

# THE INCOHERENCE OF ISLAMIC SOCIAL SCIENCES: SOME LESSONS FROM IMAM IBN-i-KHALDOON<sup>1</sup>

S.M.Mahboob-ul-Hassan Bukhari  
Department of Philosophy  
University of Karachi

## Abstract

Social sciences are generally perceived to be value neutral and capable of being with any other paradigm without falling into contradiction. Attempts have been made to graft social sciences into Islamic knowledge and Islamic Economics, Islamic Sociology, Islamic Political theory etc have emerged as new sciences. These new (grafted) sciences are aimed to bring freedom and progress (Enlightenment values) in the society without transcending the Islamic metaphysics. These sciences rely on an empirical epistemology derived from the Enlightenment which undermines the role of revelation. There appears to be a conflict between Islamic epistemological foundations and quest for freedom and progress. The present paper aims to illuminate this conflict.

Social sciences presume a specific metaphysics and a value specific epistemology. This metaphysically grounded epistemology is not consistent with Islamic epistemology which is also value laden on the basis of its own metaphysical assumptions. Hence there appears to be no room for grafting these two incommensurable paradigms: Islamic and Social Sciences. Ibn-i-Khaldoon is relevant in this discourse. He critically examines society and state while remaining loyal to the epistemology which is specific to Islamic metaphysics and considers it essentially non-contestable. This paper aims to explore this incompatibility with reference to Ibn-i-Khaldoon.

JEL Classification: Z0000

<sup>1</sup> Ibn-i- Khaldun is Abd-ar-Rahman b. Muhammad b. Khaldun al Hadrami (1332-1406); leading statesman and Intellectual of the Islamic west; wrote The Muqadimmah as part of a much larger History of the Berbers during the interludes in a stormy political career spent largely in the emirates of North Africa and Spain

### Introduction

The aim of this paper is to show that social sciences are value laden and are not compatible with the Islamic paradigm of knowledge. Ibn-i-Khaldon is relevant as a representative of Islamic paradigm. Social scientists believe that social phenomenon should not be evaluated on the grounds of religious authority. Religious authority is assumed to be unreliable epistemological grounds. Social phenomenon should be evaluated on rational ground which is presumed to be reliable as well as objective. This method of study has been derived from a particular conception of human being. Social scientists believe that human beings are autonomous and self dependent beings. They assume that human beings are not created beings by some Super Natural Being such as Allah. This metaphysics is presumed in the rational method of the social sciences. Similarly this metaphysics determines the direction or the *telos* of the inquiries of social sciences. In these terms social sciences are value laden not value neutral.

Islam is a revealed religion and its criterion to judge any phenomenon be that social, economic, ethical, political etc is *Naql*<sup>2</sup> that is Quran and Sunnah. Ijtihad is a secondary source of Islamic epistemology. It is not equal *tonusus*. Ijtihad necessarily follows the Quran and Sunnah. If a *Mujtahid*<sup>3</sup> carries out Ijtihad and other *Mujtahideen*<sup>4</sup> verify it on the basis of the Quran and Sunnah it becomes *Ijma'a*. *Ijtihad* is dependent on the Quran and Sunnah. It has never been seen in abstraction in the history of Islam. This epistemological ground is unquestionable in Islam and regarded as transcendental at any time and place. Hence Islamic paradigm is value specific.

---

<sup>2</sup> *Naql* is the name of the Islamic episteme consists in Quran and Hadith.

<sup>3</sup> *Mujtahid* is an Islamic Jurist who carries out *Ijtihad*. He must have command in Quran, Hadith, Arabic literature, And must be practicing Muslim.

<sup>4</sup> *Mujtahideen* is plural of *Mujtahid* in Arabic.

The Islamic and the Enlightenment epistemological paradigms are not only antagonistic in nature but in some respect substantively incommensurable. They reveal two different states of consciousness: being with Allah and being in the world. The self interestedness ground of social sciences claims that rationality provides self evident proof for its justification<sup>5</sup>. This claim is debatable. Postmodernists for example Foucault and Derrida have questioned the role of reason in the determination of good and right. This view is from within the camp of capitalism. Both modernists and post modernists reject religion as it is against freedom therefore heterogenous. This shows that the epistemological base of social sciences is grounded in metaphysical presumptions regarding the validity of the realm of apodictic evidence.

