Research Article/Araştırma Makalesi

In the Context of War Theories in International Relations, the Causes of Societies' Defeat and Victory in Ibn Khaldûn's Philosophy

Uluslararası İlişkiler Savaş Teorileri Bağlamında, İbn Haldun'un Felsefesinde Toplumları Mağlubiyet ve Galibiyete Götüren Nedenler

Ayşe YAŞAR ÜMÜTLÜ[1]

Abstract

In this article, the causes that lead states to war, defeat and triumph in Ibn Khaldun's thought will be discussed. Ibn Khaldun adopted an approach to explain wars with social, historical, political and economic factors. Frankly, it is a prerequisite for understanding factual facts that Ibn Khaldun draws attention to the historical context of the issues he wants to explain and predicts future events by analyzing past events and wars. Analyzing historical facts based on this assumption is an important part of his methodology. In his approach, wars are analyzed not only through military strategy but also through their social, historical, geographical, political and economic contexts. Therefore, in this article, his thoughts are presented not only from a state-centered and single-actor approach, but also from a civilization-oriented perspective, in order to help us understand the complexity of wars from the perspective of international relations. The article primarily focuses on the war experience in Ibn Khaldun's life. Then, according to his theory of war, the reasons why societies fight, and then the reasons for victory and defeat, are determined. Finally, Ibn Khaldun's theory is compared in the context of classical war theories in the history of thought and modern war theories.

Jel Codes: H56, H59, H70
Keywords: Ibn Khaldûn, War, Victory, Defeat, International Relations

---

[1] Lecturer Dr., Necmettin Erbakan University, ayumutlu.ajanda@gmail.com, ORCID:0000-0001-9500-5338

Öz

Bu makalede İbn Haldûn düşüncesinde devletleri savaşa, yenilgiye ve zafere sürükleyen sebepler ele alınacaktır. İbn Haldun savaşları sosyal, tarihi, siyasi ve ekonomik faktörlerle birlikte açıklamaya yönelik bir yaklaşım benimsemiştir. Açıkçası İbn Haldun'un açıklamak istediği konuların tarihsel bağlamına dikkat çekmesi, geçmiş olayları ve savaşları analiz ederek gelecekteki olayları tahmin etmesi olgusal gerçekleri anlamanın ön şartıdır. Bu varsayıma dayanarak tarihsel gerçekleri analiz etmek onun metodolojisinin önemli bir parçasıdır. Onun yaklaşımında savaşlar sadece askeri strateji üzerinden değil aynı zamanda sosyal, tarihi, coğrafi, politik ve ekonomik bağlamları üzerinden de analiz ediliyor. Dolayısıyla bu makalede, savaşların karmaşıklığını uluslararası ilişkiler perspektifinden anlamamıza yardımcı olmak amacıyla, onun düşünceleri sadece devlet merkezli ve tek aktörlü bir yaklaşımla değil, medeniyet odaklı bir perspektiften de sunulmaktadır. Makalede öncelikle İbn Haldûn'un hayatındaki savaş tecrübesi üzerinde durulmaktadır. Daha sonra onun savaş teorisine göre toplumların savaşma nedenleri, ardından da zafer ve yenilginin nedenleri belirlenir. Son olarak İbn Haldun'un teorisi, düşünce tarihindeki klasik savaş teorileri ile modern savaş teorileri bağlamında karşılaştırılmaktadır.

Jel Kodları: *H56, H59, H70*
Anahtar Kelimeler: *Ibn Khaldûn, Savaş, Galibiyet, Mağlubiyet, Uluslararası İlişkiler*

1. Introduction

There is great diversity in theories of war, particularly in the fields of international relations legal, political science and law. However, idealists distinguish between just war (bellum justum) and unjust war (bellum injustum) whereas realists generally view war, as a natural and even needed phenomena, as do 'statist' and 'Social Darwinist' perspectives (Say, 2011: 627; Distein, 2021: 59-77). Even while just war theories present a case that does not distinquish between politics from morality, they do so by examinig the nature of man and his place in the natural world. (Swanson, 2018; Rubin, 2022).

But there are restrictions on the right to war (Boothby, 2018) and the use of force (McKenna, 2020: 364-382), per the theories of the states and international law. Accordingly, there is a presupposition that states can exercise the right to war on grounds that can be determined by themselves; therefore, they have mostly adopted to determine the conditions for the exercise of this right (Brock & Simon, 2021; Zumpani, 2014: 121-132). On the other hand, in international law, the prohibition of the use of force in order to reduce wars and ensure a more peaceful world, the "Monopoly on the use of force" is reserved to the United Nations Security Council in Article 2/4 of the United Nations Charter (Ruys & Hoffer, 2018; Schrijver, 2015). Therefore, it is a reality that wars have been handled from many different perspectives until today. In fact, it can be said that in the history of mankind, the way wars have been fought has been tried to be softened with principles based on religious views and later with philosophical ideas regarding the exercise of the right to wage war (Say, 2011: 628; Aslan, 2008: 235-274).

The fact that Ibn Khaldûn developed an approach that tries to explain wars together with social, historical, political and economic factors can be read as a part of the process we mentioned, and the identification of the points where it differs provides a perspective in understanding today (Alatas, 2022: 302-311; Bucholc, 2022: 320-332; Alatas & Caksu, 2017: 27-42). Because, in addition to the factors we have mentioned, he examined both the apparent and subtle reasons for prevailing in wars, that is, achieving victory, with its material and spiritual dimensions, and preferred to express factual realities with the data he observed, including the war tactics of certain tribes. In this respect, we see that he was one of the pioneers in determining both an understanding of just war close to the realist perspective and the understanding of the monopoly of the use of force belonging to states, as well as the connections between war and morality. Therefore, there are also thinkers who claim that it is a synthesis of realism and idealism (Baali, 1988). However, overcoming state-centered understandings has led to a rereading of Ibn Khaldûn when it comes to the analysis of factual realities from a civilization-oriented perspective that pays attention to the context of history and society (Dale, 2015: 48-55; Scheopner, 2019: 684-697).

It is known from his Muqaddimah and especially from his autobiography, Ta'rif, that Ibn Khaldûn was a person who experienced wars throughout his life. We learn that his family, originally from Seville, moved to Ceuta and from there to Tunisia after the Christian conquest of Seville in 1248. Later in his life he also held important posts at the Marinid court in Fez and in the Nasrid kingdom in Granada; we know that he sometimes retreated into seclusion, eager to devote himself to his scientific endeavors and the writing of his work, first to the ribat of the Wali Abu Maydan at al-'Ubbâd near Tlemcen, and then to his castle in

Ibn Salamah, where he began to write the Kitâb al-'Ibar and where he managed to finish the introduction, the Muqaddima. When he received a request from Abbâd on the Hafsid sultan Abu al-Ibar to participate in various military expeditions, Ibn Khaldûn used the pilgrimage to Mecca as an excuse to head to Egypt, thus beginning a new period in his life in which he maintained close ties with Egypt and the Islamic East. His fame enabled him to receive a generous welcome from the sultan Zahir Berkûk and to hold numerous posts. Thus, he taught Maliki jurisprudence at the al-Azhar mosque, the al-Kamhiya madrasah, the al-Zâhiriyya madrasah, the al-Salihiyya madrasah. In Egypt, he worked as a great Maliki qadi, and during this period, upon the arrival of Timur's armies, he accompanied the Egyptian Sultan Faraj on various defensive expeditions. Here he met with Timur and dissuaded him from his intention to conquer North Africa. As we can see, Ibn Khaldûn had many war experiences throughout his life, both in his duties at the court of North African dynasties, especially the Hafsids, and in the struggles of the Egyptian sultan Faraj to stop the wars (Irwin, 2018; Alatas, 2013).

Therefore Ibn Khaldûn had considerable experiential knowledge of the real danger of living in the Mamluk Empire in Cairo and succumbing to foreign enemies. In this period of history, the Westerners are winning in the West, Spain is being reconquered, the danger of the Mongols coming from the east, the sacking of Baghdad, and Timurlenk coming all the way to Egypt are all factual realities on the stage of history. So there is a real sense of crisis in Ibn Khaldûn, which leads him to try to understand the components of survival and success (Ḣabibullaev, 2004; Fischel, 1952). In this respect, his method of explaining wars is based on a number of basic elements: First of all, one of Ibn Khaldûn's most important concepts is "asabiyyah". This concept refers to social solidarity and the power to act together. However, when analyzed in terms of origin and scope, it has very broad meanings. In the context of our subject, asabiye determines the level of loyalty and solidarity between the members of a society. Ibn Khaldûn explains the development of social life and the establishment of the state on this basis. Asabiyyah is formed in two different forms: asabiyyah by descent and asabiyyah by reason. While the asabiyyah of descent means that people come together due to genealogy, the asabiyyah of reason means that people come together and act together due to common goals. Ibn Khaldûn argues that one of the most important factors affecting the outcome of wars is the level of asabiyyah of a society. High asabiyyah contributes to a society being stronger in war (Wajid, 2022:107-120; Jamal, 2012: 77)

Ibn Khaldûn also analyzes the internal and external factors that influence the outcomes of wars. Internal factors include the internal dynamics of society, leadership, military capabilities and military discipline. External factors include relations with other societies, the international conjuncture, and external threats (Nidzom & Rajzanjani, 2022: 227-246). Ibn Khaldûn states that the situation of societies and nations is not fixed and is in constant change. In particular, he states that societies and nations change throughout history and do not follow a stable path. The customs, traditions and practices of societies can also change and evolve over time. Ibn Khaldûn's view emphasizes the understanding of history as a process of change and transformation rather than continuity and stasis. According to him, such changes and transformations occur not only among societies, but also among individuals, in different periods of time and in different geographies. Moreover, Ibn Khaldûn

emphasizes that this change is the universal law of God and is effective in the lives of people and the history of societies. According to him, those who are aware of this change can better understand historical and social processes and better adapt to social transformation (Ibn Khaldûn, 2015c1: 96).

