

Comparative Study of Social Change: Ibn Khaldun and Classical Sociologists

Dr. Pirzada M. Amin*

Abstract

This paper examines the extent to which Ibn Khaldun can legitimately be considered as a founding father of sociology by tracing out the ideological similarities and differences between Ibn Khaldun and the western founding fathers of sociology. The said legitimacy is attempted through the theoretical comparisons of Ibn Khaldun vis-a-vis other classical sociologists/founding fathers such as Auguste Comte, Emile Durkheim, Karl Marx, and noble laureate Jane Addams. Further, in consonance with the theme, this paper encloses a detailed account of Ibn Khaldun with respect to his biography, intellectual and sociological legacy, *ilm al-umran* (science of culture), types of society, social conflict, theory of asabbiyah, cyclic theory etc., as an anticipation of Ibn Khaldun to various schools of thought and how various scholars through times have claimed Ibn Khaldun to be the real founding father of Sociology. Thus the present work is an attempt to draw a holistic picture of sociology and its foundations through the integration of various theoretical inputs of significant sociologists with an aim of highlighting the striking parallels between Ibn Khaldun and other founding fathers of Sociology.

Key Words: Sociology, Ibn Khaldun, asabiyah, ilm al-umran.

Introduction

Sociology is a broader discipline known as the queen of all social sciences. Given the complexity of its subject matter amidst its all encompassing nature, sociologists entail a great degree of

*Associate Professor of Sociology & Head Department of Social Work
University of Kashmir, Srinagar.

difficulty in defining the subject. One useful way to describe the discipline, however, is as a cluster of subfields that examines different dimensions of the society. By definition, Sociology is the scientific study of society and human social action. It generally concerns itself with the social rules and processes that bind and separate people not only as individuals, but also as members of associations, groups, institutions and, hence, examines the organization and development of human social life. The sociological field of interest ranges from the analysis of small interactions between anonymous individuals on the street to the study of global social processes.

A crucial element of sociology as in all sciences is theory. Subject of sociology is incomplete and unjustified without social theories. Fundamentally, a theory is a statement that organizes a set of concepts in a meaningful way by explaining the relationship between them. Facts are salient and have no meaning until we give meaning to them and that meaning is given by the theory. Theory makes the facts of social life comprehensible. It places meaningless events in a general framework that guides us in determining the cause and effect relationship, to explain and to predict. Most of the founding fathers of sociology and classical sociologists have emphasized upon the development of sociological theories and are/were guided in their work by major theoretical perspectives that provide a point of view for the study of specific problems. The main theoretical perspectives of modern sociology are Evolutionary Perspective, Functionalist Perspective, Conflict Perspective and Interactionist Perspective.

Origins of Sociology

The middle Ages are often thought of as a time of ignorance and superstition in Europe, though in fact, during this period Islam and Islamic civilization advanced far beyond the West in terms of philosophy and sociology. Many of the disciplines which we learn in school today were invented by medieval Muslims, which were translated and worked during ancient Greek manuscripts. These

classical times whose influence faded after the fall of the Roman Empire and spread of Christianity survived in newly conquered Muslim lands in the Middle East. Sociology as a separate field of study is of recent origin and emerged as a response to the forces of changes which took place during the 18th and 19th centuries in Europe. The scientific and technological changes generated the foundations for the transformation of society from rural, agrarian to urban, industrialized and mechanized pattern of living. The extensive changes integral to the process of industrialization involved a major paradox; in that it brought a more mechanized society with more productivity potential and complex ways of living, but simultaneously created extensive disruptions in traditional patterns of life and relationships, thereby created attendant problems of unpleasant urban conditions, poverty and unemployment. Thus, sociology emerged as a distinct discipline because of these intellectual and material changes in the second half of the 19th century due to drastic changes because of Industrial and French revolution. Broadly, as also according to Morris Gingsberg, it may be said that sociology has a fourfold origin in philosophy of history, political philosophy, biological theories of evolution and social surveys aimed at social and political reforms. The term sociology was coined by Auguste Comte, a French philosopher and the so called father of sociology in 1839.

