



Comparing the Role of the Ruler in the Political Thought of Khajeh Nezam Al-Mulk Tusi and Thomas Hobbes

Mehdi Masoudi Ashtiani¹, Maghsood Ranjbar^{2*}, Darab Foolady³

^{1,3}Department of Political Science, Ashtian Branch, Islamic Azad University, Ashtian,
Iran

²Department of Political Science, Qom Branch, Islamic Azad University, Qom, Iran

Received: 18 Nov 2020

;

Accepted: 20 March 2021

Abstract:

This comparative study aimed to investigate anthropology and the status of the ruler from the perspectives of Hobbes and Khajeh Nezam Al-Mulk. On the one hand, we have Hobbes representing Western Thinking where God and Religion have no position as the human soul has prevailed, while, on the other hand, we have a Muslim thinker whose ideas have been derived taken from the Qur'an and a Hadith (Quotes from the Prophet). In this research, we first seek to review the political thinking of Hobbes and Khajeh Nezam Al-Mulk Tusi, and secondly, to investigate the position of the government in the thinking of these two thinkers. Using the library method, data were collected and after the data were collected, the differences and similarities between the two views were stated and finally, the following results were inferred: 1- There are fundamental differences between the two views and ideas of these two philosophers with the differences being that Hobbes thinks only based on mundane and human thinking and encounters many doubts and contradictions, whereas Khajeh states his thinking based on Islam and Revelation. 2. Hobbes's political thinking is originally extra-religious and is based on the social contract, while the political thinking of Khajeh Nezam Al-Mulk is based on religion and religious decrees. However, the two thinkers are mostly similar in the sense that they regard security preceding over justice and equality being the most important concept when justifying the absolute governance. The most important findings of this study suggest that Hobbes focuses more on the law as being more in favor of the ruler with the people following the ruler completely; hence this is a prelude to the formation of absolute states. This is while Khajeh considers people slaves to the ruler while emphasizing the ruler's Divine Right. Accordingly, this could intensify domination. The two thinkers consider the security of the people and the society under the shadow of the ruler with Hobbes regarding the ruler as an elected representative of the people and social

*Corresponding Author's Email: maghsoodranjbar@gmail.com

contract and Khajeh calling him as selected by God. In this article, attempts were made to review and compare the issues using the historical and analytical method proposed by Skinner.

Keywords: Thomas Hobbes, Khajeh Nezam Al-Mulk Tusi, Ruler, Security

1.Introduction

The issue of the political system is one of the subjects most political scholars have attempted to investigate while proposing solutions to the problem of the social disorder based on it. This has long existed since ancient times in the East and the West. In modern Western thinking, various scholars have addressed this issue, among whom is Hobbes, the one with a great influence on political streams. Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679) was the first English political philosopher in modern times, whose great work "Leviathan" has been considered one of the classic writings in the field of political philosophy that analyzes the political system with a different framework based on the social contract. He first analyzed man and describes what a political system and a government are through a specific method, which was an outcome of a "whole analysis and combination" in addition to a method of geometric analogy; by government, he meant the one with completely authoritarian tendencies. Criticizing the nature of his government, some argue that Hobbes should have created an authoritarian government to avoid chaos in line with his era in the British Civil War.

Providing peace, compromise, security, end to fear, war, establishing a government, etc. are key issues that Hobbes repeatedly emphasizes in his seminal work "Leviathan" on political theory. To Hobbes, human beings are constantly influenced seeking to satisfy their interests, and words are incapable of preventing human ambition, greed, anger, and other emotions without fear of any coer-

cive power; one that cannot be imagined in essence in a purely natural state, where all human beings are equal and refrain from the reality of fear; however, there must be an authoritarian power that warns of the consequences of violating it while barring human's force from violating it. This power can only be achieved by establishing a government or commonwealth governance with sufficient civil power to force the people to live up to their commitments.