Ibn Khaldûn emphasizes that states are the organizers and directors of war. Because the state is the protector of social order and the organizer of war. Therefore, the outcome of war is closely related to the structure of the state, the quality of leadership and military organization (Ridho, 2019: 48-70; Rahman, 2021: 237-258). Ibn Khaldûn emphasizes at every opportunity that societies experience cyclical periods of rise and fall throughout history (Bayyiğit, 1991). Depending on which of these periods the state is in, the results of wars may also change. However, weak asabiya will make a society weak in war (Shosh, 2009: 219-230; Kalateh, 2010: 145-167). The reason why Ibn Khaldûn tried to understand the causes and consequences of wars by analyzing history is that past events and wars can help predict future events. This is because history is a source for analyzing all factual realities in terms of time and space, different geographies, policies and processes of different states. Ibn Khaldûn's approach aims to understand wars not only in terms of military strategy but also in their social, historical, political and economic contexts (Mahdi, 1964; Bru, 1994: 73-86). Thus, Ibn Khaldûn's approach transcends the Westphalian approach, which is the dominant perspective in international relations, and the Eurocentric, realist and idealist perspective in which states are the only actors.

Through his analysis of history and observation of societies, Ibn Khaldûn recognized that war played a powerful role in shaping the fate of civilizations. He argued that the external pressures and challenges a civilization faces, including military conquests and invasions, can unify and strengthen it or lead to its downfall. By examining the rise and fall of civilizations, Ibn Khaldûn's theory seems to provide insights into the importance of military strategy and preparedness for social stability. Furthermore, Ibn Khaldûn's theory challenged prevailing views at the time by arguing that the strength and success of a civilization was not only determined by military power, but also by factors such as harmony in social life and economic development. His theory offered a holistic view of civilizations, emphasizing the complex relationship between war and the overall trajectory of civilizations.

J.M. Hobson's criticism of the discipline of international relations from this very point is an important emphasis that reveals the importance of Ibn Khaldûn's method, emphasizing that the ignoring of history and sociology by IR theories causes them to fall into chronology fetishism and the fallacy of tempocentrism, that is, seeing the present and the past as the same (Hobson, 2007: 414-430). Ibn Khaldûn emphasizes these errors of approach in his discourses on how he realized the science of Umran, especially in his criticisms of historiography. However, since this issue can be the subject of another article, we will only mention it here.

2. Literature Summary

There are some studies in Turkish literature evaluating Ibn Khaldun in the context of international relations. For instance, Say's thesis is a comprehensive exploration of Ibn Khaldun's thoughts and their relevance to international relations (IR). He emphasizes how Ibn Khaldun's concepts like 'asabiyyah (social cohesion) and the dynastic cycle can be integrated into IR theory to challenge Western-centric (Say, 2011). "Ibn Haldun and Machiavelli's Realist Political Theories" by Osman Elmalı: Compares Ibn Khaldun's and Machiavelli's concepts of state and power, focusing on the dynamics of state formation and collapse from a historical sociology perspective (Elmalı, 2003). "Ibn Khaldun's Concept of the State and Economic Development" by Sema Yılmaz Genç: Analyzes Ibn Khaldun's views on the state's role in economic activities and compares them with modern welfare state concepts (Genç, 2015). "Ibn Khaldun's Theory of Society and State" by Oktay Uygun: Examines Ibn Khaldun's state theory in detail and compares it with modern state theories within political science and international relations (Uygun, 2008).

Besides, some scholarly works have examined Ibn Khaldun's contributions to international relations in English. These studies highlight how his ideas resonate with and even precede contemporary theories in these fields. "Ibn Khaldun: A Fourteenth-Century Economist" by Jean David C. Boulakia: Explores Ibn Khaldun's economic ideas and their relevance to modern economic and international relations theories. Also these works highlight the significance of Ibn Khaldun's theories in contemporary studies of political power, state formation, and economic development (Boulakia, 1971). Jack Kalpakian's Work: Kalpakian's article in The Journal of North African Studies positions Ibn Khaldun as an alternative progenitor of realism and social constructivism. He discusses the relevance of 'asabiyyah and the dynastic cycle, comparing them to modern concepts of identity and hegemonic cycles (Kalpakian,2008). Robert Cox considers Ibn Khaldun's insights valuable for a post-hegemonic world order. He highlights how Ibn Khaldun's theories about the rise and fall of states can inform contemporary discussions about global governance and power transitions (Cox, 1996). And Shahrbanou Tadjbakhsh's Contributions In "Non-Western International Relations Theory: Perspectives on and Beyond Asia", Tadjbakhsh examines the potential of integrating Islamic perspectives, including Ibn Khaldun's, into IR theory. She discusses how Ibn Khaldun's blend of materialism and idealism offers a nuanced approach to understanding global dynamics (Tadjbakhsh, 2010).

These studies collectively argue that Ibn Khaldun's work provides a rich source of non-Western perspectives that can enhance the understanding of modern international relations and theories by offering alternative frameworks and concepts. Similar to these works, some works collectively underscore the contemporary relevance and enduring theoretical value of Ibn Khaldun's ideas in the context of modern social sciences and political theory. Such as Douglas H. Garrison's Thesis, "Ibn Khaldun and the Modern Social Sciences: A Comparative Theoretical Inquiry" compares Ibn Khaldun's ideas with those of Thucydides, Machiavelli, Hobbes, Rousseau, and Hegel, highlighting both contextual differences and theoretical

similarities. This work emphasizes Ibn Khaldun's relevance to contemporary political power, state, and social change studies (Garrison,2012) . "Dawla and Leviathan: Ibn Khaldun and Hobbes in Defense of State", This study compares Ibn Khaldun's theory with Hobbes's, focusing on state and social dynamics, providing insights into the similarities and differences in their conceptualizations of social cohesion and state authority (Orwin,2018).

Unlike all these studies, with an original approach this article contributes to the field of international relations with a comparative study of Ibn Khaldun's theories with those of the best-known theories of war.

3. Causes of Wars

According to Ibn Khaldûn, "war is a necessity" (Ibn Khaldûn, 2015c1: 287). He conceptualizes it as something natural for human beings from which no nation or generation can escape. Because he considers the state of rebellion and conflict as one of the states inherent to the nature of human beings, he also states that there is no other way for people of the same descent to defend and protect each other than war (Malesevic, 2021: 389-406). According to him, the necessity of war is related to its use by societies and states for defensive or offensive purposes in order to preserve and develop their existence. It is inevitable for a society or state to engage in war from time to time in order to maintain its power and regulate its relations with other communities. This enables societies and states to defend themselves against external factors that threaten their existence. All wars and similar conflicts have been going on since the first day of Allah's creation. Therefore, he actually agrees with some of his predecessors that wars are omnipresent and that the hope for a lasting absolute peace is futile. According to him, wars are a natural phenomenon that takes place between human beings according to their nature. No nation or generation is exempt from it.

The tendency of competition and conflict inherent in the nature of human societies prevents the establishment of a lasting peace and predicts that societies and states will continue to compete with each other. He also discusses the reasons behind wars in terms of human nature, and in this context, the most basic reason for wars is that people want to take revenge on each other (Ibn Khaldûn, 2015c1: 292). To put it in other words, a person who is persecuted for any reason will seek help from his relatives by using the bond of kinship. While the intention of one of the parties to the conflict is to take revenge, the intention of the other will be to fight for self-preservation. As long as the kinship is close, this bond will be quite strong, and as the kinship becomes more distant, protectionism due to kinship will partially decline. Ibn Khaldûn (Ibn Khaldûn, 2015c1: 556; Mufti, 2019) states that wars can be fought out of enmity, which can develop out of anger, jealousy, or other reasons, as well as for the sake of God and religion, or for reasons such as protecting the state. At this point, religion becomes not only a discourse of legitimizing wars but also a social force that strengthens the asabiyyah.

According to Ibn Khaldûn, enmity is inherent to the nature of all living creatures, not only humans (Ibn Khaldûn, 2015c1:127; Dhaoudi, 1984: 263). However, unlike animals, humans,

when it comes to defending themselves, help each other with their intellectual ability, and become a society to ensure cooperation; after the establishment of social life, he states that people need an authority and power, that is, a ruler, "to protect themselves from the attacks of each other or others" in order to avoid enmity and cruelty arising from the animal side, which is an aspect of human nature. (Verza, 2021; Ren & Abdullah, 2023: 365-372) Moreover, he considers it necessary that the authority that will rule over people should be one of them. According to him, "the meaning of the state" means "authority" that has prevailed over other people, seized power and made others obey it (Ibn Khaldûn, 2015c1: 128; Orwin, 2018: 47-64). After emphasizing war as a necessity in becoming a state, the characteristics he identified to explain what the state means are the following in this context;

- That the authority to judge between people and protect them should be one of their own,

- Providing protectionism as the one who has achieved power and subordination by outmaneuvering others,

- In this case, it can be classified as the emergence of sovereignty as a natural consequence in terms of being the ruler, that is, being superior and decisive among people (Ibn Khaldûn, 2015c1: 128; Sulastri, 2019).

Ibn Khaldûn reminds us with historical examples that some people, apart from the caliphate obtained through prophethood, can have authority and subjugate people with their own power or the power derived from their lineage. For according to him, the transformation of the caliphate into property developed as a result of political and social changes. It is a result of the evolution of political power and structural changes in society. In the early period of Islam, the caliphate had emerged as a blend of religious leadership and political authority. However, over time, the centralization of political power and changes in the exercise of authority led to the transformation of the caliphate into property. (Hatalmış, 2015: 357) However, he states that non-Muslim societies outside the Islamic civilization also have states and great works. He emphasizes that life cannot be possible in uncontrollability, disorder and chaos, but that governments in which such anarchies are eliminated are also possible in the states of non-Muslim societies (Ibn Khaldûn, 2015c1: 129; Kennedy, 2011: 101-107).