Rethinking Ibn Khaldun

Ibn Khaldun lived from 1332-1406 and was a Muslim philosopher and statesman who provided a useful way of looking at the political and social conditions of the pre-modern world. He was born in Tunis and died in Cairo, where he is buried in the Sufi cemetery. His parents, part of Banu Khaldun, an upper class Andalusian family that held many high offices in Andalusia, who were originally Yemenite Arabs, had settled in Spain, but after the fall of Seville, had migrated to Tunisia. He received his early education and, still in his teens, he entered the service of the Egyptian ruler Sultan Barquq. Under the Tunisian Hafsids dynasty,

some of his family held political office. Ibn Khaldun's father and grandfather, however, withdrew from political life and joined a mystical order. He travelled to Morocco, Spain, Damascus and other parts of the Muslim world. He witnessed the attack of Tamurlain's troops on Damascus, and spoke with Pedro the Cruel of Castile.

At the age of 17, Ibn Khaldun lost both his parents to an epidemic of the plague, which hit Tunis. Soon after his entire family died in a shipwreck, he made the Hajj to Makkah. In 1377, in the short period of five months, he wrote the *Muqaddimah* (or Prolegomena) while secluded at a palace of Sultan Abu Hamu near Tujin.¹ Although he added to his work over the next five years, the whirlwinds of political change and courtly intrigue compelled him to set aside his Prolegomena and move to Cairo, where he became a noted professor, judge and sheikh (manager) of Baybars, the greatest Sufi institution of that age. His final work, an autobiography (*al-Taarif*), is yet to be translated into English.

Since Ibn Khaldun's life was so thoroughly connected to historical events, his theory organically links the realms of ideas and actions. The prevalence with which Europeans have compared Ibn Khaldun to Western scholars has led Franz Rosenthal, Ibn Khaldun's translator and one of the principal Arabist scholars in the United States, to coin the term 'forerunner syndrome' to describe and simultaneously criticize this tendency.²

During the century that Ibn Khaldun lived, there was not even a single Christian Arabic scholar in Europe.³ Long before Europeans became acquainted with Muslim thought, Turkish scholars delighted in the treasures they found accessible to them. Despite Europe's ignorance, Europeans 'discovered' the importance of Ibn Khaldun in the nineteenth century, thereby elevating his status from just another 'footnote to Islamic historiography.... as the foremost Muslim historian of Ibn Khaldun', M. Talbi remarked, 'It was in Europe that Ibn Khaldun was discovered and the importance of his *Muqaddimah* realized'.⁴ Recognized as the founder of sociological sciences, Ibn Khaldun has been accepted and

commented upon by historians, jurists, theologians, politicians, economists, teachers, educators and environmentalists alike.

Harry Barnes and Howard Becker in their book *Social Thought: from Lore to Science* stated that “the first writer after Polybius (203–120 BC), then, to apply the equivalents of modern ideas in historical sociology was not a European”; they devoted substantial discussion to Khaldun’s ideas that are relevant to social science. By doing so, Barnes and Becker identified Khaldun as the first scholar who applied modern ideas to historical sociology and so, from their point of view, saw him as a founder of sociology.

Unfortunately, until the 19th century, Khaldunian sociology was unknown to Western scholars. From the middle of the 19th century, Western scholars commenced studying Khaldun and his social theories with astonishment and admiration. Khaldun developed numerous social theories treated a century later by Machiavelli, and some three or four centuries later by Giambattista Vico, Charles de Montesquieu, Adam Smith, and August Comte. After discovering and studying Khaldun, Western scholars began considering him a philosopher, an historian of civilization, a scholar of sociology and political economy.

Khaldun wrote the *Muqaddimah, Historical Prolegomenon* (1377) in the 14th century, centuries before the systematic development of Western sociology. In this prominent work, Khaldun discussed scientifically the fundamental problems of what would be called modern sociology: the evolution of less developed societies to advanced societies or rural-urban dichotomy. Significant portions of Khaldun’s work seem to be quite modern for his historical period. The information contained in *Muqaddimah* has anticipated and impresses numerous modern theorists as well as classical sociologists. Historically, it has been acknowledged that Khaldun made contributions to modern sociology; however, both his concepts and methods need examination, analysis and placement in their proper context vis-à-vis contemporary social science.

