



Çamlı, A. Y. (2021). "Was The Irrational Management System Why The Ottoman Did Not Adopt Capitalism?", *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, Sayı 44, Denizli, ss. 15-25..

WAS THE IRRATIONAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEM OF GOVERNANCE THE REASON WHY THE OTTOMAN DID NOT ADOPT CAPITALISM?

Ahmet Yavuz ÇAMLI*

Abstract

Western societies achieve unprecedented economic growth in the 19th century. On the other hand, The Ottomans become a state in which economic, political and financial crises have become chronic. Western societies make an economic leap by successfully internalizing modern capitalism. The Ottomans resisted maintaining their traditional mentality. It is claimed that the idea of irrational management lies behind the Ottoman not transitioning to capitalism. According to Weber, this irrational rule of the Ottoman State is expressed in patrimonialism. This study aims to search for the reason why the Ottomans did not transition to capitalism. Was the Ottoman understanding of management irrational as claimed? According to the result, the Ottoman State never wanted to convert to capitalism. The management thought of the Ottomans originated from Islamic law. Considering the management principles, it can be argued that the Ottoman State had a unique rational mindset.

Keywords: *Capitalism, Ottoman Management, Rationality, Patrimonialism, Weber.*

OSMANLI'NIN KAPİTALİZMİ BENİMSEMEMESİNİN NEDENİ İRRASYONEL YÖNETİM SİSTEMİ MİYDİ?

Öz

Batı toplumları, 19. yüzyılda daha önce görülmemiş bir ekonomik büyüme gerçekleştirirler. Osmanlı ise bu süreçte iktisadi, siyasi ve mali buhranların adeta kronikleştiği bir devlet haline gelir. Batı toplumları modern kapitalizmi başarılı bir şekilde içselleştirerek ekonomik sıçrama yapar. Osmanlı ise geleneksel zihniyetini korumak için direniş gösterir. Osmanlı'nın kapitalizme geçiş yapmamasının arka planında irrasyonel yönetim düşüncesinin bulunduğu öne sürülür. Weber'e göre Osmanlı'nın bu irrasyonel yönetimi patrimonyalizmle ifade edilir. Bu çalışmanın amacı ise Osmanlı'nın kapitalizme geçiş yapmamasının nedenini araştırmaktır. İddia edildiği üzere Osmanlı'nın yönetim anlayışı akıl dışı mıydı? Elde edilen sonuca göre Osmanlı hiçbir zaman kapitalizme geçmek istememiştir. Zira Osmanlı'nın yönetim düşüncesi İslam hukuku kaynaklıdır. Yönetim ilke ve değerleri, kapitalizmin özünde bulunan kapitalist değerlerle karşıtlık içermektedir. Yönetim ilkelerine bakıldığında Osmanlı'nın kendine özgü rasyonel bir düşünce yapısına sahip olduğu öne sürülebilir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Kapitalizm, Osmanlı Yönetimi, Rasyonellik, Patrimonyalizm, Weber.*

*Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Manisa Celal Bayar Üniversitesi, Kula Meslek Yüksekokulu, Yönetim ve Organizasyon Bölümü, MANİSA.
e-posta: ahmetyavuz.camli@cbu.edu.tr (<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0746-9755>)

1. INTRODUCTION

Capitalism is expressed as the economic and political system that emerges as a result of the economic and political system breaking away from the socio-cultural system. In pre-modern times, the socio-cultural system is a resource that generates legitimacy for all other areas such as the political and economic system. All religious, moral, cultural and traditional principles and values are representatives of the socio-cultural system. With capitalism, which expresses modernization, the socio-cultural system loses its meaning-generating function. The political system and the economic system begin to operate in new and in their own form. In the legitimacy areas of the sub-branches that make up the social organization, religious and moral principles are made obsolete. Instead, secular principles are substituted. Capitalism colonizes fields such as economics and science, politics, law, judiciary, lifestyle, education and arts. In capitalist formation, the entire system is built on a secular ground. Money and power establish excessive control over the individual, society, and social systems.

Capitalism can be mentioned with many different features and qualities. However, its most defining feature is the concentration of the factors of production in the hands of the bourgeois class acting with the drive of goal-rational action. As it is known, two important elements of institutionalization of purposeful-rationality in the 18th century are the capitalist economy and modern state. In other words, the gathering of material means of production in the hands of entrepreneurs or leaders acting purposefully-rationally started a new era. During this period, all employees were separated from material working tools. In other words, workers were separated from material means of production, soldiers from combat tools, civil servants from management tools, assistants from laboratories and research tools, and financiers from financial instruments, and their management and ownership passed under the control of entrepreneurs or managers acting purposefully-rationally. The monopolization of ownership of these material means is the necessary condition for purposeful-rational action. The process of determining the management in the bureaucratic state according to the laws and regulations issued within the framework of rational principles has a close relationship with the modern capitalist development process. Modern capitalist enterprise is primarily based on accountability. In order to survive, the capitalist system needs constant general legal norms and a rationally calculated management system, at least similar to the performance expected of a machine. Based on this fact, Weber lists the basic characteristics of modern capitalism as a) Rational capital accounting, b) Freedom of markets, c) A reliable legal system, d) Freedom of labour, and e) Commercialization of economic life. Weber (1993), p. 66-69; Jean BAECHLER, *The Origins of Capitalism*, Translated by: Ali M. Kılıçbay, Ankara: Image Publishing House, 1994, p. 48

Capitalist development is used in a different sense than capitalism. This concept indicates a stage of socio-economic development that depends on rationalization. Accordingly, the mind is at the forefront in decisions taken in sectors such as industry, trade and agriculture. Economic activities are carried out for rational purposes. Production is done with the most efficient means. Production is made for the market. Division of labour and specialization gain importance. Money economy spreads. Trade volume expands. Capital is transferred to efficient investments. Self-employment is supported. Financial principles and methods are determined rationally.