Khajeh Nezam Al-Mulk represents Islamic thinking and Hobbes represents Western thinking. On the one hand, we have a Muslim researcher and scholar, whose thinking is based on the Qur'an and Islam, though he has been influenced by Aristotle's ideas on the principles of ethics. (Eskandari, 2004, p. 3). Concerning the school to which Khajeh belongs, God is the center of all affairs and the origin of the universe lies in the existence of the Divine sanctuary. Man and the universe are moving towards Him. The basis of all do's and don'ts is thorns, but that does not mean that man has been forgotten. Indeed, there is no confrontation between belief in divine freedom and human authenticity. In Qur'anic thinking, guidance is from God, but it is the man who enjoys will, authority, movement, and struggle. Man has his role and position. Man's authority stands along with God's authority (Na'ri, 2007, pp. 7-9). According to the Qur'anic view, Tusi maintains that even though a tendency towards good and evil lies in the human soul, this innate tendency to good and evil is not constructive alone and man must achieve happiness; this is because human development re-

quires struggle, attention, and movement, and if he abandons it, he begins to demise, thereby leading him towards imperfection (Hozeh and Daneshgah, 2007, pp. 19-20). Islam considers the truth of human existence as his soul, which is an abstract and eternal substance (Seri, 2007, pp. 7-9). He never followed any political school introduced by ancient Greece and Rome. His goal was only to spread social justice, to fight oppression, and to encourage the dissemination of knowledge. That's why he wrote *Siasat Nameh* or *Seir Al-Muluk* in which he has mentioned exemplary historical stories aimed at elucidating the outcomes of justice-seeking and the omen consequences of oppression. For him, justice means that just rulers should prevail in the process of history. He considers justice in the sense that each person should have reason and wisdom in proportion to his/her intellect. This study aimed to compare the thinking of Hobbes and Khajeh Nasir on the issue of rulers.

2) Background and research method

Various books and articles have been released on the views and perspectives of Thomas Hobbes and Khajeh Nezam Al-Mulk Tusi. Some of the most important researches done in this regard are as follows:

In an article, entitled "Comparison of an authoritarian government and the position of its people in it" Tavana, Azar Kamand (2015) refers to Thomas Hobbes and Ghazali, maintaining both scholars have planned their authoritarian governments on the nature of human being. According to the four human attributes, Ghazali seeks to train a divine-human being to embark on a passive activity under the governance of a divine ruler. Hobbes, in contrast, states that human beings have a power-seeking nature such that war has been declared against all in the primitive

and natural state of humanity, and that human beings have sought to set themselves free from this state by reason. They have thus acted upon establishing a powerful government through their foresightedness. The problem for both thinkers seems to very much the same, however, their approach to the problem differs. That is, both thinkers lived in turbulent times, and the need for security led them both to resort to authoritarian rule. On the other hand, both scholars consider a passive role for people, though Ghazali and Hobbes' reasoning method is rational. At the same time, Hobbes' Rational Theory seems to pave the way to go beyond an authoritarian rule, while Ghazali's Shari'a Theory is aimed at reproducing a kind of authoritarian rule.

In his master's thesis, Bagheri (2017) conducted a comparative study on the anthropological basics of Imam Khomeini and Thomas Hobbes' political views, developing the following four main themes: Two themes are related to the political views of these two great thinkers, and the remaining two pertain to the anthropological views proposed by these two scholars. Then, in the end, the ideas proposed by the philosophers are compared. Imam Khomeini's notion of human beings is completely religious and divine based; he considers man as the caliph of God on earth, considering the establishment of divine rule and the implementation of God's laws as critical for man's eternal happiness. This view exactly contrasts that of Hobbes' Materialist View of man, as Hobbes has a dim and pessimistic view of him, regarding him as a wolf-man no one but the shepherd (government) can control his hostile temperament. This research illustrates the way human beings and political thinking are imagined in the intellectual system of Imam Khomeini and Thomas Hobbes.

