ponder over their doings, study their stories as related in books and try to copy their acts of justice and benevolence.”

**JUSTICE**

It is the transitory condition of the world which Ghazâlî has in mind when he warns the sovereign that all worldly blessings come to an end at the time of death, and admonishes
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2. Ibid., beginning, 'King’s duties,' duty 2.
3. Vide supra.
He should try to meet the learned as often as he

He should see that his servants, magistrates and

He should not be overpowered by any false sense of

He relates how the Khalifah, 'Umar b. 'Abdil-'Aziz asked

He quotes the Khalifah 'Ali that the best judge is he who is not prejudiced in his decisions from personal desires, or by any leaning towards his relations, fear or hope, but takes a neutral attitude towards all that comes before him.

It is this sense of perfect justice which makes Ghazzâli insist on the absolute neutrality of the ruler in all his acts or words. He should pay equal regard to everything great or small, to everybody high or low, noble or downtrodden, and should put down lawlessness with a stern hand.

He relates how someone once asked the Sasânian minister, Buzurghimih which of the kings were the greatest, to which he replied that those were the greatest who had the confidence of the good and were the terror of the wicked. He also mentions the story of Alexander the Great, who asked the learned men how he could better his lot, to which they replied that he should eradicate both undue likings and undesirable prejudice, he should not make any decision hurriedly without counsel and should shun all personal inclinations, likes and dislikes at the time of sitting in judgment over others.

**DUTIES AND FUNCTIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE**

This brings us to the duties and functions of the executive arm of the government centered in the person of the king or

(1) These and other most salutary principles are embodied in a chapter devoted to the art of government, the care of the subjects, and kindred matter, in the Kimiýâ, elem. II, base 10.

(2) Ibid.


(4) Ibid., p. 4.

(5) Ibid., p. 60.

Emîr, and a whole book, the Tibrîl-masbûk, is devoted to admonitions to the sovereigns who might care to peruse it. He enumerates the necessary qualities of an ideal ruler, and says that he should have intellect, knowledge, perception, correct proportion of things, chivalry, love for his subjects, diplomatic bend, foresight, strong will-power, and should be well-versed in the news of the day and the history of the kings who have passed away, while he should always see that his magistrates, secretaries, viceroy and other officers did their work well; it is chiefly in these qualities, he says, which go to make a ruler the Shadow of God on earth.

He relates how a learned man once told the great Khalifah, Hârûn a'r-Rashid to beware that he was sitting where Abû Bâkî once sat demanding truthfulness where 'Umar once sat, demanding differentiation between right and wrong, where ‘Uthmân once sat, demanding modesty and bounty, where ‘Ali once sat, demanding knowledge and justice.

He puts forward the case of the Apostle of Islam, who fed the cattle, tied his camel, swept his house, milked his goat, sewed his shoe, patched his clothes, took meals with his servant, ground his own corn in time of need and did his own marketing.

**THE SOVEREIGN'S DAILY ROUTINE**

Ghazzâli goes even so far as to set down the daily routine of the sovereign which might lead to his success in administration, giving the detail of his food and drink, and of the hours of privacy and desk-work which he considers necessary for him. After morning prayers he should go out riding in order to investigate any wrongs done to his subjects. He should then sit in court and allow all and sundry to have a direct access to him so that he might have a first-hand knowledge of any complaints that might be made. He should make it a point of taking counsel from those excelling in knowledge, intelligence and experience and should himself give interviews to foreign envoys. A ruler should be well-versed in diplomacy and politics and should not be inclined to peace simply through timidity or fear of his enemies.

He warns the ruler against too much indulgence in drink, chess or hunting and says that the best system of life is couched in the maxim,

---

(1) Ibid., p. 53.

(2) Tibr, p. 15.

(3) Kimiýâ, elem. iv, base 2, quoting a tradition handed down by Abu Sa'id Khudri.

(4) Sirr., Essays II and III.
'Work while you work and play while you play.' He tells the ruler that the good kings of old used to divide their time in four parts, setting apart one for prayers, another for State-affairs, justice and counsel of the learned about the affairs of the realm, the third for food and rest, and the last for recreation and hunting. He is very particular that the ruler should not pay heed to the advice offered by women favourites, and quoted the instance of the Khalifah 'Umar who actually divorced his favourite wife when he was elected to his exalted office for fear of being influenced by her in State-affairs. In another place he warns the ruler against the course of a system of favouritism, and the only recommendations which he would allow are those where no exaggerated ideas are conveyed to the officer to whom the recommendation is taken, no lies told about the person recommended, the officer to whom the recommendation is made is not undue praised and the person recommending does not desire from admonishing that officer for any false step he might be taking for any fear of disfavour. We can well compare the system of recommendations which are the bane of certain governments of the present day with the very high ideal set up by the Master, and can well gauge the standard to which official life would be raised if these salutary principles were to be followed.