The reputation of the *Muqaddimah* as a significant work has

brought Khaldun much attention. Khaldun taught his theories on society, the basis of sovereignty or *asabiyah*, the rise and fall of states, and other subjects presented in the *Muqaddimah*. Khaldun described social phenomena and situated them in the flow and perspective of historical events.

Khaldun's *Ilm al-Umran* (Science of Culture)

Ibn Khaldun through *ilm al-umran* i.e., 'science of culture' created a new science which came to be interpreted as the science of human social organization commonly termed as sociology. While dealing with '*ilm al-umran*' in his *magnum opus* (*Muqaddimah*), Khaldun maintained that he has presented a new science having as its subject matter human civilization, primitive societies, the states, the cities, the crafts, the occupations etc. Khaldun argued that this science has "its own peculiar object in the form of human civilization and social Organization i.e., explaining the conditions that attach themselves to the essence of civilization, one after the other".⁵

Types of Society

As understood by Western sociologists, Ibn Khaldun's division of society includes *badawa* (rural) and *hadara* (urban) societies. Defined briefly, nomadic or rural means "inhabitant of the desert" or "the desert dweller," whereas urban refers to "inhabitants of cities".⁶

To explain the concept of *badawa* in his typology, Khaldun argued that primitive people are tied to the desert because of their agricultural life style. Since settled areas do not provide wide fields and pastures for animals, their social organization is organized upon bare subsistence. These include nomad or savages people. For Khaldun, *badawa* represents a primary phase of social organization. As against *badawa*, the notion of *hadara* or urban society implies a secondary phase of social organization. People live clustered in cities that constitute countries. The economic arrangement of society is centered upon commerce and crafts, in addition to agriculture and husbandry. There is a higher level of

life observed in terms of comfort and luxury as opposed to rural society. The *badawa* and *hadara* represent the two polarities of social organization. While *badawa* people are rough, savage and uncultured, and their presence is always inimical to civilization; however, they are hardy, frugal, uncorrupt in morals, freedom-loving and self-reliant, and so make excellent fighters. In addition, they have a strong sense of '*assabiyah*', which can be translated as 'group cohesion' or 'social solidarity'. This greatly enhances their military potential. *Hadara* or the towns by contrast are the seats of the crafts, the sciences, arts and culture. Yet luxury corrupts them, and as a result they become a liability to the state, like women and children who need to be protected. Solidarity is completely relaxed and the art of defending oneself and of attacking the enemy are forgotten, so they are no match for conquering nomads.⁷

Khaldun's Social Conflict

Ibn Khaldun, through his social conflict theory accounted for rise and fall of societies and civilizations. He saw conflict as a consistent feature between the rural and urban societies contextualised by him as *badawa* and *hadara*. Khaldun stated that dominant attitude of urban dwellers prompts rural people to develop strong solidarity/*asabiyah* that later on results in conflict between two typologies of people and results in change. In his work *Muqadimah*, he presented a detailed account of the dichotomy of sedentary life versus nomadic life characterized by the inevitable loss of power by *hadara* upon the conquering of a city by desert warriors. Khaldun argued that the conflict has its basis in social solidarity (*asabiyah*), which he claims to have a fundamental role in the rise and fall of societies and civilizations. *Asabiyyah* carries nomads to power who conquer upon city dwellers, but with due course of time these victorious tribesmen lose their tribal traits by immersing into luxurious life of sedentary civilization only to be replaced by new upcoming civilizations of *badawa* thereby, completing the power cycle.

Khaldun's Social Solidarity (*Asabiyyah*)

Asabiyyah, as Fida Mohammad contends, connotes a 'we feeling' among the people - the sole fundamental criterion for the survival of any political or a social organization. It is not just group solidarity; it is the merged effect of the group solidarity with a political will towards power and organized leadership.⁸ Khaldun's social solidarity (*asabiyyah*) holds the very pedestal of his cyclical theory of social change. For him, *asabiyyah* is expressed through "associative sentiments, unity of purpose, community of social and economic interests and oneness of feelings and emotions".⁹ Each society according to him, transforms from primitive stages to advanced stages of civilization i.e., from rural to urban. The way social solidarity (*asabiyyah*) plays a major role in the rise and fall of human civilization is intrinsic in the sense that he talks about the society's birth, growth, maturity, decadence, senility and demise.