In his dissertation entitled "A Comparative study of the theory of government in the thinking of Maverdi and Khajeh Nasir Tusi", Bakaiyan (2015) aimed to show the differences and similarities between the views in the intellectual and Islamic group and in particular Maverdi and Khajeh Nasir. The main basis of the dispute between Maverdi and Khajeh Nasir lies in the issue of the government. According to Khajeh, legitimacy is derived from the holy Shari'a and depends on the views proposed by the Shari'a, but Maverdi considers it to belonging to elites.

In their valuable research on politics and knowledge in the Islamic world, Omid Safi and Mojtaba Fazeli (2017) have reviewed political ideas in the Seljuk era in general and the political thinking of Khajeh Nezam in particular. In this regard, the most important principles of Khajeh's political thinking as

the most prominent minister of the Seljuk era have been analyzed.

Despite the prior research on the political thinking of Hobbes and Khajeh, it was not possible to study the concepts considered in this study, i.e., such concepts as the ruler, people, and the laws. In the meantime, a comparative study of the Iranian-Islamic thinkers (Khajeh Nezam) and the West representative in the modern era (Hobbes) has been neglected so far and this research seeks to show a clear perspective on this. The present study was performed with a descriptive-analytical approach while using library and documentary sources. A documentary method is a qualitative method that the researcher seeks to discover, extract, classify and evaluate materials related to the subject by using systematic data (Tully, 2004, p. 97).

Table 1

Stages of research methodology in political science (James Tully: 2004)

First	Establishing an ideological background in writing a text by the author
Second	Clarifying the connection between political thinking and action about a text
Third	Investigating and explaining how to identify and develop, critique, and transform ideology
Fourth	Relationship between political ideology and political action and explaining the proliferation of certain ideologies and their impact on political behavior
Fifth	Identifying political thinking and actions in promoting and making ideological changes conventional

3) Khajeh Nezam Al-Mulk Tusi

3-1) Biography of Khajeh Nezam Al-Mulk Tusi

Abu Ali Hassan ibn Ali ibn Ishaq Tusi, known as Khajeh Nezam Al-Mulk Tusi, was one of the most famous Iranian Muslim ministers, who headed the ministry of the great Seljuk government for three decades. In the reign of the Seljuk kingdom led by Sultan Malekshah Seljuki, he managed to extend the realms of the Seljuk kingdom through his competency and intellect. His political services and thinking gave the Iranian-Islamic

culture and civilization a new dimension. On the other hand, he can be considered a major theorist and maybe a renowned political figure in the field of power and government in the Seljuk era, because of his immense role in the Seljuk government, special religious affiliations, the way he viewed the caliphate institution and his favorite religion, his approach to relations in the Abbasid caliphate and return to the Iranian traditions in the Islamic government administration. Political thinkers such as Tusi, who led the Iranian tradition and safeguarded the ministry, sought to set up a system where

consultation, justice, and practice were of importance through establishing practical and realistic techniques they had learned from the Iranian-Islamic heritage (Eslami & Khajeh Sarvi, 2013, p. 2). IN this regard, the Khajeh Nezam Al-Mulk Tusi's *Siasat Nameh* is a reflection upon the views and thinking of this great Seljuk minister on the political and social issues of his era when attempting to establish a desirable society. In this seminal work, he discussed his experiences and lessons learned from his mentors (Behzadi, 2016, p. 21).

3-2) Ruler's authority

Khajeh Nezam Al-Mulk Tusi integrated politics and religion and advised the ruler to be cognizant of religion and consultation with religious scholars. Khajeh positioned his basic argument on the fact that the king had the right to rule over his servants as he achieves his authority from divine blessing. This is what is called the Theory of Divine Right to Authority (Sharif, 1991, pp. 228 - 229).