The Islamic paradigm is based on the institution of the prophet hood. Prophets are innocent, God chosen people. Prophet Muhammad (SAW) asked us to lead the life according to the will of Allah. He has set an excellent example in our lives and demonstrated clearly what the will of Allah is. The determination of good and right is done by *Naql i.e* by reference to and justification what was revealed to prophet and his interpretation of this revelation. Reason is not necessarily compatible with *Naql*. Reason is not eliminated from Islamic paradigm altogether. Rationality is treated as an instrument for following *Naql*. As Imam Ghazali writes in *Ihya* that the rational is one who believes in Allah, prophet Muhammad (SAW) and the day of judgment (Imam Ghazali, 1993) . Rationality is incapable to discerning the will of Allah. Post modernity has also shown the incapacity of rationality to vindicate and justify the Enlightenment universals.

Both the social sciences and Islam presume two different metaphysics and hence are not compatible. This paper seeks to explicate the axiological incompatibilities of these two paradigms. We intend to show that there is no possibility of any Islamic sociology, Islamic economics or Islamic psychology or Islamic

---

<sup>5</sup> Enlightenment is an intellectual movement that promotes the rationality. Rationality is self-interestedness. Self-interestedness presumes man's ability to master the nature.

political theory. We shall take Imam Ibn-i- Khaldoon as an example to represent Islamic paradigm because

1. *Ibn-i-Khaldoon* has been perceived by some as the first social theorist. This is questionable. This perception is common not only in the East but also in the West.
2. *Ibn-i-Khaldoon* has never transcended from Islamic epistemology that is *Naql*. He relies exclusively on the Quran and Sunnah as the sole fundamental epistemic criterion to evaluate society which should be seen as a part of the state. Imam Ibn-i-Khaldoon remains loyal to the traditional Islamic epistemological paradigm in all his writings.

### Structure of the paper

This paper is divided into three sections. These three sections shall be followed by a conclusion. The first section deals with the issue that social scientific inquiries depend on enlightenment rationality that is derived from metaphysical conception of human being. This metaphysics determines the telos of the social scientific inquiry which is progress. The second section deals with the issue that Islam is based upon *Naql* and telos is man's obtaining the pleasure of Allah almighty. Islamic epistemology is based on and determined by its metaphysics. The third section deals with the issue of the impossibility of Islamic social sciences. This shall be discussed within *Ibn-i-Khaldunian* paradigm.

The human<sup>6</sup> individuality is not simply, for the social scientists, the object of social analysis and the subject of political life; it provides the underpinning of their claim to knowledge. Human individuality is not only the subject matter of social sciences but also provide the social scientific method. This

---

<sup>6</sup> Human is not man. Human is the object of the study of Enlightenment disciplines (Social Sciences). Human is that who values freedom, equality, and Progress. Human rights are applied only to humans not to men.

indicates that the telos of social sciences is the perpetuation of human individuality.

**E**mpiricists and rationalists alike tended to treat the individual subject, with the self certainty which is derived from its secure access to its own conscious states, as the foundation of all knowledge (Callinicos 2003, p30.). The Cartesian self whom Descartes calls the indubitable self is certain of the contents of its own consciousness. He comes to this certainty by the self evident truth that is *I think therefore I am*.

**S**ocial sciences presume the validity of the central proposition of Kantian mechanism and Hume's empiricism/ utilitarianism. Hume believes that nothing exists other than sensations. On the basis of sensation causation as a natural law in the world can't be known. Hume argues that natural laws are presumed by human beings. It was human mental activity, and in particular the tendency to project regular patterns onto the world even where their existence could not be rationally demonstrated, that was responsible for most of what are taken natural laws. The human self, supposedly the pivot of all knowledge, turned out to be 'nothing but a bundle or collection of different perceptions, which succeed each other with an inconceivable rapidity and are in a perpetual flux or movement (Hume 1978).