Khaldun's cyclical theory

With regard to the political and social cycle, Ibn Khaldun suggests the following sequence of events:

Nomads conquer territories and their leaders establish a new dynasty. At first the new rulers retain their tribal virtues and solidarity, but soon they seek to concentrate all authority in their own hands. Increasingly they rule through a bureaucracy of clients - often foreigners. As their former supporters lose their military virtues there is an increasing use of mercenaries and soldiers come to be more important than civilians. Luxury corrupts ethical life, and the population decreases. Rising expenditure demands higher taxes, which discourage production and eventually result in lower revenues. The ruler and his clients become isolated from the groups that originally brought them to power. Such a process of decline is taken to last three generations, or about one hundred and twenty years. Religion can influence the nature of such a model; when *asabiyyah* is reinforced by religion its strength is multiplied, and great empires can be founded. Religion can also reinforce the cohesion of an established state. Yet the endless cycle of flowering

and decay shows no evolution or progress except for that from the primitive to civilized society.¹⁰

He conceptualized societal development as being parallel to the life stages of an individual: birth, maturity and death. Khaldun believed that the dynastic cycle is as “a self-destroying but ever rebuilt bridge between two worlds”.¹¹ Khaldun contended that “dynasties have a natural life span like individuals”.¹²

Comparison of Khaldun with Auguste Comte (1798–1857)

The prominence of Ibn Khaldun as a founder of sociology viz-a-viz Auguste Comte, has been a source of hot debate within the sociological contours. August Comte, whose main theoretical frameworks consisted of the hierarchy of sciences and the law of the three stages of society, is often acknowledged as the founder of modern sociology for having independently reinvented the term sociology and for introducing it as a neologism, though many scholars consider Khaldun as the forerunner of sociology. Cohen (1959) argues that Khaldun “discovered and mastered the fundamentals of sociology some five centuries before Auguste Comte actually coined the word”. Furthermore, Comte can be seen as “greatly behind the scientific achievements of his age in many ways and quite failed to absorb many landmark developments of the period which have since entered the sociological thought.”¹³

Similarities between Ibn Khaldun and Auguste Comte

1. Each scholar undoubtedly believed uniqueness of their outlooks. While Khaldun termed his perspective *ilm al-umran* (science of human social organization), Comte termed it as sociology. Both distinguished their sciences from what preceded them and treated their concepts as unique. Both of these theorists hold almost the same vision about society but looking from different perspectives.
2. Both of these theorists explained the social evolution through three main stages. While for Khaldun societies rise and fall in three stages, and the cycle moves from Bedouin to

sedentary and ends at senility, for Comte social progress is classified human knowledge which passes through three stages - theology, metaphysics and positivism. Both Khaldun and Comte discovered social phenomena according to principles of social development. Further both thinkers maintained the increasing complexity of each succeeding stage with high degree of trade and commerce and weakened dependence on religion in the final stage.

3. Khaldun and Comte's conceptual frameworks are similar to the extent that they share almost the same approach on historical-empirical method regarding social progress. Furthermore, both created a "new science" to analyze their epoch. Khaldun anticipated some theories that were later on developed by Comte. That is, Khaldun discovered the essentials of sociology such as the systematic analysis of social structure and group behavior and the evolution of less developed societies to advanced societies some five centuries before Comte actually coined the term.
4. Both of these theorists emphasized the use of scientific methods to study society. Comte maintained that the most important aspect of human development would come through observation, experimentation and comparison accurate enough to explain all experiences in terms of natural cause and effect relations. Like Comte, Khaldun had a similar historical-empirical method to analyze the society during his time. In fact, he was the first to maintain scientific bent in the historical settings. He made scientific study of historiography that no one had done before him. Through his historical-empirical method, he exposed the sources of errors to which historians usually fell prey.
5. Both Comte and Khaldun discussed specialization, occupations and professions, focusing on inequality. Khaldun stated, "Differences of conditions among people are the result of the different ways in which they make their livings".¹⁴
6. Both shared the belief on the intervention of religion in the

creation of civilization. While for Comte, “religion was to be divorced from super-nationalism and transformed into a collective emotion-building force supporting secular reforms and social justice”,¹⁵ Khaldun perceived religion as the utilitarian foundation in the establishment of *asabiyah* (social solidarity). Religion according to him, is one of the strongest factor that consolidates and intensifies *asabbiyah* besides acting as a tremendously dominant factor in socialization and signifying unity among members of its society.