Weber is one of the thinkers who dealt with capitalism from the broadest perspective. He sees the development process of capitalism as a process of rationalization in general. In this process, according to him, all fields such as management, law, economy, art, science and religion are determined by purpose-rational principles. Weber sees them as historical processes specific to Western societies only. In addition, Weber examines why non-Western societies cannot make the transition to modern capitalism.

According to Weber, there are many reasons why the Ottomans could not reach modern capitalism. Criticisms are made under headings such as the judicial system, economic system, legal system, and world view. It is emphasized that the management system is irrational from the broadest perspective. So really, why did the Ottomans fail to achieve modern capitalism? Was it the administrative system that allegedly caused the Ottomans to fail? Or the right question to be asked is "Did the Ottoman want to transition to capitalism?" It is a fact that the Ottomans failed in capitalism. Unlike Western societies, it does not contain the conditions that will pass to modern capitalism. The main issue is, as alleged, the Ottoman Empire was not able to transition to capitalism due to an irrational administrative system? Is the management system really irrational? These

and similar questions will be tried to be answered objectively. The research will be within the framework of the management system, not around the economic system. Although it is related to capitalism, its focus is on the management system. Since the management system is a very comprehensive subject, only management principles will be investigated. In addition, since the main lines of Ottoman rule were formed in the classical period, this period will be taken as a basis.

2. CLAIMS ON THE IRRATIONALITY OF THE OTTOMAN MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

According to Weber, the Ottoman state is a structure governed by oppressive sultans. In this structure, the sultans exploit the whole society for their soulful ambitions. Weber calls this system "sultanism". Sultanism is the crystallized form of irrationality. According to him, the sultan is the only absolute authority for this most advanced variation of patrimonialism (Weber, 1978: 279; Turner, 1997: 217, 300). He has servants and slave soldiers loyal to him. The relationship between the Sultan and his servants is based on personal loyalty. Sultan has absolute right over them (Turner, 1997: 21; Curtis, 2009: 271-272). However, the sultan does not obtain this special position as a result of social consensus. He sees this as an innate right in himself. The Sultan uses his arbitrariness limitlessly with this irrational legitimacy. It controls the political process without being bound by a rational and official administrative code. Uncertainty prevails in all activities of the sultan. It directs every political activity in a way that increases its personal interests. Legislative, executive and judicial acts are legitimate only with his or her consent. He creates a patrimonial family of servants who swear allegiance to him. He thinks that in this way he can maintain the administration of vast territories and the army. These elite servants, with different privileges, follow the arbitrary orders of the central authority to the letter. The term of office of patrimonial servants is uncertain. It parallels their obedience to orders. There is no legal procedure for appointment, promotion or dismissal. Failure to fulfill the personal and arbitrary orders of the sultan is perceived as disobeying authority. This revolt can often have serious consequences. Disruptions in duty are never tolerated and punished mercilessly. There is no justice in such a system. People cannot claim their rights (Weber, 2012b: 348). As will be noted, Ottoman society in Weber's perspective is under the direction of a militarist administrative structure. The Sultan wants to constantly increase his arbitrariness by following a colonial and expansionist policy. For this, he has to create a very strong army and keep it alive continuously. A large army of hired soldiers, slaves, volunteers and the people needs. Resources across the country are irrationally wasted in order to meet the military's expenses such as food, ammunition, equipment, daily wages and salaries (Weber, 1978: 1081). The people, who do not actually participate in the war, work with all their might to provide one of the expense items of the army. As a result, the sultan becomes increasingly dependent on the tools of imperial politics. On the other hand, the survival of a huge military system requires the efficient and complete maintenance of the resources that provide revenue for the treasury. Spoils constitute the biggest share of treasury revenues (Turner, 1997: 39-43, 294).

A patrimonial state is fed by many such irrational financial resources. The main sources are the gain of the people who were seized by force, the tributes collected from the colonies, the gifts from other heads of state, the tributes paid by the autonomous administrations at regular intervals, and the taxes that were taken from the people in times of war. Therefore, the occupancy rate of the treasury and the success of the patrimonial army follow a parallel course. Likewise, the most strategic forces of the sultan are these two phenomena (Turner, 1997: 294).

Another feature of the despotic rule is that it does not accept the private property. As is known, the livelihood of the patrimonial society is based on agricultural activities. The only value in the hands of the farmer was land. But the ownership of the land also belongs to the state. Since the sole owner of the country is the sultan, the ownership of the agricultural lands also belongs to the sultan. The Sultan allocates these lands to his patrimonial servants according to his services. After a minimum amount is given to the farmer as a processing share, the remaining product is retained by the sultan and his men. In other words, according to Weber, the sweat and effort of the people are used in the financing of the personal and arbitrary expenditures of the patrimonial administration (Turner, 1997: 221, 223).

In the Ottoman political life, the sultan protected stability as long as the privileged group could keep the various frequency groups in balance. These groups are scientific class, military sector and popular organizations

(Turner, 1997: 185). Despite this, stability never seems to last long. Political chaos prevails constantly. Sultan constantly uses brute force. Factors such as the attacks of the enemy state, the revolt of the power centres in the country as soon as they find the opportunity, and the rentier demands of the interest groups are effective (Turner, 1997: 39, 294). As a result, according to Weber, the Ottoman administration is a despotic administration. There is no legal or moral principle that this administration takes as an example. As a result, country resources are used to cover the arbitrary and military expenses of the sultan. Therefore, there is no accumulation of capital. Land ownership also belongs to the sultan. Large segments of peasants survive on a low income. Income distribution injustice is at an extreme. There is no rational legal system. Therefore, the possibility of the economy to evolve to the stage of rational capitalism is blocked.