Heads of Revenue

Ghazzâlî is very clear about the taxation which can be legally levied, and says that every bit that is collected beyond the amount allowed under the Law is absolutely ultra vires, regarding even such ordinary sources as fines and tribute from Muslim potentates as illegal. He goes so far as to say that an honest man who gets an emolument from the royal treasury should see that the amount paid to him does not come from such illegal heads, otherwise all his belongings would be tarnished. This gives us a clue to the condition of the Budget in those far-off days, where it seems that the income was put down under different independent heads and expend-
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(1) Tibr, p. 58.
(3) Tibr, Principles of Administration, Pr. X.
(4) Kimiyâ, elem. II, base 4. Ghazzâlî himself sets an example—vide his speech before the ruler, Makāribat, p. 9 ff. where he admonishes the sovereign while recommending the case of the inhabitant of Tûs.
(5) Ibid.
want anything from any of God’s creatures! This and a number of other anecdotes from the history of Ḥajjāj b. Yusuf, Hārūn-ur-Rashid, Mu’taḍid bi’l-lāh and other rulers are given to indicate the respect of the sovereigns for those who excelled in learning, and the sense of equality between the ruler and the ruled which was the ideal set up in those days. In spite of these lofty ideals, Ghazzālī seems to have rightly realised that times had changed since the early days of Islām, and besides, honest work there was something else—a certain amount of prestige which was wanted to exert a psychological influence on the people and keep Law and Order in the land, which was the first desideratum of Statehood, and he would desist from doing anything which might result in the disintegration of the State through the lack of these factors.

**Slavery**

It is in the essence of the Islāmic ideal that all men are equal before the Law, and perhaps arguing from this truth, the Master tells his sovereign that he should deal with the people in such a manner that they should be agreeable to the rule of Law, quoting the Apostolic Tradition the best of the Muslims are those who seek mutual love and respect and the worst those who deal with each other in anger. It is this principle which is the basis of the Islāmic theory of slavery, and Ghazzālī quotes the Apostle of Islām again that the masters should feed and clothe the slaves in exactly the same manner as themselves, should immediately sell them off when they are of no use to them and not to keep God’s creatures in perpetual agony, always remembering that if it were the will of God, He would have turned the tables making the slaves themselves masters of their present owners. Ghazzālī says that it is the right of the slaves not to be deprived of food and clothes and never to be looked down upon, and if they do anything wrong, it should remind the master of all the sins against God’s command which he himself commits every day.

**Secret Service**

The ideal king is one who keeps a watchful eye on the innermost affairs of the State, and Ghazzālī very pertinently remarks that a king without secret-service men at his command and without the news of the country constantly coming to him is like a body without a soul. At the same time, however, he sets definite limits to external interference, State or otherwise, in the privacy of the household, and quotes the story of the Khalifah ‘Umar who wanted to spy on a man by climbing his wall and who was told by the owner of the house that he had done himself wrong by acting against the precept of the Qur’ān which enjoins (i) not to probe into others’ secrets, (ii) to enter others’ houses by the front doors, (iii) not to enter any house barring one’s own except after speaking to the owner and offering him one’s compliments. We at the present day are fully aware that every government has its secret service to keep it on guard against both internal and external dangers which might be hidden from view, and having lived in the entourage of a great minister in his youth, Ghazzālī gives the institution the importance which is its due, with however, certain limitations which it would be well for even modern governments to follow.

**Ghazzālī and Democracy**

Here it is necessary to digress a little from Ghazzālī’s trend of thought about the practice of Politics. We must remember that his outlook on political organization is different from modern democratic outlook. Democracy with all its attendant consequences demands that there should be a system of checks and balances, and the authority of the ruler should be hedged in by the authority of the Legislature which should encroach more and more upon the Executive power till that power is virtually transferred to the hands of its chosen representatives. In Islām there is no real kingship, but in Ghazzālī’s time this ideal had given place to the numerous dynasties which had grown up in different parts of what was once the mighty Empire of Islām. What Ghazzālī does is to put the two ideas together and to draw his own conclusions as to how kingship can be adapted to the Islāmic ideal of equality before God, and limited by the dictates of the Law. He brings down kingship to the level of the democratic emirate by hedging it with the ideal set up by the Apostle of Islām.
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(1) *Ihya*, II, 9, iv.
(3) *Tibr*, Principle IX.
(5) *Ihya*, II, 9, ii.
and his successors. It was an extremely difficult task, for the two institutions were poles apart, and Ghazzâli realises his difficulty. He possibly knows that the ideal would not be acceptable in the light of the changed conditions of the Islamic world still, like the honest man that he was, he fearlessly puts it forward in order that an attempt might be made to act upon it.