7. Both the thinkers were living in the period of chaos and were hell-bent to maintain order and stability in the society. The role of social cohesion in the creation of a social group can be seen in Khaldun’s emphasis on the role of social solidarity in fortifying the social group, and in Comte’s analysis of society as “an organism where the whole is better known and more important than the part”.¹⁶
8. Both believed in the uniqueness of human nature and stages through which all the human societies pass.
9. Both treated social change as an essential ingredient of every society. While Khaldun perceived social change in his theory of ‘rise and fall of human civilizations’, Comte perceived it in his ‘law of three stages’.

Divergence of thought

1. Khaldun applied theory of social change theory, both to society as well as to state. Khaldun argued that the social system can be classified into two types i.e., rural and the urban society; Comte only applied his theory to the human mindset in its progress from the theological stage to the positive stage. Thus Comte made human mind as a subject of study but Khaldun made use of state or society at large. In other words Comte traced evolution of mind but Khaldun traced evolution of society from *badawa* to *hadhara*.
2. In contrast to Comte’s strong materialist and positivist view, excessive dependence upon a materialistic position was

marginalized in Khaldun's understanding of the cyclic theories of civilizations in which Khaldun took a hostile position towards materialism.

3. Ibn Khaldun maintained cyclical perspective of social change while as Comte acknowledged the unilinear direction of social change.
4. Comte over emphasized the factor of intellect in the process of change and advancement while as, Khaldun saw multiple factors as the basis of social change with *asabiyyah* as the dominant factor. Khaldun also mentioned the factor of geography and asserted that distinctions in the attributes of primitive and advanced civilized people persist because of differences in habit rather than differences of natural character. He believed that there is not progress in human ability, only that change is cyclical.
5. Unlike Khaldun's perspective, Comte's theory of the three stages of societal progress was idealistic because Comte's basic principle extended from ideas, rather than economic dynamics. Therefore, according to Comte, society evolved from theological phases to philosophical phases, and finally to positivist phases in mental orientation.
6. The subject matter of Comte's new science became human society; his sociological goal was the improvement of human society. Conversely, Khaldun was interested in describing human society. In his historical framework, Comte asserted that social progress throughout history can be classified under three stages.
7. While as Comte's division of society into social static and social dynamic was explicit and more specific, Khaldun's division of society into primitive society (*badawa*) and advanced society (*hadara*) was implicit and comparatively less specific than Comte. Again, Comte's observation of static and dynamic conditions represents an extension from physical science to social science. On the other hand Khaldun maintained historical flavor in his work.

From above, it can be inferred that Khaldun and Comte's conceptual frameworks are almost similar as they share the same approach on historical-empirical method regarding social progress. Furthermore, both created a "new science" to analyse their epoch. Khaldun anticipated some theories that were later on developed by Comte. That is, Khaldun discovered the essentials of sociology such as the systematic analysis of social structure and group behavior and the evolution of less-developed societies to advanced societies some five centuries before Comte coined the word. There have been speculations of August Comte having followed the Ibn Khaldun –the question raised by Baali. Some assumptions as to how Comte may have come to know of the works of Ibn Khaldun are that Comte would have come across the French translations; that he would have heard of Ibn Khaldun through his Egyptian students; and that he had read Montesquieu, who had been reading Ibn Khaldun in the original Arabic.