**H**ume holds that reason is the slave of the passions. He wrote "Reason is and ought to be the slave of the passions" (Hume 1978, p415). For Hume reason is not an abstract autonomous instrument to discover reality objectively but its contents are filled by the passions. Hence Hume leaves no room for the articulation of religious doctrines in the life of an individual. Hume's empiricism led to the Utilitarianism which became later a criterion on which human behavior can be evaluated.

**K**ant's response was not to deny that the world we experience is the product of our mental activity. But he identified the source of this activity which is the transcendental subject underlying these impressions (Callinicos 2003). The very possibility of conscious experience requires that we presuppose

a transcendental unity of apperception to which our sense perceptions could be attributed but which was not itself present in experience.

Kant presumed that causality and objectivity are the structures found in the human mind. Human experience is moulded by the mental categories. Kant believes that the world is not “out there” but “in us”. The world is experienced by the shape of the human mind. Hence the self determines the structure of experiences. “The self”, says Kant, “does not derive its laws from but prescribes them to nature” (1954, p67)

The world as we experience it results in part from the sensations provided by our senses and in part from the workings of the mind (Barry & Velasquez 1988). The senses provide the content of the experience; the mind provides its form and its structure. For every event our senses perceive, the mind knows there is a prior cause. Event as we experience them must occur in orderly relationships are there because it has the ability to organize sense perceptions by imposing these relationships on them before the human being even become aware of them. These abilities allow human being to make sense of its experience (Korner 1954).

According to Kant, human beings can't perceive things as they actually are before the mind organizes the sensations of them. Human beings never perceive things as they are in themselves which he calls the *noumena*. All human beings can ever know are things as they appear to us which he calls the *phenomena* (Korner1954). The noumena stimulate the senses the sensations that follow are organized by human mental categories so that humans perceive them as phenomenal things of the ordered and casually connected everyday world of experience. Kant held that the world around us is a world that the human mind constructs so that world must conform to mind. The mind constructs the world in accordance with our ideas and categories. Because the world is constructed in accordance with ideas, ideas have to be accurate representations of the world. This revolutionary claim is often referred to as the “Copernican revolution” equivalence in knowledge (Korner 1954, p30).

**Man** is the lawgiver to the world which is shaped by the internal structure of the mind. The more he practices this law giving activity, the more progress he would bring about in the world. This is Copernican social revolution.

**In** the Kantian framework the use of reason has been specified in this world. Hence there is no possibility of religion within the Kantian framework. The only space remaining is the Science. Kantian rationality provides guide to scientific discourse.

“The ‘noumenal self’, beyond but presupposed by sense experience, was the source of the universal moral laws which regulated individual conduct and provided the foundations of political life” (Callinicos2003, p30). Universalisable maxims can be generated by a human thought. This was accepted by the Modernists. This acceptance leaves no room for surrender before Allah. There is no contradiction between phenomenal self and Noumenal self. Noumenal self in fact facilitates the process of legitimizing the desires of the phenomenal self. Universalisable principles will make things as they ought to be, as they are desired to be by human beings.

Man is autonomous. He can discover reality independently. He needs no help from any other agency. Instead he can know the reality as it is and derive laws which he would implement in society and state. Hence man is free. This freedom has been presumed in sciences in general and in social sciences in particular.

**Social sciences** are thus committed to a particular conception of being and of the world. Man is an actual or potential creator of the world and the purpose of practical reason is to establish man’s mastery over the world (Ansari 2005,p73). Inquiry in social sciences presumes that human subject which is free, autonomous and rational and self interested. The world in which man is living is the creation of man himself. Social sciences presume a particular world which is out there to serve an autonomous, rational, self interested and free man. Man should use his reason in a particular way. He should use reason to satisfy his needs and prolong his survival in this world. This is known as progress. The criterion of the right use of reason is its participation in the process of progress.

Social sciences presume the universe to be a self contained, self regulating, dynamic mechanism the laws of motion of which are to be discovered / determined by human self reflection (Ansari 2005,p73). Knowledge is the product of the self understanding of the self which imposes its order on the world. The self itself can't be known, for it is the condition of knowledge. Knowledge becomes possible only with rational, autonomous and free man. Reason is a means for practicing the universalisable commands of the (unknowable/ Noumenal) self.