On the other hand, the transformation of the caliphate into property (Ridho, 2019: 48-70) was, according to Ibn Khaldûn, inevitable in the context of the principles he identified above regarding the natural processes of society and statehood. As an example of this discourse in his Muqaddimah, he reminds us of the Mudar tribe, whose asabiyyah was fundamental in the early days of the caliphate, when its power was constantly increasing, gathering other tribes and tribes around it, advancing in the Quraysh, and becoming a leading force with the spread of Islam. Here, he emphasizes the effect of asabiyyah in gaining the upper hand in struggles and strengthening the authority and turning it into property, that is, a state.

As a matter of fact, according to Ibn Khaldûn, it is a natural and inevitable consequence of this empowerment during Mu'awiya's reign that the caliphate became a property. However, Ibn Khaldûn criticizes the views of the period on the formation of the caliphate, stating that some opinion holders, such as the Mutazilites and Kharijites, thought that there was a

transitional and intermediate period between Mu'awiya's administration and political system in the form of property and the administration of the pre-Islamic bedouin Mudar and Quraysh in the form of riyas. The proponents of this idea only called it the caliphate. (Ibn Khaldûn, 2015c1: 409). In this context, he states that they argue that it is possible to be without a state, but there is no common opinion (ijma) on this. He states that their aim in reaching such a conclusion is to escape from the atrocities that occur in the state and even from some worldly blessings (Ibn Khaldûn, 2015c1: 409). However, according to Ibn Khaldûn, "people cannot live without a state, because it is impossible for them to live a social life and build the world under the conditions that would arise in such a situation" (Ibn Khaldûn, 2015c1: 330; Chabane, 2008: 331-349) According to him, it should be known that the Shari'ah does not condemn the state per se, nor does it consider the establishment of the state objectionable (Ibn Khaldûn, 2015c1: 410). However, Ibn Khaldûn emphasizes that states that have established their sovereignty and have a wide sphere of sovereignty are based on religion and that religion is an invitation to prophethood and the Truth (Ibn Khaldûn, 2015c1: 347; Black, 2001; Pocock, 2019: 469-508). He sees the evolution of societies in Islamic civilization towards state structures as completely natural mechanisms.

According to Ibn Khaldûn, the state is the sovereign power that prevents oppression and conflict. But states have different natures and types (Ibn Khaldûn, 2015c1: 400). In this respect, not every asabiyyah is a kind of state or sovereignty. "In reality, the asabiyyah that has a state or sovereignty is the one that dominates the people and subjugates them to itself, collects taxes, sends armies and envoys, protects the borders, and has no other power over which it is subjugated" (Ibn Khaldûn, 2015c1: 401). Ibn Khaldûn emphasizes that if an asabiya is incapable of fulfilling some of these duties, it is a sovereignty that has not found its true meaning. Thus, if the necessity for people to live in society makes the state obligatory, it is certain that a compulsory need for "law" and "lawgiver" will arise. Therefore, according to Ibn Khaldûn, there is a need for a power to prevent human beings from harming others. Therefore, the purpose of authority, which is the source of property or the state, is to counter enmities, oppression and conflicts.

Again, he expresses the following ideas in different places where he mentions the characteristics of the state. First of all, the welfare of the state adds strength to its power in the first establishment times (Ibn Khaldûn, 2015c1: 377). Because in the early times, the lineage asabiyyah is still intact, strong and the state of solidarity is quite high. However, in the stages of development and change of the state over time, the morality and nature of the people also change according to the stages of the state (Ibn Khaldûn, 2015c1: 378). In Bedouinism, the first state of human beings is rather simplicity in their nature and related features such as simplicity, fortitude, courage, rudeness and being content with what is needed for survival. Thanks to these qualities, they can act more quickly in situations where defense or warfare is required. Ibn Khaldun notes that conquests and wars were common among nomadic societies, not only for nearby water and pasture resources, but also to establish a certain ranking order among tribes and, of course, over settled communities. The stronger tribes collected a khuwwa (a 'status' tax imposed on militarily weaker units)(Fuchs, 2023). However, with urbanization, the dissolution of asabiyya and expansion, the increasing prosperity and luxury in social life caused a deterioration in the morals of the people. They

lose important virtues such as courage (Ibn Khaldûn, 2015c1: 381; Zorlu, 2020: 177-192; Gule, 2014: 119-138). At this point, Ibn Khaldûn reveals that due to the loss of courage in society with urbanization, a state of weakening will occur against attacks from other societies.

On the other hand, according to Ibn Khaldûn, all the works that a state creates and builds are in proportion to the strength of the foundations of that state. In addition, the state has two foundations. These are the army (military) and the treasury (finance); the deterioration that can lead states to collapse occurs only with the weakening of these two foundations (Ibn Khaldûn, 2015c1: 598; Gelder, 1987: 329-360; Irwin, 2010). Therefore, we can say that Ibn Khaldûn determines the basic duties of the state as 'ensuring the security of the people' against the attacks of other societies and 'keeping under control' against disorder. Thus, the duties of preventing oppression and injustice, justice and defense of the oppressed will be added to the duties that the state must fulfill. When we look at Ibn Khaldûn's thoughts on the issue of acquiring land, which is another issue related to wars, we see that according to Ibn Khaldûn, every state possesses a certain amount of land and cannot reach more than these borders (Ibn Khaldûn, 2015c1: 354). At the same time, the width of the borders of states and the length of their lifespan are proportional to the number of those who protect that state (Ibn Khaldûn, 2015c1: 356). According to him, in countries where different types of tribes and asabiyyahs live together, it is rare to see the establishment of a state with a strong authority and stability in governance (Ibn Khaldûn, 2015c1: 359). Having the glory of being a state by a dynasty or a leader alone, preferring prosperity, comfort and peace are the characteristics of being a strong state (Ibn Khaldûn, 2015c1: 363; Pasha, 2018: 554-564). In the section where he explains how the disruption of a dynastic rule and the establishment of a new dynasty in its place can occur, he draws attention to the possibility of two factors in particular;

1. The governors of the distant provinces of the dynasty declare their independence or, (Ibn Khaldûn, 2015c1: 607)

2. One of the tribes of the nations that are neighbors of the dynasty marches on the other (ibid: 607; Demircioğlu, 2022: 42-54)

In this context, when what we have explained so far is analyzed, it is seen that Ibn Khaldûn emphasizes that wars take place for the following reasons;

1. Jealousy, resentment and rivalry with neighboring tribes and clans (Ibn Khaldûn, 2015c1: 557),

2. The preference for war as a means of livelihood among the races (Arabs, Turks, Turkmen, Kurds), which he calls the savages living in the desert, Sahara or steppes (according to him, the purpose of this type of war is the plunder of goods and not the establishment of rank or statehood).

3. Fighting for the sake of God and religion, i.e. jihad, emphasizes the struggle for the defense and propagation of faith, which leads to spiritual rewards (see Albarran, 2019: 55-78; Mufti, 2019; Hatalmış, 2015: 358)

4. Wars with those who rebel within the state and disobey the laws and rules (Ibn Khaldûn, 2015c1: 557; Ghossein, 2020: 932-956) In Ibn Khaldûn's typology of war,

sedition is a form of violence that lacks legitimacy and legality, unlike jihad, the just war implied by the religious struggle.

Thus, he states that different nations have various methods regarding wars and warfare (Ibn Khaldûn, 2015c1: 556). If we analyze from the perspective of international relations, we can interpret this classification as Ibn Khaldûn defining the first two types as unjust wars (bellum in justum) and rebellion (baghi and fitna), and the last two as just wars (bellum justum) (adl) and religious defense (Albarran, 2019: 58). Because Ibn Khaldûn's understanding of just and unjust wars in his ideas revealing the causes of wars can be determined from his approach shaped around the concepts of justice and legitimacy. According to him, the legitimacy of war is based on the causes, goals and methods of war. The concept of just war refers to wars fought for legitimate purposes such as defense, territorial protection or ending oppression. According to Ibn Khaldûn, such wars are justified when they are necessary for the defense of society, justice and the preservation of order. Unjust war, on the other hand, refers to wars fought for purposes such as aggression, land grabbing or unjust gains. Such wars, according to Ibn Khaldûn, create injustice, oppression and unrest and do not serve the interests of society. In this context, Ibn Khaldûn's theory of war emphasizes the importance of justice and social order when evaluating the legitimacy and justification of war. According to him, the legitimacy of war is directly related to the preservation of justice and social balance and order. Therefore, the legitimacy and justification of war is determined not only by military power or strategy, but also by justice and social values.

In the context of society, law and economics, at the core of Ibn Khaldun's thought, the recognition of property, economic freedom; the right to welfare and especially public welfare are more important than individual interest. But the ultimate goal of all economic activity is social security and justice (JmMuslimin, 2019).

Comparing this to international war types, defensive wars are seen as legitimate by both Ibn Khaldûn and contemporary international law, which generally justifies them under the right of self-defense (e.g., UN Charter Article 51). Aggressive wars are viewed as unjust by Ibn Khaldûn due to their basis in aggression and resulting oppression, a perspective that aligns with international law's prohibition of such wars (e.g., UN Charter Article 2(4) prohibiting the use of force). Internal conflicts, or civil wars and rebellions, are considered unjust by Ibn Khaldûn unless they are legitimate uprisings against tyranny, a view that is complex under international law, where legitimacy often depends on humanitarian grounds and the protection of human rights. Religious or ideological wars are justifiable for Ibn Khaldûn if they defend the community's values and beliefs, though such wars are complex and contentious under international law, often scrutinized for compliance with human rights and humanitarian laws. Overall, Ibn Khaldûn's approach aligns with contemporary views in international relations that emphasize the importance of just causes and methods in war. His emphasis on justice and social order provides a moral framework that resonates with modern principles of international law.