On the other hand, Khajeh Nezam amplifies the basis of tyranny by expressing the divine right to the monarchy. This is God who chooses the king, not the people, and

their votes do not interfere with the work of the king whatsoever, he adds. It is also God who adorns him with royal arts, thus he needs not to gain knowledge and learn governance laws. That is why an individual like Sultan Sanjar of Seljuk ascends to the seat of authority for forty years and does whatever he wishes and issues any order he deems necessary while being illiterate, as he's chosen by God to rule. This is while no one has the power and courage to protest and disobey (Halabi, 1989, pp. 217-218).

Hence, in this divine system of political society, everything takes its source from the providence of God, and the king's authority also arises from His absolute authority.

No one, both humble or noble, has the right to disobey the caliph for his legitimacy arises from God's authority. For example, in Chapter Three of *Siasat Nameh*, on Yaghoob Leis and the Caliph of Baghdad, the former was accused of disobeying the Caliph of Baghdad and of converting to the Esmaelian monarchy. This led Yaghoob Leis to move outside of Sistan and arrived in Khorasan. Then, he came to Iraq where Mar people deceived him to convert to the Esmaelian (Halabi, 1988, pp. 217-218).

Table 2

The view of Khajeh Nezam Al-Mulk Tusi regarding the ruler and the people

Ruler	People
The ruler is chosen by God and he is charged to preserve the religion	Social unrest and disorder is because of disobedience of the ruler and the people's rebellion against God because he is the ruler chosen by God
The absolute ruling monarchy advises the ruler of religion and to consult with religious scholars	The people must strictly obey the ruler
God, not the people chooses the ruler	People should not get involved in politics.
The ruler's main obligation is to establish order, peace, and justice	
Justice is the most important attribute of the king is	
An ideal king pays attention to religion and religiosity and is just	

4) Thomas Hobbes

4-1) Hobbes' life and era

Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679) was an English philosopher who wrote various works, including the book *Leviathan* where he describes his views on governance and politics in general. Thomas Hobbes' political ideas as a basis for modern theorists are of great importance. This is while that modern political thinking is aimed at the efficiency of the government and better administration of the society. Modern thinking turned to human intellect as the only organizing element of social life while denying the conception of the human intellect linked with transcendental intellect; it also sought to explore the basics of the rationality of the government as well as the concepts related to it, including the laws governing the relations between individuals, the government and the people. Thus, it was stated that the government was a human system the human intellect had created to organize an important aspect of social life, where at the same time the subject under discussion went on to suggest the best way forward to organize public affairs according to the man's intellect (Shahr-Aeini, Nozohoor & Karimi, 2018, p.80).

Hobbes has an influential status in the current literature of philosophy, politics, and society because he explained systematically and comprehensively the most key issues in political philosophy and political science, i.e., authority and ruling. In the book *Leviathan*, he took the first step to make politics a body of knowledge using the accuracy and certainty of mathematical rules in the area of politics, while he sought to consider *Leviathan* or government as an artificial human being using allegories. Based on the mechanical and material analysis, he also attempted to explain human nature as well as human desires, beha-

avior, and feelings based on the principle of movement (Yonesi and Akbari, 2015, p.93).

4-2) Human nature

For Hobbes, man is naturally a selfish creature. Human conducts arise from desires that require prosperity. All human conduct can be explained based on the desire for food, housing, fame, wealth, and caprice.

But this innate man became a social being, as he changed and manipulated nature by converting to the social state and continuing to live. In this state, education and government were established and the man managed to live under better conditions. Up to this point, the discussion was based on reasoning, however, from now on, his ideas take on a hypothetical status. This is because Hobbes maintains that the innate man enjoys a set of traits that make him evil, ambitious, filthy, liar, and predator. Hobbes' famous phrase "man is a wolf to man" proves his claim (Bakhshayesh Ardestani, 2004, p.21).