3. REFLECTION OF IRRATIONAL MINDSET ON ECONOMY

The situation can be understood more clearly when looking at the Ottoman economy. There are no managers, personnel or workers with technical knowledge in the field of economics. There is no predetermined fee mechanism. Since the Sultan and his staff act arbitrarily, there is no rational process. The market and trade are intervened arbitrarily. Accordingly, negativities such as bribery, abuse, favouritism, abuse of office, domination and cruelty become common. Specialization and division of labour are not as modern as in the West. Under these conditions, rational professional expertise areas cannot be produced in the economy. As the money economy does not develop, needs are met through barter. With an arbitrary thought focusing on rent, farmers are left to their fate. Therefore, capital accumulation is not allowed in the private sector.

According to Weber, the Ottoman economy is the field of application of the irrational and arbitrary policies of the despotic sultans. The manufacturer's products are forcibly taken away. Therefore, it is not possible to increase the welfare of the agricultural producer. Likewise, there is no legal system that secures the property and wealth of merchants. Therefore, the property or wealth of the merchant can be seized at any time. On the other hand, it is impossible for the entrepreneur to receive support and incentives. It is not possible for the tradesman or craftsman to specialize in his profession. In other words, in the Weberian perspective, the Ottoman economy is the personal domain of the sultan with its general appearance. Economic activity consists of agricultural production and commercial activities in small markets to fill the personal treasure of the sultan.

4. MANAGEMENT SYSTEM AND PRINCIPLES

Above are Weber's claims on Ottoman irrationality. The extent to which these claims correspond to the facts should be revealed with an objective approach. Ottoman is a state that has preserved its existence for more than six centuries. Therefore, it is natural to experience ups and downs in administration and economy. However, talking about general rationality or irrationality requires a long study. In this study, only the management principles will be discussed and the place of the Ottomans in the rational-irrationality line will be tried to be determined.

The Ottoman State is governed by Islamic law. Both the management system and the economic system are designed by Islamic law. The Ottoman economy is an economy originating from Islam. It is not rational to comment on the Ottoman economy by ignoring Islamic principles. It is not possible for these interpretations to correspond to the truth. In order to analyze the Ottoman administration or economy properly, it is necessary to set forth the reference set of Islamic principles.

Islamic religion in micro and macro scope; It is based on an organization that encompasses its environment, society and the entire universe. It offers the elements that facilitate both this world and the hereafter to the service of humanity. This set of principles and values also applies to the state. Ottoman is also a structure governed according to Islamic principles. Whether the Ottomans are irrational or not, will be evaluated below within the framework of management principles.

"Justice" can be mentioned as a priority principle. All theology, politics and ethics books recommend that those who govern the state should be absolutely fair (Koçi Bey, 1985: 101; Tursun Bey, t.y. : 27; Nizamülmülk, 1981: 35; Aristotle, 2011: 27; Atay, 1974: 38). In this respect, it can be said that the most important factor that

makes the Ottoman Empire an Ottoman is the principle of justice. Justice prevailed in all areas of the Ottoman system. Sultans are the guardians and practitioners of this principle (İnalcık, 1965: 49). Therefore, a large-scale justice accumulation is witnessed in the Ottoman Empire. The case of Fatih Sultan Mehmed and a Greek citizen can be shown as an example of this. Judge Hızır Çelebi's decision to cut off Fatih's hand is a good example showing that justice was applied with precision (Adil, 1923, vol.12: 185-186). Sultans listen to the complaints of citizens even while they are busy with their daily affairs and hobbies. It constantly issues justice and warns local administrators. These are proofs of the value given to governing with justice (İnalcık, 2010: 123; Akdağ, 1977: 403; İnalcık, 2015b: 99). Of course, the independence of the judiciary and its trial procedures prove this (D.İ.A., c.33: 519; Bayındır, 2015: 150; Ortaylı, 1976: 95-107; Ortaylı, 1994; Arık, 1997: 2-71). On the basis of justice, the sultan cannot be expected to be despotic against the citizen. On the contrary, the attitudes of both the Sultan and the members of the Divan-ı Hümayun on this issue are extremely sensitive. It can be easily said that the principle of justice was internalized by the rulers in the Ottoman Empire, where the individual was seen as a goal, not a tool.

The principle of rationality is important for all systems, especially the management system. Islam is a religion of mind. Allah speaks of the blessing of mind that He gives people in the Quran. He encourages, recommends and commands people to use this mind for earthly and ethereal purposes (Bakara / 13, 170, 171, 242, 269; Al-i Imran / 7, 190; Maide / 58, 100; En'am / 32; Yunus / 2, 16, 42, 100; Ra'd / 4, 19; Ibrahim / 52; Nahl / 12, 67; Haj / 46; Furkan / 44; Shuara / 28; 83 Ankebut / 35, 43; Zümer / 18; Mü'min / 54; Zuhuf / 3; Casiye / 5; Mülk / 10). Therefore, the principle of rationalism is prioritized in all Islamic societies, especially in the Ottoman Empire. Accordingly, the founding and supervising team of the management style is the ulema. Ulema were the chief architect of Ottoman rationality. The phenomenon of rationality on which this founding element rigorously emphasizes shows itself mostly in the style of management (Duran, 1999: 115). On the contrary, all institutions and processes related to the Ottoman administration, which Weber and the Westerners emphasize as completely irrational, are kept as far away from irrational practices and thoughts as possible. Management thoughts, principles and values; It is protected from mystical elements such as magic, dreams, fortune telling, intuition and superstition. There are examples showing that this idea was not only applied in theory but also in practice. For example, Fatih Sultan Mehmet's relationship with the leader of the Hurufiye community is an example. Another example is the suspension of some decisions of Yavuz Sultan Selim by Sheikh al-Islam (Duran, 1999: 80-84). In other words, it can rarely be seen that irrational decisions were made in the classical period in the Ottoman Empire due to some socio-political reasons. Generally, it is known that the arbitrary, unlawful and unprincipled decisions and practices of the sultan were prevented by the ulema (D.İ.A, 2007, vol. 34: 457-458).