At this point, we can provide an insightful analysis of Ibn Khaldûn's views on war, justice, and social order, highlighting his criteria for approaching between just and unjust wars. Unjust

wars include aggression, such as those initiated for expansion, land grabbing, or unjust gains, and rebellion (baghi and fitna), which refers to internal conflicts or uprisings against established authority without legitimate cause. In contrast, just wars include defensive wars fought to protect society, territory, or against oppression, and religious defense wars aimed at defending the religious community or values. The legitimacy of war, according to Ibn Khaldûn, is based on the causes, goals, and methods, with wars being justified when they serve defense, justice, and order. The legitimacy and justification of war hinge on maintaining justice and social balance, with true legitimacy measured by justice and the preservation of social values, not merely military success.

Ibn Khaldûn's war theory uniquely emphasizes the moral and ethical dimensions of conflict, which are often overlooked in mainstream international relations theories. Unlike realism, which focuses predominantly on power dynamics and state interests, Ibn Khaldûn integrates a moral framework, arguing that justice and legitimacy are crucial for understanding war. This perspective aligns with the idea that wars waged for just causes, or with legitimate authority, tend to maintain social order and garner broader support. For example, World War II is often seen as a "just war" due to the moral imperative to stop the Axis powers' aggression and genocide. In contrast, the legitimacy of the Iraq War has been widely debated, with many questioning its ethical justification. The controversies surrounding its legitimacy led to significant political and social upheaval (Cottey, 2004). Both internationally and within Iraq, illustrating Ibn Khaldûn's point about the importance of ethical justification.

4. Reasons for Defeat

According to Ibn Khaldûn, good traits lead to the existence of the state and bad traits lead to its collapse (Ibn Khaldûn, 2015c1: 316-320). In this context, we have already stated that religion's idea of justice and the protection of asabiyya in the sense of social cooperation and good traits such as courage ensure the establishment of states on solid foundations. On the other hand, he emphasizes that traits such as the deterioration of asabiyya, indulgence in prosperity that comes with urbanization, and loss of fortitude lead to collapse. Ibn Khaldûn states that another important reason for the defeat of states is that if the center of a state is defeated, the continued existence of its periphery and field is of no benefit to it. According to him, in such a case, the state immediately begins to disappear. This is because the center is like the heart from which the soul and life spread to the periphery. If the heart is defeated and possessed, all organs connected to it will suffer. We see that he uses the analogy of the heart as a continuation of the organic state (Özcan, 2016: 93-122). He exemplifies his theory as follows;

Ibn Khaldûn explains this idea by using examples from states in history such as Iran and Byzantium. First, the central Medain of the Sassanids is given as an example of the central structure of Iran. When the Muslims defeated Iran, the loss of Medain, the center of Iran, led to the complete collapse of Iranian sovereignty. This does not benefit the Iranians in the surrounding provinces and regions because the Iranians cannot maintain their power when

they lose their center. Secondly, the center of Byzantium gives the example of Constantinople. When the Muslims defeated the Byzantines in Syria, the Byzantines retreated to their center, Constantinople, where they managed to hold on. In this case, the loss of Syria is not a great loss for the Byzantines because they can protect themselves in their center. Using these examples, Ibn Khaldûn explains that centralized and decentralized state structures can have different outcomes. He says, "Their property there will continue uninterruptedly until Allah (and His social laws) allow its extinction" (Ibn Khaldûn, 2015c1: 355).

As it can be understood, the powers of states have to hold on to whichever region is the center for the continuation of their authority. Otherwise, a dissolution in the sense of loss of power is inevitable. Another important issue that leads societies to defeat, according to Ibn Khaldûn, is the quality of 'imitation' in human nature. He considers it as one of the inherent qualities of human nature, especially in the form of emulating the people or groups or nations defeated. According to him, it is "like a hereditary thing that comes from generation" (Ibn Khaldûn, 2015c1: 52). He states that the primary reason for the imitation of other individuals or societies is the defeat experienced by individuals or societies in one way or another. He says, "The defeated is always fond of imitating the victor's way of life, dress, state and customs" (Ibn Khaldûn, 2015c1: 325). The reason for this, according to him, is that the soul sees perfection in the one it submits to and believes in and imitates him. According to Ibn Khaldûn, it is actually wrong for human beings to have such an erroneous idea. Because in the end, the most important reason for the defeat of societies is the weakening of asabiyyah and their inability to resist the courage and strength of other societies. Even though this is the reason, it is a mistake for them to imitate the victor, thinking that it is his way that makes him successful and leads him to victory.

While explaining the stage of peace and tranquility in the cycle of the state, he describes it as a period of imitation by the ruler of his predecessors. In fact, according to Ibn Khaldûn, imitation is especially important in a caliphate. "For the Imamate, superiority in all qualities and conditions is essential." (Ibn Khaldûn, 2015c1: 411) In addition, he interpreted the imitation by the defeated Muslims in Andalusia of the customs of the defeated societies, such as drawing pictures or putting statues on the walls of the houses, as another form of invasion. He points out that this is precisely the meaning of the saying "the people are of the religion of the ruler" (Ibn Khaldûn, 2015c1: 326; Tjong, 2020: 59-132). However, imitators in all matters do not actually carry the characteristics, customs, or virtues and virtues of those they imitate. According to him, imitation is artificial due to incompatibility, as it does not mean carrying the same characteristics. It is debatable whether these unassimilated qualities are beneficial for societies. However, Ibn Khaldûn generally emphasizes in his system of thought that the internalization of the changes and transformations that societies formed by people who come together with voluntary obedience and subordination as a civilization creates a different social structure than the imitation of the victors by the defeated societies. For this reason, we encounter a positive expression of imitation in Ibn Khaldûn's thought in only one aspect. That is the imitation that takes place during the implementation of the caliphate in the periods of the rulers after the prophet. Because this type of caliphate is actually imitating the prophet (Ridho, 2019: 48-70).

Accordingly, in Ibn Khaldûn's thought, the reasons for defeat in wars may arise due to various factors. Ibn Khaldûn emphasizes that social solidarity, or "asabiyyah", plays a critical role in a society's success in war. If a society's asabiyyah is weak, internal divisions and weakness can lead to defeat in war. Moreover, according to Ibn Khaldûn, effective leadership can greatly influence the outcome of war. Weak or ineffective leaders can misdirect war strategies or fail to maintain unity and discipline. Lack of discipline or morale of army units can lead to collapse during war. Lack of coordination of troops and disorganization can also lead to weakness in battle. Moreover, we see that Ibn Khaldûn believed that military capabilities determine the outcome of war. Inadequacy in the face of the enemy's military tactics and capabilities can lead to defeat in battle. Ibn Khaldûn states that military logistics is also an important factor affecting the outcome of war. Inadequate supplies of materials, food and provisions can cause troops to be weakened during battle. Of course, external threats and the enemy's advantages can cause a society to be weakened in war. Ibn Khaldûn argues that societies should strengthen their defensive capabilities against external threats. As can be seen, Ibn Khaldûn puts forward his ideas on the reasons why societies are defeated in wars by analyzing their internal structures and external dynamics that affect societies. Thus, he tries to predict and explain the possible consequences of wars for societies.

5. Reasons for Victory

Ibn Khaldûn analyzes both the concrete and visible causes of wars and their abstract and deeper reasons. He makes an extraordinary difference by explaining that victories in wars cannot be easily achieved, nor can they be guaranteed by faith and effort. It is noteworthy that he points out that victory can be achieved through various conditions, not only military strategy. When we examine the thoughts he explains with this approach, we see that he emphasizes that victory in wars has both visible (umûr al-zahira) and subtle, hidden (umûr al-hafiya) causes. According to Ibn Khaldûn, victory in wars, the necessary conditions for the state's army consist of elements such as the large number of soldiers in the state's army, the perfection of their weapons, the correct organization of the ranks during the conflict, and the loyalty shown during the war (Ibn Khaldûn, 2015c1: 567). Depending on the qualities such as cunning and greed used by the warriors in the human elements, the retreat movement during the war, the use of spreading ugly rumors as a tactic to ruin the enemy, and capturing the high places of the land in the place where the war is fought, He adds other tactics such as concealment in thickets and rough places, ambushes and cover against the enemy in rough terrain, and the sudden rush upon the enemy after he has closed in, or leaving the enemy in danger looking for escape (Ibid.).

Ibn Khaldûn, in his comments on the Israelites as a factual example of his ideas, explains the reason for their inability to believe in the words of Prophet Moses and God as follows: "Because the Israelites lived under the oppression of the Pharaohs and the Coptics (Qibbîs) for many years, and because they were accustomed to humiliation and insignificance, they were accustomed to not to win the victory in their hearts" (Ibn Khaldûn, 2015c1: 314; Frisch, 2018; Gurkan, 2017: 103-119). He interprets the wisdom of this from the coming of the related parable in the verse and states that it is to "destroy this generation and create a new

generation". Ibn Khaldûn concludes that since this event corresponds to a period of almost forty years, the time required for the destruction of a generation and the birth of a new generation should be understood as at least forty years (c1: 314).

Ibn Khaldûn's thoughts on the victories won as a result of wars and struggles are generally based on factual facts from an objective point of view and make generalizations. However, the results of these thoughts result in an acceptance based on the Islamic belief system. "Nevertheless, victory depends on chance and coincidence" (Ibn Khaldûn, 2015c1: 567). Ibn Khaldûn states that hidden reasons have a great influence on victory, therefore, deception is one of the most effective means in wars, and victory often comes through them. He also reminds the hadith that says "War is a trick" (Ibn Khaldûn, 2015c1: 609). We can understand that he starts his analysis from the principles of world law, that is, the existing order, and completes it with the principles of metaphysical or religious law. It would be a serious misconception about Ibn Khaldûn to think that he interpreted these fields as completely separate issues. Although he categorically categorized and analyzed them, these fields ultimately reveal a holistic system.