Ibn Khaldun and Emile Durkheim (1858-1917)

In Ibn Khaldun, we find an anticipation of various theories and concepts developed and put forth by Emile Durkheim. The various convergences and divergences are attempted as:-

Continuities between Khaldun and Durkheim

1. At the outset, Durkheim's notion of "mechanical" and "organic solidarity" parallels Khaldun's notion of *asabiyah* or "social cohesion". The Khaldunian understanding of society based on *asabiyah*, quite blends with the Durkheim's notion of collective consciousness— the key factor for establishing social order within societies. In his book *Muslim Society* (1981), Ernest Gellner stated that "Ibn Khaldun, like Emile Durkheim, is primarily a theorist of social cohesion". Factor of solidarity and its change was over-estimated by both the theorists.
2. Khaldun compared societies to individuals when he asserted that "dynasties have a natural life span like individuals".¹⁷ Like

- Khaldun, Durkheim applied biological metaphors and analogies to describe social change. Both scholars conceptualized society as a social organism which evolves or develops from being simple and mechanical to being complex and organic.
3. Khaldun noted that "human beings cannot live and exist except through social organization and cooperation".¹⁸ This concept was similar to Durkheim's notion that "society cannot exist if its parts are not solidified".¹⁹ Khaldun discussed the well-developed division of labour in urban areas, and proposed that division of labour occurred as a result of a transition in lifestyles from rural to urban society. This idea is quite similar to Durkheim's concept of the division of labour, supposedly caused by a transition from mechanical solidarity to organic solidarity.
 4. Khaldun closely examined how economical factors affect society. However, he did not ignore contribution of non-economic factors like *asabiyah* (social solidarity) and religion. Khaldun, like Durkheim, treated religion as a culturally determined social fact and preceded Durkheim with regard to emphasizing the positive role of religion in social control and group harmony. Khaldun's association of religion with primitive society anticipated the Durkheim's notion about the role of religion in fostering the mechanical solidarity, signifying that "ideas and tendencies common to all the members of the society are greater in number and intensity than those which pertain personally to each member"²⁰.
 5. Trivialized differences among societal members advance community interests rather than individual interests. In an economic sense, labour is directed towards producing more societal benefits through the division of labour. Like Khaldun, Durkheim noted that "higher societies can maintain themselves in equilibrium only if labour is divided"²¹.
 6. Both the theorists maintained that as the societies develop from primitive to advanced levels social solidarity as a

cohesive force gets declined.

7. Both the theorists argued that developed societies need formal mechanisms of social control to combat crime like pathologies as informal means don't come to rescue at this juncture.
8. Both of these theorists made use of comparative and scientific methods in their studies.
9. Durkheim authored some of the most programmatic statements on what sociology is and how it should be practiced. His concern was to establish sociology as an independent science. Arguing for its place among other sciences he wrote: 'sociology is, then, not an auxiliary of any other science; it is itself a distinct and autonomous science'.²² Likewise Ibn Khaldun claimed that *ilm al-umran* is unique, original and speaks for itself.

Divergence of thought between Khaldun and Durkheim

1. Khaldun stated that rural societies can possess only mechanical solidarity, whereas more complex urban societies, characterized by greater division of labor, possess the potential to show signs of organic solidarity. However, Durkheim drew a direct comparison between mechanical and organic solidarity, indicating that the former has more primitive and inferior attributes of societal unity than the latter. That is, Durkheim saw mechanical solidarity as a substandard form of social cohesion, as opposed to organic solidarity.
2. From Khaldun's perspective, tribes were knit from within. While Khaldun perceived complex societies as undermined by their lack of common will, Durkheim perceived complex societies as fortified by their domestic interdependence. Indeed, Durkheim saw social solidarity as challenging for pre-modern people bound by the mere idea of Sumners; by contrast, Khaldun identified tribes as constant and united together by social solidarity.
3. The collapse of collective consciousness according to Durkheim generated a greater role for the institution of the

State, whereas the breakdown of *asabiyah* (social solidarity) for Ibn Khaldun initiated the disintegration of the state. Therefore, the loss of social solidarity in both cases resulted in two different products of social change.

4. Durkheim in his famous work, *Suicide*, asserts that the collapse of social solidarity leads to abnormal behavior, a phenomenon called as anomie by him. While Khaldun did recognize how the breakdown of social solidarity resulted in pathological behavior during his time, his conceptualization of anomie was less systematic than that of Durkheim.