Weber states that in Islamic societies and the Ottoman Empire, citizens cannot get their labour compensated. Farmers are slaved to work by the sultan and his men. The producers of the producers are detained by the sultan's men. In reality, all citizens in the Ottoman tradition are entrusted to the sultan by God. This understanding is called "vediatullah". Citizens are under the protection of the sultan in accordance with the principle of patriarchy, which parallels the provision of justice. The Sultan embraces the citizens in the country as his own family. It is personally responsible for all their needs, welfare and safety. He treats the most ordinary citizen in the society in the same way as he treats his own family, regardless of whether he is a Muslim or a non-Muslim. He is just, just, merciful and compassionate (Koçi Bey, 1985: 102; Kinalızade Ahmet Efendi, t.y .: 209). This principle is meticulously emphasized in Ottoman law texts. The legitimacy of the principle of Vediatullâh is Hz. It is based on the hadith of the Prophet (pbuh) "You are all a shepherd and you are responsible for those under your command just as he is responsible for the shepherd's flock ... The statesman is also the shepherd of the people and is responsible for his righteousness" (Bukhari, Jum'a / 11). In other words, the sultan should work with all his might to present a perfect order to his people, for whom he is responsible as the head of the administration.

In other words, the approach of the Ottoman State to its citizens is extremely humane and sincere. In the Ottoman system, 'the people are not for the state; "the state is for the people" understanding prevails. This is a sign of acting with the password of serving the people to the Right. As alleged, it is out of the question for a citizen to be seen as a slave, to be ill-treated, to be forced to work or to work unwanted. Citizens are seen as a force that serves the "survival" of the Islamic state, works for it and ensures the existence of the state. In this respect, the producers are seen as benefactors. Today's understanding of "the peasant is the master of the

nation” is a reflection of this tradition. According to the principle of the benefactor, the rights of all Muslim and non-Muslim producers are protected in detail by-laws (Hoca Sadettin Efendi, 1979: 8; Abdurrahman Şeref Efendi, 1985: 103; Gelibolulu Mustafa Ali, 1975: 52).

Just as the Sultan wants the safety of a member of his family, he is also responsible for the security of each of the Muslim and non-Muslim citizens. In this respect, the principle of Makasidu’s Sharia can be mentioned. Makasidu’s sharia principles can be expressed as the aims of sharia. In this context, the sultan is responsible for protecting and improving the lives of the citizens. It is responsible for protecting and developing their property. It is responsible for protecting and developing their mind. It is responsible for protecting and improving their culture and religion. It is responsible for protecting and developing their generation (D.I.A., 2003, vol. 27: 423).

According to allegations, the Sultan is the sole owner of the property in the country. The sultan is the owner of the land, the products, the throne, and the raia, in short, everything in the country. The criticism of ownership is mentioned a lot in Western sources and is not discussed in detail. However, opinions on this subject are often presented as a result of a misunderstanding. In the Islamic tradition, God is the only source of sovereignty. Not understanding this topic well creates misinterpretations. In this context, it is God who is the owner and sovereign of everything. Sultan is the caliph of God on earth. The owner of sovereignty and property is God and his caliph. Theologically, God, the creator of everything for believers, is naturally the owner of everything. Ownership in this view is related to belief, not to worldly law. This belief does not prevent people from gaining legal ownership. People can own spouse, children, home, and land throughout their lives. Ownership in this sense is practice and law (Demir, 1981: 140-144). The sultan or anyone cannot confiscate and claim ownership rights over someone else’s spouse, family, children, house, property, land, labour. Such an act is not allowed in Islam. It is seen that such acts are prohibited in the Quran (Maide / 38). In other words, the sultan does not own all the land, people and means of production in the country as Weber claims. Nizamülmülk says, “People of mukataat should know that property and ra’iyyet belong to the Sultan.” What is meant by property and ownership is the relationship of responsibility between the manager and his subject. The Sultan is empowered to manage the property and must act accordingly. The manager should look out for the safety, peace and well-being of the people living under his rule. The sultan has no right of ownership over the citizens, such as property ownership. In this respect, the claims cannot be accepted according to Islamic thought or Ottoman tradition. It is understood that according to the religion of Islam, all free people have the right to property. People can acquire their property through work and acquisition, inheritance, and grants. They can do whatever they want about those who own them (D.İ.A., 1996, vol. 14: 516). Operations such as the expropriation of private properties by the administrators are directly related to the public interest as in today’s modern law. In other words, administrators can expropriate private properties with public benefit within the framework of the law (Armağan, 1992: 163-168; Barkan, 1980: 288; D.İ.A., 2006, vol.31: 541). However, according to the Islamic tradition, there is no gender discrimination in a property. Men or women can own property separately as free individuals (Armağan, 1992: 47-57). It is stated that the monopoly of property in gender is not welcomed with the view that “a man earns a man, a woman wins” (Nisa / 32). Accordingly, the “property separation regime” is valid in Islamic law (D.İ.A., 2002, vol.26: 129). Likewise, when the timar system is investigated, it is seen that the operation of the land ownership proceeds rationally. As a matter of fact, it is known that the statutes were prepared meticulously without leaving any room for arbitrariness (Albayrak, t.y. : 32-234).