Social sciences are committed to freedom – the unlimited right of the self to will its ends. Belief in the self legislating self eliminates the need for seeking any moral authority for granting the self this unlimited right. This unlimited right is given to a rational, self interested man. He came to know about it by self reflection. The discoveries of the self are not and ought not to be confirmed or constrained by any other being. He is the sole determiner of every thing in this world. He is not accountable for his thoughts, beliefs and actions before any body. Therefore there is no possibility of any other world like the hereafter in this scheme of things.

Social sciences are the total endorsement of the beliefs underlying Kantian mechanism and Utilitarianism. Social sciences are not ends in themselves. They are “means for the realization of enlightenment ends –self fulfillment and progress.” (Ansari 2005, p73). Therefore we should not see them in abstraction. They have been derived from the historical experience of the West at a certain time which is known as Modernism. They are instrumental to real specific values- values sanctioned by the enlightenment.

Social sciences recognize reason as the slave of the passions. All individual acts and institutions are to be judged on the basis of the felicific calculus. Man is recognized as sovereign in the basic sense that he is the sole legitimate possessor of his body. The social sciences are committed to the promotion of the passions for money making (Hall 1989).

## II

In the second part of this paper we shall discuss

1. Islamic epistemology.
2. Its relation with Islamic metaphysics
3. The impossibility of incorporating Islamic epistemology within any other metaphysically grounded epistemology.

We divide the discussion of Islamic epistemology into two parts: the source and the object. The source of Islamic epistemology is *Naql* which means the original sources and teachings have been transmitted with *Tawatur*. What has been transmitted is the revelation. Allah almighty has revealed to the prophet Muhammad (S.A.W). Revelation is of two types: Express and Tacit. In Express revelation both the words and the meanings are revealed to the prophet like the holy Quran. Tacit revelation is that the meanings are revealed to the prophet but they are expressed in the words of the prophet. Both of these terms of revelation are similar because they are revealed to the Prophet (S.A.W).

Revelation is *Nass* (Text) in Islamic epistemology. *Nass* can fall in the following categories:

1. *Qatee-us-Subut and Qatee-ud-Dalat*
2. *Qatee-us-Subut and Zanni-ud-Dalat*
3. *Zanni-us-Subut and Zanni-ud-Dalat*
4. *Zanni-us-Subut and Qatee-ud-Dalat*

The telos of Islamic knowledge is obtaining the pleasures of Allah. Knowledge is only that which brings men close to Allah almighty. The purpose of knowledge is *Ma'ash* and *Ma'ad*. Knowledge helps the *Momin* to live in this world according to the will of Allah almighty. Hence the *Ma'ash* serves as an instrument to protect our *Ma'ad*.

Islamic epistemology is metaphysically grounded. It presumes that Allah almighty is the creator of this world including man. He defines the aim of the life of *man*. Man is considered to be the slave of Allah almighty (*Abdullah*). He must submit completely to the will of Allah almighty.

Epistemology serves metaphysics in Islam. Islamic epistemology is the instrument for knowing the will of Allah and to submit to this will according to the way prescribed by the prophet Muhammad (S.A.W).

Islamic epistemology can not serve the purpose of social sciences because social sciences presume diametrically opposite metaphysics and epistemology. They are incompatible. They do not complement each other. They contradict each other. They presume

Islamic Metaphysics	Social Sciences
Man is a means to realize the will of Allah	Man is an end in himself.
Man is the slave of Allah	Man is free and autonomous
Allah created this world	The World is the expression of the human mind.
Man must worship Allah	Man must control this world
Man must focus on his worship to win reward in the hereafter.	Man must prolong his survival by using his capacities to dominate nature.
Man must seek pleasure of Allah	Reason must be used for material progress to fulfill desire.