4-3) The nature of the ruling power in Hobbes's political philosophy

Confining happiness and pleasure in the pleasures of this sensory and accessible world yields implications in addition to the strife that provides for yet another construct for Hobbes' political thinking. In other words, as he is quoted, happiness denotes the desire to have continuous pleasure, thus human beings must attach love to peace, security, and stability because it is only in the shadow of security one can enjoy the relevant benefits. Also, one should resent all the barriers existing on the path to pleasure and enjoyment, such as death (Hobbes, 2014, p.139). These two points, i.e., "desire for peace to enjoy the gifts and benefits" and "fear of death and aversion to all barriers to pleasure", consti-

tute the basis of civil obedience and make people obey public power.

A natural state is a state of absolute insecurity while human beings desire peace. Therefore, the natural law, which is a general rule is discovered by reason and intellect, as it dictates that man should avoid conduct that is destructive to his life or the means preventing him from preserving his life, or an omission he believes is the best way to preserve the life (Gautier, 1969, p.45). Having said this, two fundamental issues will serve on reason (natural laws) as the foundation for political association and government: "Whoever seeking peace must strive for it as far as possible" with its sequel as the second law: "Everyone has to be willing as much as others to safeguard peace and order and give up their absolute rights in favor of the security of all" (Hobbes, 2014, pp. 162-160). It is clear that the mutual transfer of rights is what constitutes a "contract". This contract that

people make on the mutual transfer of their rights serves as the basis of the government and the political association. To Hobbes, the only way to secure public power is for people to "grant all their power to the state:" I grant my right to the government to rule over me or to an assembly of individuals, and consider all their actions as justified and rightful on my own; provided that they also entrust their rights on me and consider all my actions legitimate and justified" (Hobbes, 2014, p. 192). An important question arises here that may even have implications for human rights: Do people give up "all" their rights in this agreement? The purpose of such a contract is to establish a government, maintain security and peace to enjoy the benefits and life as a whole. It is therefore natural that human beings do not give up their fundamental rights in such a contract which could be contrary to this purpose (McPherson, 1975, pp. 32-35).

Table 3
Hobbes' view of the ruler and the people

Ruler	People
Absolute monarchy	Man is a physical body with wisdom
The ruler cannot violate the contract	Differences between religious sects and their involvement in political affairs have led to dire consequences
The church must follow the civil ruler.	Intellect chaos among young people stemming from lack of scientific order and control as well as improper education at universities
Legitimacy prevails over the social contract	Humans must learn to follow the law
The ruler is the sole law-maker	Citizens cannot change the form of government
The ruler is responsible for making, enforcing, and guaranteeing the law.	People's votes constitute the foundation of government
	People can only reject the ruler if he fails to provide security or endangers the life of people.

Thus, excluding the fundamental right to self-defense against death and injury, human beings entrust all their rights to public authority. This is because the goal is to provide security and the right to the goal also warrants the right to the means. As a consequence,

everything necessary to provided security must be entrusted to the public authority (Tuck, 2008, pp. 100-101). However, to whom are these rights entrusted? According to Hobbes' analysis, human beings agree to entrust all their rights to an individual or

group of individuals as a government to provide for security. Therefore, Hobbes's government, is not necessarily one of individual, though it can be based on an assembly. An interesting point is that the ruler - be an individual or an assembly of individuals- is not a party to the social contract; rather, all parties to the contract are the citizens by themselves. Hobbes does not consider the ruler to be a party to the contract to bar the ruler to breach the covenant. Having said this, the ruler is not a party to the contract at all (Lloyd, 2013, p. 5), so it is meaningless for the ruler to breach the covenant because he has not regulated the covenant; thus, the ruler does is allowed to do whatever he wishes. Also, Hobbes' social contract requires the individual citizens to consider themselves the source of the government. As a result, all government actions are attributable to every individual; put it differently, whatever the ruler does, it is as though every single citizen has done it; hence there is no right to object to the ruler. Hobbes' government is thus an authoritarian and an "integrated and indivisible" sovereign government wielding broad powers with far-reaching implications: the citizens cannot change the form of the government; it is not conceivable of the ruler to break the covenant and therefore he is permitted to do anything; no objection can be exercised against the ruler; each of the citizens is the main actor and the authority of the ruling actions' credibility, and therefore a "tyrant ruler" is meaningless; citizens cannot punish the ruler; the ruler is the only judge and arbitrator; the ruler even exercises the power to judge thoughts; he has the right to make laws; the right to declare war and peace is vested upon him; the election of all ministers and advisers and the awarding of rewards and punishments, etc., are also delegated to the ruler. One would argue that Hobbes sought to