Another principle is the principle of consultation. As the source of the principle of consultation, the 38th verse of the Surah Sura can be cited: Referring to the verse “They carry out all their actions through consultation”, the Sultans also take the rule of the four caliphs who are exemplary rulers of the Islamic tradition. Ottoman sultans make every decision in consultation. The decision-making mechanism in the Ottoman Empire is formed by the sultan, the members of the Divan-ı Hümayun, Şeyhülislam and the ulema. According to this procedure, the sultan cannot use his authority arbitrarily in an issue related to the administration. The Sultan has the responsibility to consult primarily in the Divan-ı Hümayun during the decision-making and law-making stages or on strategic issues (Ortaylı, 2008: 210).

In-state affairs, it can be said that the final opinion is the fatwas of Sheikh al-Islam. Sheikh al-Islam is in charge of protecting the basic principles and values of the state. He never allows these principles to be violated, that is,

he does not give fatwa. A decision in which Shaykh al-Islam did not issue a fatwa cannot be enforced (Uzunçarşılı, 1973: 11; Uzunçarşılı, 1972: 495-496; Uzunçarşılı, 1941: 101; Karal, 1970: 3; Ortaylı, 2008: 202; İnalçık, 2015b: 98-99.). The statement of the famous Şeyhülislam Ebussuud Efendi, “the object that is nâ-legitimate with the order of the sultan cannot be legitimate” emphasizes this view. “All these reveal that there was certain scrupulousness in the Ottoman sultans to obey Islamic law” (Aydın, 2017a: 74).

According to the principle of mutual responsibility, there is a mutual responsibility between the ruler and the managed in the Quran. This responsibility must first be fulfilled for Li-Vechillah, that is, for the sake of Allah (Nursi, Lemalar, p.44). The mutual responsibility that emerges in line with Li-Vechillah is in a way the embodiment of the concepts of teleological ethics and deontological ethics on a common religious denominator. Manager’s responsibilities are as mentioned above. Citizens also have responsibilities towards Sultana. The most basic obligation of the citizen is obedience to the sultan who is the head of the state. Obedience is legitimized according to Islamic law based on love and tolerance. This conscientious agreement, achieved with mutual and divine consent, is one of the most important characteristics of Islamic states (Koçi Bey, 1985: 59; İnalçık, 1965: 52; Tursun Bey, t.y. : 22, 24). Besides, the authority in the Ottoman Empire; It meets in his office, not in the person of the sultan. “Obedience to the Sultan or the caliph, obedience to the Prophet; Obedience to the Prophet, obedience to Allah ”(An-Nisa / 59). In other words, the citizens in the country are responsible to the sultan, and the sultan to Allah (Abu Yusuf, 1973: 28).

According to researches, another restrictive legislative principle preventing the sultans from taking arbitrary decisions in the Ottoman State (Akgündüz, 1990: 46-53). Parallel to this principle, the sultan should make every decision according to certain religious and customary procedures (Uzunçarşılı, 1973: 11). Making, interpreting and changing laws depends on certain traditions and principles. As Weber thought, every word that comes out between the sultan’s two lips is not law. Therefore, the rule of law principle is valid in the Ottoman order. It is the ulema who guarantee this (Akgündüz, 1989b: 24). As in other practices, there are Islamic traditions at the basis of the legislative process in the Ottoman Empire. In Islamic tradition, the production of laws depends on professional and scientific activities. In other words, it is revealed by expert mujtahids in the field of legal rules. Jurisprudence and comments of non-experts are never respected. In this regard, a person must first be an expert in fiqh and then in the method. The second condition is not valid without the first. In this respect, very few people have the authority to produce legal norms in the Islamic tradition (Karaman, 2013: 50-56). As it is known, the main sources of Islamic law are the Quran, Sunnah, İjma and Qiyas. It is not possible for the Quran and circumcision to cover all laws and legal regulations. Legal arrangements that do not take place directly in these two main sources may be needed. Legal arrangements are made in emerging situations depending on social developments. These are eliminated by experts in their field making case law. The comparison comes into play at this stage (Muhammed Ebu Zehra, 1986: 206). Benchmark is both intensive and healthy reasoning and highly rational actions such as empirical experimentation. In this respect, it comes into play when faced with a new situation that is not included in the Quran and Sunnah, which are the main sources of Islamic law. The mujtahid person tries to produce a rational solution by comparison individually (Karaman, 1984: 111). Legal collections such as criminal law, commercial law, civil law, administrative law, which are sub-branches of Islamic law, are generally created by comparison. In addition, it is produced through the method of maslahat (social benefit) and Muslim (seeing social good), which Hanafi jurists call secret analogy (Bilmen, t.y., vol.1: 17). Serahsi expresses consent as a mechanism to facilitate daily practice. Mujtahid bases his statement on some verses and hadiths (Serahsi, 2011, vol.10: 267). “Allah wishes for you ease, not difficulty” (Bakara / 185), “What is beneficial in your religion is ease” (Bukhari, İman / 29) and “do not make it difficult, make it easy, not hate it” (Bukhari, İlm / 12). When looking at Muslim societies, it is seen that this principle is used many times. It is claimed that Imam-i Malik said: “Ninety per cent of the Sharia is Maslahat and Istihsan.” The main societies based on the principles of Charity and Employment are the Turkish states, Ottoman society and Andalusian Umayyads established in Maverünnahr (Duran, 2017: 180). Based on this explanation, the authorities of the sultans in legislation in the Ottoman Empire can be listed as follows. They can enact Sharia provisions exactly. Sharia provisions can partially regulate and enact them in a way that their essence remains the same. They can choose any of the jurisprudence provisions and enact them. They can enact an ijtehad opinion recommended by Shaykh al-Islam or great scholars. If they have the authority, they can make case law in a situation where there is no Sharia and jurisprudence. They

can enact the solution proposal of the experts in an event on which there is no sharia and jurisprudence. They can make arrangements in some areas based on their legitimate authorities (Akgündüz, 1990: 5-87).