Hence there is no possibility of reconciling Islamic epistemologies and Social Sciences. Sociology is not merely a science of society but it is the science which shares the capitalist society which is the collection of free, autonomous and rational individuals should be organised. Here man is not treated as the slave of Allah who seeks the pleasure of Allah. Therefore in social theory, issues like *Hijab*, interacting with *Muharimat and non Muharimat* are not theorized. The sole purpose of Sociology is to set the society free for progress in this world. Issue like *Hijab* is not salient for capitalist society because human being (the being theorized by Sociology) is not being with Allah. *Hijab* is an issue for a man who seeks the pleasure of Allah. He would follow the commandments of Allah. Therefore Islamic sociology and Islamic social sciences are incoherent epistemological project.

Islamic society has never been and will never be benefited from this kind of epistemological grafting. The history of the previous century provides a clear example of this fact. Islamic sociology has only addressed the issues importantly of Muslims nationalism<sup>7</sup>. It has not served to increase the opportunities to get the pleasure of Allah.

<sup>7</sup> Muslim Nationalists value freedom and progress sanctioned by Enlightenment. They do not transcend capitalist ideals.

## III

In third section I shall discuss

1. Ibn-i- Khaldun's concept of Islamic epistemology and metaphysics
2. Ibn-i- Khaldun's concept of society and state.
3. Ibn-i- Khaldun's commitment to Islamic epistemology and metaphysics while analyzing society and state empirically.

Ibn-i-Khaldoon's importance consists

1. in his postulating the *Asa'biya* as the principal deriving force of political action
2. in his projection of Islam as a universal civilization grounded on the metaphysics and epistemology of Islam and inviting mankind to the truth.
3. In his realization of the causal interdependence of the several factors of social life in the power state.
4. in the concept of the parallel existence of the state founded by a prophetic lawgiver; as distinct from the state built on power in response to the human need for political association
5. In his definition and analysis of the Islamic *mulk* as a composite structure whose law is a mixture of *sharia* and rational, political law.
6. in his fundamental recognition of the vital part which religion should play in the life of the state, especially if it is to transform the *asabiya* into a durable, cohesive spiritual motive power
7. In that he postulates a causal law for the state which determines its development in a cycle of origin, growth, peak, decline, fall and resurgence. (Rosenthal 1988, p105)

Ibn-i- Khaldun argues that it is obligatory for every Muslim to seek knowledge of the commandments of Allah almighty. For him, *Naql* is the source of knowledge. The Quran and Hadith are *Uloom-un-Naqaliyah* (episteme of *Naql*). He compares the episteme of *Naql* with the sciences of *Aql* (rational) (Ibn-i-Khaldoon 2001, p403). He thinks that reason can only be helpful in worldly affairs. It has nothing to do with faith (Unity of Allah, Finality of

Prophet Muhammad (S.A.W), and Day of Judgment). For Imam Ibn-i-Khaldoon , *Naql* is superior to *Aql* (Philosophy, Metaphysics). He advises that Muslims should not indulge in the sciences of *Aql* before they master the epistememes of *Naql* (Ibn-i-Khaldoon 2001, p493).

Ibn-i-Khaldoon advices Muslims to strive to acquire the disciplines of *Naql*. He thinks that epistememes of *Naql* (Knowledges) are end in themselves. He condemns all those who spend much time in acquiring instrumental sciences (Arabic literature) (Ibn-i-Khaldoon 2001, p493). . He shares this line of argument with Imam Ghazali. In *Ihya-Uloom-ud-Din*, Imam Ghazali took the same position. This superiority of *Uloom-un-Naqaliyah* over *Uloom-ul-Aqaliya* remained non contestable among all the Jurists and Scholars of Islam since the time of Imam Ghazali.

Ibn-i-Khaldoon prefers *Uloom-un-Naqaliyah* (disciplines of *Naql*) over sciences of *Aql* (rational). This shows that he is truly committed to Islamic metaphysics. He is not ready to subjugate Islamic epistemology or Islamic Metaphysics to this worldly epistememes.