Comparison between Ibn Khaldun and Jane Addams

1. Both Ibn Khaldun and Addams meet much on the definition of a contemporary sociologist. Both have been the leaders in their respective fields, Khaldun as the leader of Islamic and contemporary sociology and Jane Addams as the leader of a large number of women sociologists whose contributions in the field of sociology has also been neglected. While Ibn Khaldun can be claimed to be the father of sociology, Jane Adams can be called as the mother of social works.
2. While Ibn Khaldun has analyzed various issues objectively and determined consequences of various policies. On the other hand Adams has pioneered and advocated peace movement.
3. Both of these theorists have stressed upon contemporary social issues. Ibn Khaldun established *rijal* club (male club) to discuss various emerging challenges and issues. On the other hand Adams established Jane's club (coop residence for working women).
4. For Khaldun thoughts are self created and Adams actions are also self created. Both of these thinkers had international exposure. Ibn Khaldun was exposed to Spain, Tunisia, Egypt, Morocco, Iberia and wrote on Arab, Jews, Greeks, Roman, Persians, and North African, while Adams was exposed to Hague, Hungary, UK, and US and Hawaii and wrote on

Italian, Russian, Polish Jews, Irish, German, Greeks, and Bohemian.

5. Ibn Khaldun introduced social studies with special focus on social conflict between the cities and desert followed by rise and fall of civilizations. On the other hand Adams focused on social action of youth, women, children and immigrants.
6. For Khaldun there is pedagogy in education but for Adams there are compulsory laws in education.

An interesting fact about both of the above sociologists is that both of them are being considered as forerunners of their respective fields with Khaldun being referred to as the 'father of sociology' and Addams as 'mother of social works'. While as the Ibn Khaldun's works are more inclined towards the social change and how government policy may influence the social change, Jane Addams works have a strong inclination towards social work such as fighting for the rights of the poor, children and women in society. Although both sociologists may differ in their approach, it is clear beyond doubt that both Ibn Khaldun and Jane Addams had a profound impact on the society as a whole.

Conclusion

The above comparative analysis reveals plentitude of striking parallels between Khaldun and the so called founding fathers of sociology. The theoretical convergences between Khaldun and other eminent western sociologists can be explained on two major levels. On one hand, societal innovation and change in both cases has been shown to proceed from less advanced to a more advanced state; on the other hand, the process of change in the either case can be connected to and is based upon certain materialistic perspectives and forces in the transformation of societies. Moreover, both Khaldun and other founding fathers of sociology have explained social phenomenon mainly in terms of principles of social change. Khaldun based his argument on two claims. The first claim is that the rise and fall of civilization can be understood as the interruptible processes of evolution and transformation. The

second claim is expounded in Khaldun's historical-empirical studies where he analyzed the social behavior of the Arab world. The culmination for Khaldun is that no civilization lasts forever.

Khaldun and Comte's conceptual frameworks are similar to the extent that they share almost the same approach on historical-empirical method regarding social progress. Furthermore, both created a "new science" to analyze their epoch. Khaldun anticipated some theories that were developed by Comte. To say, Khaldun discovered the essentials of sociology such as the systematic analysis of social structure and group behavior and the evolution of less developed societies to advanced societies some five centuries before Comte actually coined the term.

The conflict theory of Ibn Khaldun predates the conflict theory of Karl Marx—the man of conflict. The preliminary statement of Marx that all the history of hitherto societies is the history of class struggle has been well anticipated by Khaldun while accounting for his rise and fall of civilizations. While in Marx's conflict theory, the two main polarities are capitalists/haves and non-capitalists/have nots, in Khaldun's conflict theory, the two polarities are *badawa*/rural society and *Hadara*/urban society with the class-consciousness of Marx being pre-substituted by social solidarity (*asabiyah*).

The similarities between Khaldun and Durkheim are so compelling that one can declare Khaldun's theory of social system, a dualist typology in tone with Durkheim's typology. Moreover, Khaldun's concept of *asabiyah* and Durkheim's concept of solidarity are identical. It can be said that Khaldun's theories on *asabiyah*, division of labour, and religion were highlighted and developed by Durkheim some 500 years later.

Finally resonance between the theoretical inputs of Khaldun and Adams more than overcome their minor divergences. Both have worked on same issues with Khaldun having stressed upon the conceptual part and Adams upon the action sphere.