Anyhow, while there seems a great difference between his ideal and the modern democratic notions, if we were to go into the question more fully, we would find that the transition between the two is not so difficult as it looks, for in both cases it is the Law which is uppermost, may it be human or Divine. Both systems are, however, different for modern dictatorships which have sprung up after the Great War, for in this case there is absolutely no limit to the power of the dictator. He is free to act without any legal limit to his power, without any check or balance and without the necessity of counsel. He regards himself supreme above all laws and institutions, a human divinity set up by himself to end chaos according to his own private inclinations.

COUNSEL

One feels that the difference between the democratic and the dictatorial systems is the need for counsel, and Ghazzâli makes it a requisite for successful kingship. The need for counsel is interspersed throughout the chapters and books which the Master has devoted to Politics. He says that the ruler should take advice from those who are learned or are experts in any branch of the administration. This matter is dealt with great precision in the Tibr’ul-masbûk, where the very second principle of government, the one after Justice, is said to be the need for counsel, and as has been previously stated the kings who take the advice of the learned are regarded as the best of their order, while the learned men are taught to act independently, never to kiss the king’s hand, nor to bow before him except when the king is such as to have earned respect out of his piety or good deeds. He quotes the saint Suhîyân-i Ýhîr to the same effect in another place and says that the Apostle of Islam used to take advice of his companions according to definite orders of God as enjoined in the Qur’ân.

3. Ibid., p. 71.
4. Ibid., cap. 2.

EL-GHAZZÂLI ON THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF POLITICS

PROVINCIAL ADMINISTRATION

Ghazzâli is quite clear in his mind with regard to the duties and functions of provincial governors. He quotes the Letter of Instruction issued by the Khalifah ‘Umar to one of his governors, Abû Musâ al Ash‘ârî, in which the Khalifah says that the best governor is he who does good to his subjects, and the worst he who treats them harshly; No governor should issue orders while he is overpowered with anger or lust. He quotes the Sasanian Emperor, Ardshir who is related to have said that when a ruler cannot reform his principal officers and cannot keep them from committing cruel deeds, he cannot be expected to reform the lot of the people in any way. He wants the affairs of the provinces to be given in charge of the nobles of the land, while there should be a strict supervision of food and water in every fortress as well as of the defence of the land, while the commanders in charge of the fortresses should be good and kind to the soldiers under him, and even the least thing should be given its proper importance and its consequences properly probed into, for,

ولا تغريب أرا صنيفا فربما قتلت الآلا فر مركوم الغريب

The governor and the commanders of fortresses should absolutely desist from taking any intoxication liquor for it leads to temporary insanity and a hundred other vile consequences.

MINISTRY

So far as the organization of the government is concerned, Ghazzâli rightly lays a great stress on the need of an honest minister, and a whole chapter is devoted to the topic in the Tibr. He says that the worth of the Sultan is increased and his fame spreads far and wide if he has a good minister by his side, for a faithful minister is the guardian of the ruler’s secrets and the chief intermediary between him and the rest of his officers. On the other hand rulers ought to respect their ministers, for (such was the accepted ideal in those days) they would correct the rulers’ faux pas the moment they come across them. Ardshir, the Emperor of Persia is reported to have said that there are four categories of persons the services

1. Ibid., Principle III.
2. “You should not despise a small thing, for it often happens that makes die from the poison of the scorpions.”
4. Chapter 11.
of whom should be commandeered whenever they are discovered, namely, a learned secretary, an honest minister, a kind chamberlain and a good counsellor.

CONCLUSION

We have briefly sketched the political thought of a great savant who was, in a sense, superior to some of those who had gone before him in that while he had become perfectly at home in the working of the political machine when he was attending the court of his patron, Nizâmûl-mulk, and had made a close study of the problem of politics, it was his lot to leave off his luxurious life and compile most of his works from a neutral point of vantage in Syria or Arabia or else in the seclusion of his paternal hearth and home. He is superior to el-Mâwerdî in being analytical as well as comparative in his argument, to the author of the Qâbûs-nâmeh in that his works are either books or else pamphlets written with a rare dignity and grace for his own sovereign, and to Nizâmûl-mulk himself in that he is far more independent and far more neutral in his analysis than the Seljûqî Wazîr. A student of the history of political theories is aware of the great gap which seems to exist between the decline of Roman thought about the beginning of the Christian era till about the thirteenth century, when thought seems dull, constitutions unscientific and people lethargic and pleasure-loving. Knowledge would be the richer and chains of thought more continuous if that artificial blank were to be filled by such giants of wisdom as Mâwerdî, Nizâmûl-mulk and el-Ghazzâlî. Even in Oriental thought, Ghazzâlî's place is certain. As has been said elsewhere,* the ways had parted and people had begun to look towards the pagan East for inspiration. Ghazzâlî's greatness partly consists in having successfully refilled the desired outline by brilliant Islamic colours, although they were not destined to last very long, giving place once again, and finally, to barbaric hues.

H. K. Sherwani.
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*Sherwani: The Political Thought of el-Mâwerdî, etc., p. 23.