This and the following principles essentially constitute the subgroup of the mentioned principles related to management. The principle of "Ibadullah's Terfih-i Ahvalleri" (food) can be mentioned first. The principle of "maximizing state revenues" and "maintaining the optimum balance" can also be put forward in this direction. These are the basic principles that regulate socio-economic life. According to the subsistence principle, the Ottoman system was human-oriented. Taking human as a goal improves supply-side thinking (Tabakoğlu, 1999: 17). According to the principle known as subsistence, the sultan must meet the basic needs of every person in his subjects. It should provide them with an environment of trust, peace and prosperity. He is responsible for ensuring that they continue their lives. In this respect, it is aimed to enable people to fulfil their consumption needs in the easiest and cheapest way in the Ottoman lands. In addition, the products produced must be of human quality. Many policies are shaped on this basis (Pamuk, 2017: 143). Fulfilling subsistence requires some mandatory intervention and critical practices for a state that spans about 15 million square kilometers. Considering the geographical and technical conditions of the period, it is understood that it was not easy to act according to this principle. Thus, Ottoman rulers produce guiding, interventionist and controlling policies in socio-economic life. Thanks to the healthy functioning of this laborious organization, social welfare can be maintained by increasing it to a certain level (Genç, 2012: 48-63). This goal is successfully achieved with the grooming system. The timar system is not unique to the Ottoman Empire. This system was designed by Ottoman rationalism and the food issue was resolved without any problems for centuries.

Justice is phenomenally important in the Islamic and Ottoman tradition. Justice has a great role in the classical period Ottoman society as an ideal and model society. In this respect, justice is a phenomenon that spread to and affects every activity of the Ottoman Empire from micro to macro. The thinking of the Ottoman sultans is motivated by this essential element. Generally speaking, Ottoman codes of administration are handled within the scope of the justice department. Accordingly, justice is the dynamic that produces the strongest and lasting motivation between the state and society, and between individuals and institutions. In parallel with this, in a social organization, justice should be provided first. The state should create a strong military force to protect individuals, to rule with justice and to ensure peace. The state treasury must be full for the expenses of a large number of soldiers. The elements of the treasury that will generate income are labour and land. Financial resources become productive with the farmer's cultivation and joyfulness of the land in a safe environment. The state treats its citizens fairly in this process. In this way, the justice department is completed (Kinalızade Ali Efendi, t.y. : 282-283). Likewise, the long-term existence of a state like the Ottoman shows that it has a rational financial system (D.İ.A., 2003, vol. 27: 423).

The other principle is to Maintain Optimum Balance. Centuries' changes and experiences in the Ottoman Empire are taken as an important reference in daily life by passing through a rational filter. This accumulation is reshaped and activated according to the conditions of the period and social interest in an Islamic framework. Based on this reference, Ottoman rulers establish a unique and flexible structure. Policies, practices, measures, orders, interventions and privileges are all carried out in accordance with this system of values. With this method, the Ottomans reach the optimum balance level based on the public interest and providing partial welfare to the individual (Pamuk, 2014: 30). The needs that arise and diversify over time are met in a way that maintains this optimum level. Economic activities, institutions, policies, practices, inspections in the Ottoman Empire may differ according to time and place. The principles that form the essence of these always remain the same (D.İ.A., 2007, c.33: 525; Tabakoğlu, 2013: 85-95).

Thanks to these principles, the Ottoman Empire became one of the rare states that preserved its existence for the longest time in history. Despite the mediocre economy of the Middle Ages, the harsh conditions of the period and geography, and the troubles from the environment, the Ottoman economy successfully developed since the establishment of the state. As a result of a rational organization and a planned economy, the Ottoman Empire took its place among the strong economies of its period (Barkan, 1980: 741; Wallerstein and Tabak, 1999:203; Kaku, 2014: 333-6). In this context, existing production factors participate in the production process in the most efficient way (Duran, 1999: 33). A highly developed credit and financial organization add vitality to the

trade sector (Pamuk, 2014: 6). The liabilities of the producer are clearly stated with the legal regulations. Even in the remotest part of the countryside, the presence of central authority is felt at the highest possible level. Thus, the real operates in an environment of trust and peace not seen in Western feudalism (İnalçık, 2015a: 51). Indeed, with the implementation of the timar system, the most stable functioning of the military (Cin, 1978: 5), political (Itzkowitz, 1989: 78), economic (Barkan, 1980: 874), financial (Genç, 2012: 102) and all other institutions becomes possible income (Takaş, 1958: 331).

5. CONCLUSION

The Ottoman State is a state that has succeeded in maintaining its sovereignty in wide geography for centuries. Apart from the fact that it contains Muslim societies within itself; it has the ability to manage groups belonging to different religions, cultures and traditions under one roof with tolerance policies. In the Ottoman Empire, fields such as administration, law, economy, judiciary and legislation are built on Islamic principles and values system. In this process, it is inevitable that interactions arise in dialogues with different societies. In addition, the rulers evaluate the rational and legitimate Muslim-Turkish states before them and the traditions of the societies that ruled in the same geography. Called the classical period 14.-17. can speak of a system of four full flesh for centuries.