Ibn-i- Khaldun was well versed both in the philosophical and traditional knowledges. His account of Muslim epistememes is an authoritative summary of their scope, content and meaning. But his attitude to the philosophical sciences is determined by his traditionalism and empiricism. For him, sciences of *Aql* (sciences based on the superiority of reason) are natural to man and are found among all civilized nations. At the same time Ibn-i-Khaldun stresses the grave danger of philosophy to religion. And because religion is important for the state, there is a consequent danger for the society. It is true that the philosophical sciences form an integral part of "*Umran*" and are useful for everybody. But since philosophy propounds doctrines in opposition to the *Sharia* and its teachings as they are literally interpreted, speculation is to be discouraged, unless the student has first mastered the religious knowledges. On the other hand he stresses the importance of speculation for the historian and on the whole shares the view of Imam Gahzali who sees no harm

in any subject as long as the teachings of the *Nusus*<sup>8</sup> are not contradicted. Imam Ibn-i-Khaldoon as a convinced Muslim writes “for whom the prophetic law is perfect and alone adequate to lead man to his happiness in the hereafter” (Rosenthal 1988, p97).

For Ibn-i-Khaldoon, the purpose of the study of history is to understand the causes of the rise and fall of states and societies. He proves his point of view by providing evidences from the history. History should not deal with the actions of the few individuals but with the social and political development of the people (Rosenthal 1988). Man has the power of reflection, a tendency towards association, and the need for controlling authority. Ibn-i-Khaldoon maintains that *daulat*<sup>9</sup> has its foundations on one of two great moral principles, the Group Mind *Asabiya*,<sup>10</sup> and religion.

He begins his Prolegomena with conditions of human society in general and says that man is distinguished from mere animals

1. By virtue of his intellect
2. By his need for an all pervading sovereign, for without him it would be impossible to keep society intact (differently to such animals as the ants and the bees which keep together by sheer instinct)
3. By his search for means of subsistence
4. By his desire to live long with his fellow men, which in the long run, leads to permanent abodes in towns and cities.

While comparing nomadic society with the urban variety he seems to have inclination towards the former. He says that it is in the tribe that is found the Group Mind in all its perfection and this is based on the spiritual and moral excellence of the people of the desert (Saeed 1997).

---

<sup>1</sup> Nusus is Arabic plural of Nass which means Quran or Hadith or Both.

<sup>2</sup> Daulah means state.

<sup>3</sup> Asabiya is the bending of the like minded people which presumes ties of kinship and blood.

Social laws can be formulated only by gathering social data on a very large scale and by working out their patterns. The social data may be gathered from either faithful records of the past events or careful observations of the present ones. Societies are essentially dynamic like living organisms. He writes "In this way, the life span of a dynasty corresponds to the life of an individual: it grows up and passes into an age of stagnation and thence into retrogression" (Muqaddimah, p345).

Ibn-i-Khaldoon views history as an organic whole. Civilization is the object of inquiry for Ibn-i-Khaldoon's historic investigations. His analysis of history explores the social, economic, political, theological domains. The State is seen as an organism which functions according to the law of causality. The growth of the state is a natural phenomenon for the social and political survival of a civilization. Analysis of the state structure is essential for understanding human civilization. Ibn-i-Khaldoon's analysis of society and state is epistemologically relevant.

His methodology of historical analysis is empiricist but his empirical analysis does not detach him from his commitment to Islamic epistemology. His work "is deeply rooted in the traditional beliefs and convictions of Islam" (Rosenthal 1988, p84). His epistemological reliance on Quran and Sunnah enables him to reconcile empiricism and *Nusus*. He assigns the essential role to the holy Quran and Sunnah which provides the epistemological criterion for an objective analysis of socio-political structures. His vocabulary coined for this analysis is derived from the epistemological frame work of the holy Quran and Sunnah. Rosenthal acknowledges that "Ibn-i-Khaldoon's empiricism manifest in his "new science" is matched by his traditionalism. His traditionalism is epistemologically grounded in Fiqh and Tafseer" (Rosenthal 1988, p84).

Ibn-i-Khaldoon argues that the state is necessary for the socio-political survival of any civilization and the constitution of *Asabiya* is inevitable for the emergence of the state. Religion provides a criterion to judge every socio-political transformation

and the direction of this transformation. He thinks that the strength of *Asabiyyah* and that of religion complement each other.