To conclude, it is reasonable to assert that Khaldun has developed the contours of the discipline of sociology, defined

various relevant concepts, presented propositions and developed causal relationships. Though belonging himself to the pre-modern age Khaldun apparently coined the terms like rise and fall of civilizations, societal transformation, and social solidarity etc., and established a theoretical framework that incorporates significant elements of modern thought. Khaldun crafted his ideas around social principles such as division of labor, social interaction, change in individual values and that of society at large. He examined dynastical patterns throughout history and created a paradigm that explains the stages of social development of civilization. Having developed an interdisciplinary perspective towards sociology, Khaldun evolved his theoretical concepts using the available knowledge of his era, given its strengths and limitations. In him, we find a sheer anticipation of various sociological theories and concepts. It is no wonder then, to consider him at par with other founding fathers of sociology.

Notes and References

- ¹ M.A. Enan.(1975) '*Ibn Khaldun: His Life and Work*'. Lahore: India, pp. 51-2
- ² B. L. Bruce. (1984). '*Ibn Khaldun and his Time*', in *Ibn Khaldun and Islamic Ideology*. Leiden: E.J.Brill, p. 15.
- ³ R.W.Southern. (1962). '*Western Views of Islam in the Middle Ages*'. Harvard University Press: Cambridge USA, p.88
- ⁴ B. L. Bruce. (1984). '*Ibn Khaldun and his Time*', in *Ibn Khaldun and Islamic Ideology*. Leiden: E.J.Brill, p. 15.
- ⁵ Ibn Khaldun. (1958).*The Muqadimmah: An Introduction of History* (Vols. 1-3) (F. Roshendal, Trans.) New York: Bollingen Foundation, p.77.
- ⁶ Ibn Khaldun. (1958). *The Muqadimmah: An Introduction of History* (Vols. 1-3) (F. Roshendal, Trans.). New York: Bollingen Foundation, p. 250.
- ⁷ Charles Issawi and Oliver Leaman, "Ibn Khaldun, 'Abd al-Rahman (1332-1406)," in Routledge's *Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. vol. 4., (London: Routledge) 623-627.
- ⁸ Fida Mohammad, 'Ibn Khaldun's Theory of Social Change: A comparison with Hegel, Marx and Durkheim', *the American Journal of Islamic Social Sciences*, Vol. 15, 1998, AMSS and IIIT, Virginia, p.

- 37.
- ⁹ S. Ali. (1977). *Intellectual Foundations of Muslim Civilization*. Lahore: Publishers United, p. 118
- ¹⁰ Charles Issawi and Oliver Leaman, "Ibn Khaldun, 'Abd al-Rahman (1332-1406)," in Routledge's *Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. vol. 4., (London: Routledge) 623-627.
- ¹¹ J. Arnason, & G. Stauth, *Civilization and State Formation in the Islamic Context: Re-Reading Ibn Khaldun* (Thesis Eleven, 2004), p. 36.
- ¹² Ibn Khaldun. (1958). *The Muqadimah: An Introduction of History* (Vols. 1-3) (F. Roshendal, Trans.). New York: Bollingen Foundation, p. 343.
- ¹³ Barnes H. & Becker H. (1952). *Social Thought: From Lore to Science* (Vols. 1-2) Washington: Heath and Company, p. 565.
- ¹⁴ Ibn Khaldun. (1958). *The Muqadimah: An Introduction of History* (Vols. 1-3) (F. Roshendal, Trans.). New York: Bollingen Foundation, p. 249.
- ¹⁵ H. Barnes & H. Becker. (1952). *Social Thought: From Lore to Science* (Vols. 1-2) Washington: Heath and Company, p. 503.
- ¹⁶ F. Baali. (1988). *Society, State, and Urbanism: Ibn Khaldun's Sociological thought*. Albany NY: Sunny Press, p. 66.
- ¹⁷ Ibn Khaldun (1958). *The Muqadimah: An Introduction of History* (Vols. 1-3) (F. Roshendal, Trans.). New York: Bollingen Foundation, p. 343.
- ¹⁸ Ibid., p. 33.
- ¹⁹ E. Durkheim. (1984). *The Division of Labor in Society*. New York: Free Press, p. 332.
- ²⁰ Ibid., p. 332.
- ²¹ Ibid., p. 397.
- ²² Mary C. Brinton & Victor Nee. (2001). *The New Institutionalism in Sociology*. Stanford University Press, p. 11.