As a civilization built on long historical experiences, traditions and values, the Ottoman Empire has its own institution, principles and practices. For this reason, it is important to understand the system of principles and values that ensure the survival of the state. In this direction, the principles that designed the classical Ottoman administration and economic life should be known.

In this context, it is seen that the Ottoman administration was designed in a principled, systematic and rational way. Since the establishment of the state, the institutions established for management, determining policies, measures are taken, decisions made, appointments made and laws passed have rational bases. In such an atmosphere, the sultan is one of the people who use his personal will least, let alone arbitrariness, in matters related to the administration. In addition, the sultan acts with a legitimate, legal and rational understanding in the legislative, executive and judicial fields. Even though all power and authority were concentrated in its own office, it shares these powers with the subordinate authorities in a systematic and rational manner. It takes decisions on issues needed in the field of execution by consulting with bureaucrats, each of whom is an expert and authority in their field. This institution that helps Sultana in administrative matters is the Divan-ı Hümayun. In the classical period, most of the members of the Divan were from the limited class. The limited class or the ulama is in the position of "higher wisdom" in the Ottoman administration. The sultans adopt the legal-rational management principles designed by the ulema. In this respect, they are responsible for managing the state according to Sharia. Like everyone else, they are responsible before the law, from every decision they make to every step they take. Then they act with the consciousness that they will be accountable in the presence of God. On the other hand, the main source in the legislative process is Sharia. According to this, the sultan can either enact one of the shari provisions in the legislation or enact a new law within the framework of sharia. These activities are carried out with the cooperation and coordination of the sultan, the members of the Divan-ı Hümayun and the shaykh al-islam. After all, the sultan administers the state according to certain basic principles. These are the main principles such as consultation, justice, compassion, tolerance, security, freedom, and the rule of law, formed under the guidance of the ulema. It seems that the Ottoman understanding of administration is shaped by a solid framework and by the advanced scientists and information technology of the age.

However, it is a concrete fact that Ottoman society could not evolve into the capitalist stage. However, Ottoman society was not captive in a feudal structure in the rationalization process. Without adopting the capitalism system, the Ottomans show extremely successful performances on capitalist developments. It is possible to see these developments in the Ottoman society. Indeed, the values surrounding the Ottoman system are completely opposite to the values that exist in capitalism. As a result of the rationalization unique to the West, a racist, hedonist, discriminatory, confrontational, self-interested and egoist mentality emerges. These are prototypes in stark contrast to Islamic values. In the Ottoman society, which is framed by Islamic principles, all institutions and methods are built on moral, religious and rational values as much as possible. Society is not only

motivated by success and interest, but also feelings such as solidarity, sacrifice, and brotherhood. In the West, all fields of value are violated in order to gain economic and political power. It is seen that the socio-cultural system in the Ottoman Empire assumed the function of distributing legitimacy.

As a result, Ottoman society develops a system that is incompatible with feudal and patrimonial characteristics and is unique in every field. This system is organized by a high level of rationality. Since it covers a very long period, naturally, irrational practices are also witnessed from time to time. However, the so-called classical period 14-17. it can be said that the Ottoman Empire showed significant success in the socio-economic field in the century.

REFERENCES

- Akman, M. (1997). *Osmanlı Devletinde Kardeş Katli*, Eren, İstanbul.
- Aydın, M. A. (2017a). *Osmanlı Devleti'nde Hukuk ve Adalet*, 2. Basım, Klasik, İstanbul.
- Aydın, M. A. (2017b). *Türk Hukuk Tarihi*, 14. Basım, Beta, İstanbul.
- Aydın, M. A. (2006). "İslam Hukuku'nun Osmanlı Devleti'nde Kanun Hukukuna Doğru Geçirdiği Evrim", *Türk Hukuk Tarihi Araştırmaları*, 1, 11-21.
- Aydın, M. A. (2004). "Kanunnâmeler ve Osmanlı Hukuku'nun İşleyişindeki Yeri", *Osmanlı Araştırmaları*, XXIV, 36-46.
- Aydın, M. A. (1991). "Osmanlılar: Hukukî-Adlî Yapı", *İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, C. 33. İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yay., 515-521.
- Bach, D. C. (2011). "Patrimonialism and Neopatrimonialism: Comparative Trajectories and Readings", *Commonwealth & Comparative Politics*, 49/3, 275-294 (DOI: 10.1080/14662043.2011.582731).
- Berki, A. H. (1978). *Açıklamalı Mecelle (Mecelle-i Ahkam-ı Adliyye)*, Hikmet, İstanbul.
- Bilmen, Ö. N. (t.y.). *Hukukî İslamiyye ve Istılahatı Fıkhiyye, Kamusu 1. Cilt*, Bilmen, İstanbul.
- Bilmen, Ö. N. (t.y.). *Hukukî İslamiyye ve Istılahatı Fıkhiyye, Kamusu 6. Cilt*, Bilmen, İstanbul.
- Cin, H. ve Akgündüz, A. (1989). *Türk Hukuk Tarihi I*, S.Ü., Konya.
- Curtis, M. (2009). *Orientalism and Islam, European Thinkers on Oriental Despotism in the Middle East and India*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Duran, B. (2017). *Din ve Kapitalizm*, Lambert Academic Publishing Saarbrücken.
- Duran, B. (2002). *Akıl ve Ahlak*, 2. Baskı, Nesil, İstanbul.
- Eisenstadt, S. N. (1973). *Traditional Patrimonialism and Modern Neopatrimonialism*, Sage Publications, London, United Kingdom.
- Ekinci, E. B. (2017). *Osmanlı Hukuku*, (5. Baskı), Arı Sanat, İstanbul.
- Erdmann, G. and Ulf, E. (2007). "Neopatrimonialism Reconsidered: Critical Review and Elaboration of an Elusive Concept", *Commonwealth & Comparative Politics*, 45/1, 95-119 (DOI: 10.1080/14662040601135813).
- Gedikli, F. (1998). *Osmanlı Şirket Kültürü: XVI.-XVII. Yüzyıllarda Mudarebe Uygulaması*, İz, İstanbul.
- Genç, M. (2012). *Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Devlet ve Ekonomi*, (8. Basım), Ötüken, İstanbul.
- Habermas, J. (1984). *The Theory of Communicative Action Volume 1: Reason and the Rationalization of Society*, Beacon Press, Boston.
- Harrington, A. (2000). "Value-Spheres or 'Validity-Spheres'?: Weber, Habermas and Modernity", *Max Weber Studies*, 1/1, 84-100.
- Heyd, U. (1973). *Studies in Old Ottoman Criminal Law*, (Ed. V. L. Menage), Oxford University Press, London.
- İnalçık, H. (2015). *Devlet-i'Aliyye, Osmanlı İmparatorluğu Üzerine Araştırmalar-I 55. Basım*, Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür, İstanbul.
- İnalçık, H. (2015b). *Osmanlı Tarihini Yeniden Yazmak: Kuruluş*, (Ed. E. Ayla), Hayy İstanbul.
- İnalçık, H. (2011). *Osmanlı İdare ve Ekonomi Tarihi*, İsam, Ankara.
- İnalçık, H. (2001). "Kanunnâme", *İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, C. 24. İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yay., 333-337.