The State or political order without telos loses its capacity to sustain and survive (Suri, 2009). Imam Ibn-i-Khaldoon believes that religion provides the telos which transcends culturally specific and the historically determined political ideals of *Asabiyya*. Religion not only reconciles the natural dichotomy between rural and urban life but it also reinforces the natural strength of *Asabiyya* because the “call to religion increases the force of *Asabiyya*” (Rosenthal 1988, p97). He argues that ethnic particularity is not directly in conflict with Islam. It is complementary to it. He claims that the religious call is not complete and effective without *Asabiyyah*. There is no conflict involved in ethnic particularity and religious universality.

The role of religion is teleological. Religion plays a role in the determination of the meaning of ethnic collectivity and spiritual justification of this particularity. The *Asabiyya* is not only the natural agent of political domination, but its equation with religious conviction. The religious dimension not only provides the teleological basis of collectivity but it also provides the spiritual basis of political hegemony. Rosenthal remarks “the spiritual and temporal powers are united in him.” (Rosenthal 1988, p97).

The above mentioned analysis reveals the fact that Ibn-i-Khalidun uses an empirical method which does not transcend his commitment to the metaphysically grounded epistemology of Islam. Now we move on to discuss the issue can he be legitimately held to be the founder of modernist social theory? There are three identifying features of a Modernist Social Theory:

1. It is concerned with society, which is conceived as being distinct from political institutions;
2. It distinguishes between and seeks to make generalizations about different kinds of society.
3. It is concerned in particular to analyze modernity- the form of society which emerged in the modern West over the past few centuries and has come to dominate the world as a whole( Callinicos 2003, p10).

Ibn-i-Khaldoon analyses society not as distinct from the state. He thinks that society is the initial phase which leads to the political state. He studies the society as the continuity of the state. Hence there is no possibility to derive general principles about different societies as independent institutions that is of that state form. Ibn-i-Khaldun is not concerned in particular to analyze modern society that has emerged in the modern West a few centuries ago.

Calinicos writes that he is not the father of sociology for two reasons

1. He analyzes the society on religious grounds.
2. His analysis is cyclical hence it leaves no room for evaluating progress.(Callinicos2003,p11)

Calinicos argues that “One (Imam Ibn-i-Khaldoon) may use the concept without explicitly formulating it” (Calinicos 1999, p 11). Ibn-i-Khaldoon did not theorize the concept of Modernist Sociology. He did not conceive society distinct from political institutions. To view Ibn-i-Khaldoon the first sociologist would be misleading for the following reasons:

1. His propositions about the varieties of social organization are advanced within the framework of an essentially religious discourse that seeks to emphasize the limitations of human reason.
2. He conceives the relationship between the two main social forms he analyses as a cyclical one.

Within the cyclical view of history, it is impossible to formulate the idea of a radically novel form of society which breaks with its precedents, and inaugurates a new pattern of development (Ibid).

### Conclusion

Social sciences are value specific and presume a particular metaphysics that is presumed by Enlightenment. This metaphysics is in contradiction with Islamic metaphysics and epistemology. Hence grafted sciences like Islamic economics, Islamic sociology etc. are incoherent and are not epistemologically justifiable. Imam Ibn-i-Khaldun has not founded Islamic sociology at all.

### References

1. Ansari, J.A, 2005, Rejecting freedom and Progress, University of Karachi press, Karachi.
2. Ansari, J.A, Syed Zeeshan Arshad, 2006, Business Ethics in Pakistan, Royal Book Company, Karachi.
3. Callinicos,A,T, 2003, Social Theory, Polity,U.K.
4. Hume, David, 1978, A Treatise of Human Nature, Oxford University Press.
5. Hall,J,(1989)Liberalism, Pantheon ,London.
6. Imam Ghazali, 1993,Ihya ul uloom-id-Din, Darul Ishaat,Karachi.
7. Imam Ibn-i-Khaldoon, 2001, Muqaddimah (in Arabic), Beirut.
8. Kant,I,1958, Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals, London.
9. Rosenthal,E.I.J, 1988,Political thought in Medieval Islam, Cambridge.
10. Suri, A.W, Jan 2007 , The possibility of Meta-History, Market Forces.