Focusing back on our main theme, Ibn Khaldûn argues that victory Ibn Khaldûn refers to the hidden causes (umûr al-hafiya) as "some celestial and divine elements that are not in the hands of people and are thrown into the hearts". According to him; "The fear unleashed on the enemies through such divine means suffocates them and causes them to be defeated" (Ibn Khaldûn, 2015c1: 567). For this reason, he explains that although both sides resort to different tricks to achieve victory, hidden reasons may be effective in one side's victory. For Ibn Khaldûn, there is no certainty of victory in war, even if hardware and numerical strength prevail. Therefore, victory is still He emphasizes that it is the 'asabiyyah of descent' that should be respected. Because according to him, an army consisting of various asabiyyahs cannot resist the side with an army belonging to a single asabiyyah (Ibn Khaldûn, 2015c1: 568-569). However, he adds that this will still remain "in the provision of apparent reasons" (Ibn Khaldûn, 2015c1: 566-569). He also includes "fame" in the subject of victories achieved for hidden and unnatural reasons. According to Ibn Khaldûn, victory in wars What the state of fame and the state of fame have in common is that it is rare to find fame and glory in their rightful place. He states that many people who are famous do not deserve the fame they have earned, and that many people who have bad reputations are actually in a state of goodness in contrast to their bad reputations. He also emphasizes that there are those who are worthy and capable of much more than the fame they have, and that if fame has occurred, it is exactly where it should be (Ibn Khaldûn, 2015c1: 570).

He attributes the reasons for this to the way people spread their opinions about people. According to him, people spread certain words about people for various reasons, such as the need to be favorable to themselves or by spreading their fame and praise to those in authority or by spreading their fame. The fact that people are competitive beings by nature increases their attraction to fame instead of virtue. He concludes this section by emphasizing that everything that arises from hidden causes is called "fortune" (Ibn Khaldûn, 2015c1: 569-570). We have already mentioned that Ibn Khaldûn expressed these and similar analyses and determinations based on his life experiences. For example, in his memoirs about his life, especially in the part where he describes the power struggles in the Maghreb, he tells in the

style of a completely natural process that Sultan Abu Hammû asked for his help in capturing Bijaye and winning the hearts of the Riyah tribes for this purpose, and that he was involved in the Sultan's intrigues to start a war with the Devavide tribe in his struggle against Abu Zayyan (Ibn Khaldûn, 2011: 106,107).

As can be understood, Ibn Khaldûn includes elements such as the number of soldiers, the quality of weapons, good deployment (logistics) and tactics, which are also important today. The tangible and visible reasons such as land, sovereignty, resources, etc. are seen to include social, economic and political competition. We can say that these are references to the laws of war and the science of war, as logistics and tactical techniques that can be taught in military books are taught in military fields in order to be passed down from generation to generation. But we understand that for Ibn Khaldûn these are necessary but insufficient. He also wants to be aware of hidden factors, such as intangible elements like morale, sudden changes in circumstances or confusion, which are man-made or caused by fortune. There are also factors based on psychological, cultural and social dynamics, such as social tensions, leadership rivalries, struggles for sovereignty, popular discontent. Indeed, Ibn Khaldûn also wants it to be understood that victory is not necessarily the result of visible, i.e. apparent, factors, but rather, and perhaps even more so, of hidden factors.

6. Comparison of Ibn Khaldûn's Classical War Theory with Modern International Relations Theories

First of all, it should be noted that all the theories of war produced throughout the history of thought are not narrow enough to be covered in a single article. Here, we have to be content with a comparison of the most widely known and accepted ones. In this context, we can say that Ibn Khaldûn's theory of war emphasizes how social, economic and political factors affect the outcome of war, while classical Western war theories focus more on strategic and tactical approaches. Clausewitz's theory of war, for example, emphasizes the link between war and political objectives, defining war as an act of using force to force the enemy to accept our will. There are also important differences in his understanding of human nature where he emphasizes three human tendencies, known as absolute war, real war distinction or trilemma. The first tendency, according to Clausewitz, is that feelings of violence are the motivating force in wars. The second is the calculation of chance (the incalculable) and probability (the realizability of events). The third is reason, which is the tendency that links political goals. Clausewitz makes another trilogy by associating ambition with the people, chance and probability with the commander and his army, and reason with the government (Sharma, 2015: 327-347; Kıvılcım, 2015: 39-61). Sun Tzu's theory focuses on manipulating the enemy and, if possible, achieving victory without fighting. He emphasizes that war is a strategic art and discusses the basic elements of winning a war. According to him, first of all, it is necessary to know the enemy and measure their own strength. This is a critical factor that determines the outcome of the war. Secondly, Sun Tzu emphasizes the importance of waiting for the right time and opportunities to win the war. Third, strategic planning and maneuverability are vital to deceive the enemy and exploit his weak points. All in all, Sun Tzu's theory of war offers a guide to gaining the upper hand in war by focusing on strategic thinking, preparation, and flexibility (Fedorov, 2021: 170-174). Since Ibn Khaldûn's theory is

based on the natural evolution of societies and the rise and fall of states, it emphasizes how war is related to these processes. In these ways, Ibn Khaldûn's theory of war offers a different perspective from other theories of war.

In the modern era, theories of war are usually considered in the context of international relations and include a variety of factors. International relations theories such as realism, liberalism and structuralism explain the causes and consequences of war in different ways. For example, according to the realist perspective, competition and power struggle between states is the main cause of war. States may fight to ensure their own security and war is inevitable due to the chaotic nature of the international system (Morkevicius, 2015:11-22). Therefore, according to realist theorists, wars are caused by power imbalances and states have to fight to protect their interests (James, 2022). Realist theory emphasizes the power struggle between states and the anarchic structure of the international system as a method of analyzing wars in international relations. According to this theory, the main goal of states is to maintain and increase their power, which often results in competition and conflict. Realists see wars in international relations as a result of power struggles between states. States may go to war to protect their national interests and to balance their rivals. These conflicts arise from the inherent tendencies of competition and conflict in the international system. Realists also argue that the anarchic nature of the international system encourages wars. (Grieco, 1988: 485-507) Since the international system has no central authority, states may have to fight to ensure their own security and protect their interests. In this context, strong states pressuring weak states or seeking hegemony can also be the causes of wars (Joseph, 2000: 179-202).

In conclusion, realist theory views wars as strategic moves by states to protect their security and interests and focuses on structural factors arising from the nature of the international system. The prelude to World War I is a classic example of realist theory in action. The power struggle among the European great powers, including the alliances between Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Italy (Triple Alliance) and France, Russia, and the United Kingdom (Triple Entente), exemplifies the realist emphasis on power balances. The assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand of Austria in 1914 triggered a series of events where states, driven by the need to maintain their power and alliances, plunged into war. The conflict was seen as inevitable due to the existing power imbalances and rivalries. Also the Cold War (1947-1991) between the United States and the Soviet Union is another example where realist theory applies. The two superpowers engaged in a global power struggle, seeking to expand their ideological and military influence. The absence of a central authority to regulate their competition led to a series of proxy wars, nuclear arms race, and strategic alliances. Besides, the Cuban Missile Crisis in 1962, was a critical moment where both powers came close to direct conflict, driven by the need to balance each other's influence and ensure national security. Then Iraq Invasion of Kuwait (1990), Iraq's invasion of Kuwait under Saddam Hussein can be analyzed through a realist lens. Iraq sought to enhance its regional power and economic resources by taking control of Kuwait's oil reserves. The international

response, led by the United States, can also be seen through realism: the coalition aimed to restore the balance of power in the Gulf region and protect the interests of oil-importing states. This led to the Gulf War, emphasizing the realist view of power struggles and strategic interests as causes of conflict. Realist theory provides a framework to understand wars as strategic moves by states to protect their security and interests in an anarchic international system (Canan-Sokullu, 2019:2-12).

Liberal theory argues that factors such as economic integration, democratic peace theory and international institutions can reduce the risk of war. Economic links and relations between democratic regimes can have a war-preventing effect (Sutch, 2012: 172-190). According to liberal theorists, factors such as international institutions, trade and democratic peace theory can reduce the risk of war (Keith & Spencer, 2023). Liberal theory emphasizes democratic peace theory and economic linkages as a method of analyzing wars in international relations. According to this theory, war is less likely in relations between democratic states and economic integration promotes peace. The style of governance among democracies provides a more favorable environment for peaceful conflict resolution and cooperation.

Therefore, according to liberal theory, the likelihood of war is reduced in relations between democratic states. Second, economic linkages increase interdependence between states and raise the cost of war. This encourages states to opt for peaceful solutions. For instance, the European Union (EU) is a prime example of economic integration promoting peace. After World War II, European nations sought to create economic interdependence to prevent future conflicts. The EU's single market and trade agreements have significantly increased economic cooperation among member states, making the prospect of war among them highly unlikely due to the high economic costs involved. Also the democratic peace theory posits that democracies are less likely to go to war with one another due to shared norms, political structures, and mutual accountability to their citizens. An example is the long-standing peace between the United States and Western European democracies. Despite various disagreements, these countries have avoided war with each other for decades, largely due to their democratic governance, which favors negotiation and peaceful conflict resolution over military confrontation.

Besides, international institutions play a crucial role in facilitating communication, promoting norms, and providing platforms for conflict resolution, thereby reducing the risk of war. The United Nations (UN) is a key example. Its various bodies, such as the Security Council and the International Court of Justice, work to mediate disputes, enforce international laws, and provide forums for dialogue. Liberal theory emphasizes that economic integration, democratic governance, and international institutions are vital in reducing the risk of war. Economic linkages create interdependence that raises the cost of conflict, democratic states are more inclined towards peaceful resolution of disputes, and international institutions provide mechanisms for dialogue and conflict resolution. Examples such as the EU's economic integration, the democratic peace observed among Western democracies, and the UN's role in mediating international conflicts illustrate how these liberal principles contribute to a more peaceful international order. Finally, liberal theory argues that

international institutions and cooperation mechanisms can play an important role in preventing wars (Barkawi & Laffey, 2001). International institutions can facilitate communication between states, provide platforms for conflict resolution and promote international norms. These methods are the key elements that liberal theory focuses on when analyzing wars. Factors such as democratic peace theory, economic linkages and international cooperation form the basis of liberal theory's approach to understanding and explaining wars.