- İnalçık, H. (1992). "Comments on 'Sultanism': Max Weber's Typification of the Ottoman Polity", *Princeton Papers in Near Eastern Studies*, 1, 49-72.
- Kalberg, S. (1980). "Max Weber's Types of Rationality: Cornerstones for the Analysis of Rationalization Processes in History", *The American Journal of Sociology*, 85/5, 1145-1179.
- Karahasanoğlu, C. O. (2011). "Mecelle-i Ahkam-ı Adliyye'nin Yürürlüğe Girişi ve Türk Hukuk Tarihi Bakımından Önemi", *OTAM*, 29, 93-124.
- Karaman, H. (1984). *Ana hatlarıyla İslam Hukuku 1: Giriş ve Amme Hukuku*, Ensar, İstanbul.
- Karaman, H. (2013). *Fıkıh Usulü: İslam Hukukunun Kaynakları, Metodu ve Felsefesi*, 11. Baskı, Ensar İstanbul.
- Muhammed Ebu Zehra. (1986). *Tarih Boyunca İslam Hukuk Okulları ve Sekiz Büyük İmam I.*, (Çev. İ. E. Dal), İhya, İstanbul.
- Ortaylı, İ. (2008). *Türkiye Teşkilat ve İdare Tarihi*, 3. Baskı, Cedit, Ankara.
- Özcan, A. (1982). "Fatih'in Teşkilat Kanunnamesi ve Nizam-ı Alem için Kardeş Katli Meselesi", *İÜEFTD*, 33, 7-56.
- Özgül, O., Gül, M. F., ve Azap, E. Y. (2014). *Aksaray'ın Tek Şer'iyye Sicili*, T.B.B. ve Aksaray Barosu Ortak Yayınları, Aksaray.
- Parsons, T. (1937). *The Structure of Social Action: A Study of Social Theory with Special Reference to a Group of Recent European Writers*, McGraw Hill Book Company, New York.
- Pitcher, A., Moran, M. and Johnston, M. (2009). "Rethinking Patrimonialism and Neopatrimonialism in Africa", *African Studies Review*, 52/1, 125-156 (DOI: 10.1353/arw.0.016).
- Serahsi. (2011). *Mebcut*, (Ed. M. C. Akşit), 10. Cilt, Gümüş Ev, İstanbul.
- Şatibi. (2016). *El-Muvafakat*, 5. Baskı, (Çev. M. Erdoğan), İz, İstanbul.
- Turner, B. S. (1997). *Max Weber ve İslam*, 2. Baskı, (Çev. Y. Aktay), Vadi, Ankara.
- Uzunçarşılı, İ. H. (1984). *Osmanlı Devletinin Saray Teşkilatı*, 2. Baskı, Türk Tarih Kurumu, Ankara.
- Weber, M. (1950). *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, Third Impression, (Trans. T. Parsons), Charles Scripner's Son, New York.
- Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and Society*, (Ed. G. Roth and C. Wittich), University of California Press, California.
- Weber, M. (1993). *Sosyoloji Yazıları*, 3. Baskı, (Çev. Taha Parla), Hürriyet Vakfı, İstanbul.

Beyan ve Açıklamalar (Disclosure Statements)

1. Bu çalışmanın yazarları, araştırma ve yayın etiği ilkelerine uyduklarını kabul etmektedirler (The authors of this article confirm that their work complies with the principles of research and publication ethics).
2. Yazarlar tarafından herhangi bir çıkar çatışması beyan edilmemiştir (No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors).
3. Bu çalışma, intihal tarama programı kullanılarak intihal taramasından geçirilmiştir (This article was screened for potential plagiarism using a plagiarism screening program).