Structuralists argue that the structure of the international system determines the behavior of states. War is caused by structural conflicts arising from the structure of the system and these conflicts mean that the system must be transformed. They argue that structural factors in the international system, especially the balance of power between states and structural conflicts, determine the causes of wars. Structuralists see wars as an inevitable consequence of competition between states, which arises as a result of structural contradictions in the international system. According to structuralist theory, the anarchic nature of the international system encourages states' efforts to gain and maintain power. This can lead to increased competition and conflict between states. Structuralists see the root causes of wars as power struggles between states, conflicts of interest and structural contradictions in the international system. In this context, structuralists take into account the overall structure of the international system, the dynamics of relations between states and the balance of power when analyzing wars. They associate the causes of wars with structural factors stemming from the structure of the international system and attribute the consequences of wars to these structural factors (Wilhelmsen, 2017: 166-183).

One of the most illustrative examples of structuralist theory in practice is the Cold War (1947-1991). The international system during this period was characterized by bipolarity, with two superpowers—the United States and the Soviet Union—dominating global politics. This bipolar structure created a rigid balance of power and intense rivalry, leading to numerous proxy wars and heightened global tension. Structuralists would argue that the Cold War's conflicts were inevitable outcomes of the bipolar system, which inherently fostered competition and antagonism between the two superpowers. The structural contradictions of this system made peaceful coexistence challenging and required a transformation to end the pervasive hostility, which eventually occurred with the dissolution of the Soviet Union. The multipolar structure of the international system prior to World War I and World War II also aligns with structuralist arguments. Before World War I, multiple great powers (including Britain, France, Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Russia) engaged in a complex web of alliances and rivalries. Structuralists asserts that the multipolar system's inherent instability and the competition among these powers led to the outbreak of war (Canan-Sokullu, 2019:2-12).

Similarly, the power struggles and shifting alliances among the major states contributed to the causes of World War II. The structural dynamics of the multipolar international system, with its multiple competing powers, created conditions ripe for conflict. Following the Cold War, the international system shifted towards unipolarity, with the United States as the predominant global power. While this period saw a reduction in large-scale global conflicts, it also witnessed numerous regional wars and interventions, such as the Gulf War (1990-

1991) and the wars in Afghanistan (2001-present) and Iraq (2003-2011). Structuralists would argue that even in a unipolar system, conflicts arise due to the power dynamics and efforts by other states to challenge the hegemonic power or assert regional dominance. The unipolar structure, while seemingly more stable, still contains structural contradictions and imbalances that can lead to conflict (Lane, 2006: 7-41). By analyzing historical examples like the Cold War's bipolarity, the multipolarity preceding the world wars, and the unipolarity of the post-Cold War era, we can see how structural factors, such as the balance of power and systemic contradictions, influence state behavior and lead to conflict (Mic, 2021: 182-193). This approach emphasizes the need to consider the broader systemic context when evaluating international relations and the causes of war, highlighting the inherent challenges and potential for conflict within different structural configurations of the international system.

Another theory, the Constructivist theory, argues that social structure and ideologies shape international relations. According to constructivist theorists, international norms, identities and beliefs can influence states' decisions to go to war. According to this theory, inter-state relations are shaped by social structures, norms, values and ideologies. Therefore, the causes and consequences of wars can also be determined by these social structures and ideologies. Constructivists see wars as violations or changes in social norms in inter-state relations. For example, an attack by one state on another can be considered an act of war because it violates the norms of peaceful settlement established by the international community (Steele, 2007: 23-52). Likewise, ideological differences or identity conflicts can also be the root causes of wars. Constructivists also emphasize the effects of wars on perception and meaning. The start or end of a war can lead to changes in the perceptions and understandings of states and societies. These changes can shape future relations and conflicts. A key example of constructivist theory in action is the end of the Cold War. The dissolution of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War were not solely the result of economic or military factors but also significant changes in the ideologies and identities of the states involved. Mikhail Gorbachev's policies of glasnost (openness) and perestroika (restructuring) represented a shift in Soviet ideology that ultimately contributed to the thawing of relations with the West (Buckley, 2010: 782-784). Constructivists would argue that this ideological shift was crucial in ending the Cold War, highlighting the importance of social and ideological change in transforming international relations. And The Rwandan Genocide can be analyzed through a constructivist lens, particularly concerning identity conflicts. The deep-seated ethnic identities and the resulting tensions between the Hutus and Tutsis were major factors leading to the genocide. This example illustrates how social constructs and identity play a critical role in the causes and consequences of war. Consequently, constructivist theory emphasizes the role of social structures, norms, values and ideologies when analyzing wars in international relations. It attempts to explain the causes and consequences of wars through the influence of these social structures and ideologies (Reus and Smit, 1996). These theories address the causes of war, the consequences of war and the structure of the international system from different perspectives. Like Ibn Khaldûn's theory, these modern and international relations theories analyze the social, economic and political contexts of war, but their focus and emphasis differ.

Ibn Khaldûn's theory is generally considered to be among the classical theories of war and when compared to modern theories of international relations, various differences and similarities emerge. As mentioned above, Ibn Khaldûn's theory of war is a civilization-centered approach and focuses on the dynamics of relations between civilizations. According to him, conflicts between civilizations are closely related to the nature and dynamics of civilizations. However, Ibn Khaldûn looks for the root causes of war in social and economic factors. According to him, the main reasons underlying the conflicts between civilizations stem from the differences in the social and economic structures of societies (Tayob, 2022: 1-17). Ibn Khaldûn also sees the rise and fall of civilizations throughout history as a cycle. According to him, strong civilizations weaken over time and are replaced by new rising civilizations. Ibn Khaldûn's war theory, with its focus on justice and legitimacy, offers a moral and ethical dimension that is often underemphasized in other international relations theories. While realism and structuralism focus on power and systemic factors, and liberalism and constructivism emphasize institutional and ideological elements, Ibn Khaldûn's perspective integrates these views with a strong emphasis on the ethical justification of war and its impact on social order. For instance the distinction between World War II and the Iraq War (2003). World War II is often seen as a "just war" due to the moral imperative to stop the Axis powers' aggression and genocide. In contrast, the legitimacy of the Iraq War has been widely debated, with many questioning its ethical justification. The controversies surrounding its legitimacy led to significant political and social upheaval, both internationally and within Iraq, illustrating Ibn Khaldûn's point about the importance of ethical justification.

Ibn Khaldûn's approach is holistic, blending material (economic resources, manpower), structural (political systems, alliances), and moral (ethical justification, social impact) elements. This contrasts with other theories that might emphasize one dimension over others. For instance, realism and structuralism prioritize power and systemic factors, often at the expense of ethical considerations, while liberalism and constructivism focus on institutions and ideologies but may not adequately address the moral dimensions of war. For example, the Vietnam War demonstrates the interplay of these factors. The United States engaged in Vietnam based on strategic (material and structural) considerations, aiming to contain communism (realism). However, the moral and ethical opposition to the war grew, particularly in the U.S., as the human cost and ethical implications became more apparent. This moral opposition ultimately influenced U.S. policy and public opinion, highlighting the significance of Ibn Khaldûn's holistic view. Ibn Khaldûn asserts that the ethical justification of war affects social order.

7. Conclusion and Evaluation

Theories of war are very important in the field of international relations because war is one of the most serious and influential forms of relations between states. Theories of war are of primary importance for understanding the international balance of power, strategic moves and the causes of war. They also provide important clues for peacekeeping, crisis

management and international dispute resolution. The similarities and differences in the war theories of Western and Eastern societies are based on various cultural, historical and intellectual factors. Ibn Khaldûn's theory of war is a clear example of these differences. This is because his theory is shaped by a strong historical and sociological analysis and differs from the most widely accepted realist war theories of the West. Ibn Khaldûn's theory of war emphasizes the natural cycle of societies and states and its relationship with wars. According to him, societies initially come together in unity and grow stronger, but over time, as wealth and prosperity increase, this unity weakens and societies are subject to internal divisions. These internal divisions can lead to the weakening and eventual collapse of the state. Ibn Khaldûn states that war can accelerate this cycle and enable the state to regroup. While Western theories of war generally focus on the balance of power between states, the international system and strategic interests, Ibn Khaldûn's theory is based more on social and historical dynamics. From this perspective, there are cultural and methodological differences between Western and Eastern theories of war.

According to Ibn Khaldûn, wars and victories have various conditions related to history, geography, economy and politics. We have seen that Ibn Khaldûn emphasizes that one of the most important factors of the victorious outcome of the war is the level of asabiyyah of the society. According to him, asabiyyah refers to the internal unity and solidarity of a society. A strong asabiyyah keeps a society together and provides unity and coordination in war. Good leadership greatly affects the outcome of a war. The leader's directing the military strategy correctly, keeping the morale of the troops high and ensuring discipline contribute to the victory of the war. Ibn Khaldûn emphasizes that military skills also determine the outcome of war. The training, tactical knowledge and combat skills of the soldiers affect the success of the war. Ibn Khaldûn emphasizes that military logistics is a primary factor affecting the outcome of the war. The supply of materials, food and provisions is critical for the successful conduct of wars. High morale and strict discipline of the troops are factors that affect the outcome of the war. Lack of morale and discipline can lead to the collapse of troops.

Ibn Khaldûn states that situations where the enemy is weak result in victory. The enemy's weak asabiya, lack of discipline or military shortcomings contribute to making victory more likely. The victorious outcome of war requires good planning and strategy. It is important to carefully design military operations and identify the enemy's weaknesses. Ibn Khaldûn's thinking emphasizes the complexity of the victorious outcome of wars and the influence of social, military and leadership factors. The combination of these factors can lead to the successful outcome of war. By comparison, Ibn Khaldûn's theory of war focuses on the recurring cycles of inter-civilizational relations throughout history, while modern theories of international relations often focus on the power struggle between states and the role of international institutions. Ibn Khaldûn's theory emphasizes that social and economic factors play an important role in the causes of wars, while modern theories often focus more on factors such as power, economic interests and ideology. Ibn Khaldûn's theory of war emphasizes the nature and dynamics of civilizations, while modern theories often focus on more abstract concepts such as international institutions, democratic peace and

international norms. Compared to other theories in modern international relations, Ibn Khaldûn's theory offers a different perspective and can help us understand the changing dynamics of international relations throughout history.

As a conclusion Ibn Khaldûn's war theory offers a comprehensive framework that accounts for material, structural, and moral dimensions, providing a richer understanding of war's causes and consequences. By emphasizing justice and legitimacy, his perspective illuminates the critical role of ethical considerations in shaping social order and the broader implications of conflict, offering valuable insights often missed by other international relations theories. This analysis highlights the unique contributions of Ibn Khaldûn's war theory to the understanding of conflict, demonstrating how ethical and moral dimensions interplay with material and structural factors in shaping the outcomes and societal impacts of war.

Note from the author: This study was prepared in accordance with the rules of scientific research and ethics. There is no content in this study that requires ethics committee permission or legal/special permission.

Resources

Abou-Tabickh, L. (2022). What Does Ibn Khaldûn Mean by the Term Madda? On Human Association and Political-Economic Organization. *Al-Masaq, 34*(3), 256-275. https://doi.org/10.1080/09503110.2022.2051391

Abozeid, A. (2021). Re-reading Ibn-Khaldun in the 21st Century: Traveling Theory and the Question of Authority, Legitimacy, and State Violence in the Modern Arab World. *Arab Studies Quarterly, 43*(2), 146-171. https://doi.org/10.13169/arabstudquar.43.2.0146

Alatas, F. & Oxford Center for Islamic Studies. (2013). *Ibn Khaldûn* (1st ed.). Oxford Centre for Islamic Studies: Oxford University Press.

Alatas, S. F. (2022). Reading Ibn Khaldûn in the Formative Period of Sociology. *Journal of Historical Sociology, 35*(3), 302-311. https://doi.org/10.1111/johs.12377

Alatas, S. F. & Caksu, A. (2017). Ibn Khaldûn and Philosophy: Causality in History. *Journal of Historical Sociology, 30*(1), 27-42. https://doi.org/10.1111/johs.12149

Albarrán, J. (2019). Holy War in Ibn Khaldûn. *Journal of Medieval Worlds, 1*(1), 55-78. https://doi.org/10.1525/jmw.2019.100004

Alrefai, A. & Brun, M. (1994). Ibn Khaldûn: Dynastic Change and Its Economic Consequences. *Arab Studies Quarterly, 16*(2), 73-86.

Aslan, M. Y. (2008). Basic Principles of the Law of War. *Journal of TBB*, (79), 235-274. http://tbbdergisi.barobirlik.org.tr/m2008-79-470

Baali, F. (1988). *Society, State, and Urbanism: Ibn Khaldûn's Sociological Thought*. State University of New York Press.

Bak McKenna, M. (2020). The Discourse of Proportionality and the Use of Force: International Law and the Power of Definition. *Nordic Journal of International*

Law=Acta Scandinavica Juris Gentium, 89(3-4), 364-382. https://doi.org/10.1163/15718107-89030006

Barkawi, T. & Laffey, M. (2001). *Democracy, Liberalism, and War: Rethinking the Democratic Peace Debate*. Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Baxter, R. & Vagts, D. F. (2013). *Humanizing The Laws of War: Selected Writings of Richard Baxter* (First Edition). Oxford University Press.

Bayyigit, D. M. (1991). Ibn Khaldûn Sociology. *Journal of Necmettin Erbakan University Faculty of Theology, 4*(4).

Black, A. (2001). *The History of Islamic Political Thought: From the Prophet to The Present*. Edinburgh University Press.

Boothby, W. H. & Heintschel von Heinegg, W. (2018). *The Law of War: A Detailed Assessment of the US Department of Defense Law of War Manual*. Cambridge University Press.

Boulakia, J. D. C. (1971). Ibn Khaldûn: A Fourteenth-Century Economist. *The Journal of Political Economy*, *79*(5), 1105–1118. https://doi.org/10.1086/259818

Bourne, G. H. (1941). *War, Politics and Emotion*. Liveright.

Brock, L. & Simon, H. (2021). *The Justification of War and International Order* (First edition). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198865308.001.0001

Bucholc, M. (2022). Ludwik Gumplowicz (1897-1898), Ibn Khaldûn: An Arab Sociologist of the 14th Century. *Journal of Historical Sociology, 35*(3), 320-332. https://doi.org/10.1111/johs.12378

Buckley, M. (2010). Gorbachev's Gamble: Soviet Foreign Policy and the End of the Cold War by Andrei Grachev (review). *The Slavonic and East European Review (1928)*, *88*(4), 782–784. https://doi.org/10.1353/see.2010.0019

Canan-Sokullu, E. (2019), Savaş Türleri, *Güvenlik Yazıları Serisi*, 22. https://doi.org/ 10.13140/RG.2.2.31310.41283

Chabane, D. (2008). The Structure of 'Umran al-'Alam of Ibn Khaldûn. *The Journal of North African Studies, 13*(3), 331-349. https://doi.org/10.1080/13629380701844656

Cottey, A. (2004). Chapter 2. The Iraq War: The Enduring Controversies and Challenges. *SIPRI Yearbook*.

Cox, R. W. (1996). Towards A Posthegemonic Conceptualization of World Order: Reflections on The Relevancy of Ibn Khaldun (1992). In *Approaches to World Order,* 144–173. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511607905.009

Dale, S. F. (2015). Return to Ibn Khaldûn-Again. *Review of Middle East Studies, 49*(1), 48-55. https://doi.org/10.1017/rms.2015.65

Demircioglu, A. (2022). Every State Has a Limited Lifespan: An Analysis on Ibn Khaldûn. *Reality of Politics, 20*(2), 42-54.

Dhaoudi, M. (1984). The Place of Human Nature in Ibn-Khaldun's Thinking. *Al-Majallah Al-ʻArabīyah Lil-ʻulūm Al-Insānīyah, 4*(13), 263.

Dinstein, Y. (2001). A Historical Perspective of The Legal Status of War. *War, Aggression and Self-Defense*, 59-77. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139164726.005

Elmali, O. (2003). "İbn Haldun ve Machiavelli'nin Realist Siyaset Kuramları", *EKEV Akademi Dergisi*, 7(15), 133-142

Fischel, W. J. (1952). Ibn Khaldūn and Tamerlane : Their Historic Meeting in Damascus, 1401 a.d. (803 a. h.) A study based on Arabic manuscripts of Ibn Khaldūn's "Autobiography,"University of California Press.

Frisch, H. (2018). Ibn Khaldûn and the Law 'Israel: The Nation State of the Jewish Nation' The Jerusalem Post.

Fuchs, C. (2023). Ibn Khaldûn and the Political Economy of Communication in the Age of Digital Capitalism. *Critical Sociology*. https://doi.org/10.1177/08969205231206488

Garrison, D. H. (2012). *Ibn Khaldun and the modern social sciences: A comparative theoretical inquiry into society, the state, and revolution,* 51(3). ProQuest Dissertations & Theses.

Garrison, D. H. (2012). *Ibn Khaldûn and The Modern Social Sciences: A Comparative Theoretical Inquiry into Society, The State, and Revolution.*

Gelder, G. J. van. (1987). The Concept of Pen and Sword: On an Arabic Lutherary Debate. *Journal of Semitic Studies, XXXII*(2), 329-360. https://doi.org/10.1093/jss/XXXII.2.329

Ghossein, M. (2020). Alfarabi and Ibn Khaldûn: On Tyranny and Domination. *Philosophy East & West, 70*(4), 932-956. https://doi.org/10.1353/PEW.2020.0068

Gillespie, A. (2021). *The Causes of War* (Volume IV, 1650-1800). Hart Publishing.

Grieco, J. M. (1988). Anarchy and the Limits of Cooperation: A Realist Critique of the Newest Liberal Institutionalism. *International Organization, 42*(3), 485-507. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818300027715

Gule, L. (2014). Ibn Khaldûn: Law and Justice in the Science of Civilization. *Philosophy of Justice* (Vol. 12, 119-138). Springer Netherlands. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-9175-5_8

Gurkan, S. L. (2017). Some Implications of ibn Khaldûn's Approach to The History of The People of Israel: The Relation Between 'Asabiyyah and Chosenness. *Sakarya University Journal of Faculty of Theology, 19*(35), 103-119. https://doi.org/10.17335/sakaifd.298032

Ḣabibullaev, A. (2004). *Amir Temur va Ibn Khaldun*. Ŭzbekiston Ëzuvchilar Uishmasi Adabiët Nashriëti.

Hatalmış, A. (2015). Ibn Khaldûn and Conquest. *International Ibn Khaldûn Symposium International Ibn Khaldûn Symposium*, 1, 347-362.

Hobson, J. M. (2007). Reconstructing International Relations Through World History: Oriental Globalization and the Global-Dialogic Conception of Inter-Civilizational Relations. *International Politics (Hague, Netherlands), 44*(4), 414-430. https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.ip.8800198

Ibn Khaldûn. (2011) Translation: Akyüz, Vecdi, Bilim ile Siyaset Arasında Hatıralar. et-Ta'rîf bi-Ibn Khaldun ve Rıhletuhu Garben ve Şarkan. Dergah Publications. February 2011

Ibn Khaldûn. (2015). *Muqaddimah*. C; I-lI, (prepared for publication by Dr. Arslan Tekin). Istanbul: İlgi Culture and Art Publishing House.

Irwin, R. (2010). *Mamlûks and Crusaders: Men of The Sword and Men of The Pen*. Ashgate/Variorum.

Irwin, R. (2018). *Ibn Khaldûn: An Intellectual Biography*. Princeton University Press.

Jamal, M. (2012). Ibn Khaldûn's Asabiyah: Past and Present. *Pakistan Perspectives, 17*(2), 77.

Jm Muslimin. (2019). Society, Law and Economy: Contextualizing Ibn Khaldun's Thought. *Al-Iqtishad: Jurnal Ilmu Ekonomi Syariah, 11*(2). https://doi.org/10.15408/aiq.v11i2.13778

Joseph, J. (2000). A Realist Theory of Hegemony. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior, 30*(2), 179-202. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-5914.00125

Kalpakian, J. (2008). Ibn Khaldûn's Influence on Current International Relations Theory. *The Journal of North African Studies, 13*(3), 363-376. https://doi.org/10.1080/13629380701844698

Kennedy, J. (2011). Prophets armed: Muhammad Ibn Khaldûn and Niccolò Machiavelli. *Theology (Norwich), 114*(2), 101-107. https://doi.org/10.1177/0040571X10391843

Kinsella, M. (2017). Hostile Takeovers-An Analysis Through Just War Theory. *Journal of Business Ethics, 146*(4), 771-786. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-016-3256-x

Kıvılcım, R. B. (2015). Clausewitz's War Theory and New War Studies. *Journal of National Security and Military SciencesSonbahar/Fall 2015, 2*(8), 39-61

Layne, C. (2006). The Unipolar Illusion Revisited: The Coming End of the United States' Unipolar Moment, *International Security*, *31*(2), 7–41. https://doi.org/10.1162/isec.2006.31.2.7

Laabdi, M. (2021). Ibn Khaldûn Between Legal Theory and Legal Practice. *Journal of Islamic Studies (Oxford, England), 32*(1), 27-61. https://doi.org/10.1093/jis/etaa046

Lacourse, K. & Stone, P. (2020). Rethinking the Foundations of Just War Theory. *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice, 23*(2), 475-481. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10677-019-10040-8

Mahdi, M. (1964). *Ibn Khaldûn's Philosophy of History: A Study in The Philosophic Foundation of The Science of Culture*. University of Chicago Press.

Malesevic, S. (2021). Warfare And Group Solidity: From Ibn Khaldûn to Ernest Gellner and Beyond. *Filozofija i Drustvo (Zbornik Radova), 32*(3), 389-406. https://doi.org/10.2298/FID2103389M

Malesevic, S. (n.d.). War, Violence and Group Solidarity: From Ibn Khaldûn to Ernest Gellner and Beyond. *Ernest Gellner's Legacy and Social Theory Today* (241-269). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-06805-8_10

Mic , D. A. (2021). The Evolution of the Post-Cold War International Relations System. Bipolarity. *Revista de Ştiinţe Politice. Revue Des Sciences Politiques*, *72*, 182–193.

Mufti, M. (2009). Jihad As Statecraft: Ibn Khaldûn on The Conduct of War and Empire. *History of Political Thought, 30*(3), 385-410.

Mufti, M. (2019). *The Art of Jihad: Realism in Islamic Political Thought*. State University of New York Press, Albany. https://www.rusi.org/podcasts/talking-strategy/episode-4-ibn-khaldun-and-early-muslim-strategic-thought (November 18, 2023)

Nidzom, M. F. & Rafsanjani, F. A. (2022). The Historical Criticism and Causality in The Philosophy of History: Ibn Khaldûn's Perspective. *Tsaqafah, 18*(2), 227-246. https://doi.org/10.21111/tsaqafah.v18i2.8118

Olatunji Abdulganiy, Abdulganiy, A. O. & Abdulbaki, S. Z. (2019). The Legacy and Legendary of Ibn Khaldûn as a Fore-Runner Scholar in Sociology. *International Journal of Social Sciences & Educational Studies, 5*(3), 128-141. https://doi.org/10.23918/ijsses.v5i3p128

Oruç, C. (2010). Learning in Ibn Khaldûn's Muqaddimah. *Journal of Necmettin Erbakan University Faculty of Theology, 29*(29), 129-142.

Orwin, A. (2018). Dawla and Leviathan: Ibn Khaldûn and Hobbes in Defense of State Authority. *Journal of Ibn Khaldûn Studies (Online), 3*(1), 47-64. https://doi.org/10.36657/ihcd.2018.35

Özcan, O. (2016). The Idea of the State in Ibn Khaldûn and a Comparative Study in the Context of the Debate 'Is the State a Means or an End: (Ibn Khaldûn-Aristotle-Thomas Hobbes). *Journal of Ibn Khaldûn Studies (Online), 1*(1), 93-122. https://doi.org/10.36657/ihcd.2016.3

Pocock, J. G. A. (2019). Two Essays: I. The Desert and The City: Reading the History of Civilisation in Ibn Khaldûn After Edward Gibbon. II. Rational Enthusiasm and Angelicality: The Concept of Prophecy in Ibn Khaldûn and Edward Gibbon. *History of European Ideas, 45*(4), 469-508. https://doi.org/10.1080/01916599.2018.1463675

Rahman, H. (2021). From Farabi to Ibn Khaldûn: The Perception of State in the Early Muslim Intellectual's Writings. *Liberal Thought, 26*(103), 237-258. https://doi.org/10.36484/liberal.743630

Ren, H. & Abdullah, S. (2023). The Relationship Between Man and Nature in Ibn Khaldûn's Muqaddimah. *e-Bangi: Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities, 20*(3), 365-372. https://doi.org/10.17576/ebansi.2023.2003.32

Ridho, M. Z. (2019). From Chalipate to Modern State: A Reflection of Ibn Khaldûn's Thought. *Ulumuna, 23*(1), 48-70. https://doi.org/10.20414/ujis.v23i1.345

Rubin, D. (2022). System Structure, Unjust War, and State Excusability. *Journal of Global Security Studies, 8*(1). https://doi.org/10.1093/jogss/ogad001

Ruys, T., Corten, O. & Hofer, A. (2018). *The Use of Force in International Law: A Case-Based Approach*. Oxford University Press.Schrijver, N. (2015). The Ban on the Use of Force in the UN Charter. In The Oxford Handbook of the Use of Force in International Law. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/law/9780199673049.003.0022

Say, S. (2011). *Ibn Khaldûn's System of Thought and Theory of International Relations*. Istanbul: Ilk Harf Publishing House, p. 627.

Scheopner, C. (2019). The (Re-)Introduction of Ibn Khaldûn to Spain. *Philosophy East & West, 69*(3), 684-697. https://doi.org/10.1353/pew.2019.0057

Shosh, B.-A. (2009). Language, Civilization and Globalization in the 14th Century: Historical Periodicity and The Evolution of Language at Ibn Khaldûn. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae, 62*(2), 219-230. https://doi.org/10.1556/AOrient.62.2009.2.4

Sulastri, N. (2019). The Concept of State and Government in Ibn Khaldûn's Thought. *International Journal of Nusantara Islam, 7*(2). https://doi.org/10.15575/ijni.v7i2.5634

Sune, E. (2016). Non-Western International Relations Theory and Ibn Khaldûn. *All Azimuth, 5*(1), 79-79. https://doi.org/10.20991/allazimuth.167344

Swanson, David C. N., Mr. (2018). Just War Theory Facilitates Unjust Wars. *War Is Never Just*. eBookIt.com.

Sylvester, C. (2012). War Experiences/War Practices/War Theory. *Millennium, 40*(3), 483-503. https://doi.org/10.1177/0305829812442211

Tadjbakhsh, S.(2010). "International Relations Theory and the Islamic Worldview." In Non-Western International Relations Theory: Perspectives on and beyond Asia, edited by Acharya and Buzan, 174-96.

Tanji, M. bin T. (1951). Al-TaʿRīf Bi-Ibn Khaldûnūn Wa-Riḥlatihi Gharban Wa-Sharqan. Lajnat Al-TaʿLīf Waâl-Tarjamah Wa-Al-Nashr.

Tayob, A. (2022). Beyond Modernity: The Moral Economy of Ibn Khaldun. *Journal for the Study of Religion*, *35*(2), 1-17. https://doi.org/10.17159/2413-3027/2022/v35n2a4

Tjong, K. F. N. (2020). Cultural and Economic Diversity in (Al-Andalus) An Approach to Ibn Khaldûn's Sociology. *Religions (Dawhah, Qatar), 13*, 59-132.

Uygun O. (2008), İbn Haldun'un Toplum ve Devlet Kuramı, XII Levha, İstanbul

Verza, A. & ProQuest. (2021). *Ibn Khaldûn and The Arab Origins of The Sociology of Civilization and Power*. Springer.

Wajid, A. (2022). Ibn Khaldûn's Concept of Asabiyah and Its Current Manifestation. *Journal of the Pakistan Historical Society, 70*(4), 107-120.

Yilmaz Genç, S. (2015). "Welfare State" And "Economic Development Thought" With In The Framework Ibn Khaldun's Comprehension State. *Anemon Muş Alparslan Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi; 3(1), 141-154*.

Zorlu, A. (2020). Bedouin Umran and Hadarî Umran in terms of Body Construction in Ibn Khaldûn. *Journal of Selçuk University Institute of Social Sciences, 43*, 177-192.

Zumpani, F. (2014). International Law, War and Human Rights: The Humanitarian Response against the State of Emergency. *Athens Journal of Social Sciences, 1*(2), 121-132. https://doi.org/10.30958/ajss.1-2-3