make it quite rational to justify his authoritarian ruler.

5. Comparing the thinking of Hobbes and Khajeh Nezam about the ruler

Political philosophy, and especially the formation of political society, is founded on Hobbes's interpretation of human nature. Human nature in Hobbes's psychological system is based on various principles. At first, Hobbes emphasized the psychological and biological basics of human nature analysis; however, ultimately it is the physics and mechanical principles and laws that would play a major role. Based on this premise, Hobbes considers human nature to be fixed and unchangeable even after it enters society. The idea behind the movement led Hobbes to great innovation in the psychology and knowledge of politics. He explained nature, man, and society in terms of movement. Hobbes sought to create a theory that would describe the people's movement relative to each other and then infer what kind of government people should have to make them maintain and maximize their movement. For Hobbes, physics and psychology were the science of movement and, therefore, considered to be branches of mechanics. Although Hobbes' ethics and politics conform to mechanical materialism and are sometimes extended on the same subject, they have not been derived from it. There may be similarities between the way humans struggle with each other and what comes out of inanimate objects, however, as Hobbes explains, explaining war and advising to avoid it is not fundamentally mechanical. War and peace are essential issues to be consulted, accepted, or rejected. They are only secondarily products of blind impersonal forces within human beings. That is why Hobbes provides the causes of peace in the form of rulings that are

justified to follow while considering the causes of war as seditious beliefs or clumsy practical policies that are wise to abandon.

Thus, according to Hobbes' view, knowledge of political apparatus is contingent upon understanding human nature, and on the other hand, understanding human states and actions hinges on understanding mechanical principles and physics laws. For Hobbes, man is naturally irrational and compelled, such that he cannot establish a political society in his nature. In other words, man is naturally civilized and must be made sociable. To Hobbes, even reason, education, learning, and society are incapable of containing human interactions, and if there is no external power, we will get engaged in the war of all against all. So, we need an absolute government. Human nature is ultimately founded on the human body, whose structure stands in the system of nature, ultimately determining human behavior. Since society cannot change our physical structure, it also cannot control our desires either. So, we need external power or Leviathan. Khajeh Tusi considers the dignity and position of reason to be fundamental in practical wisdom and its branches; this is because as he states, ethics has a strong connection with education, with moral

issues formed in a system of education and its mechanisms. Therefore, any type of constructive and efficient education for him is based on an intellectual system and the development of rational principles is founded on such principles as "reason and knowledge" and "justice" and refraining from oppression and successful human experiences (human intellect related experiences) (Ranjbar, 2006, p. 98).

When entering the court of the savage Mongols, Khajeh Nezam Al-Mulk overshadows the short-term military victories with the power of reason and intellect via a discrete and wise tactic, and later as knowledge and philosophy advanced and the level of awareness and insight of the people rose, he placed no position for militarism while adding to the human experience that policy-making based on coherent reason and thinking was rationally and practically victorious over violent militaristic thinking. Being concerned that the political life of Muslims suffers from a crisis of ignorance and cultural degradation and that of Ash'arite and rigid thinking had prevailed, he resorted to the domination of a political system with a dominant and violent nature (Ranjbar, 2006, p. 99).

Table 4
Comparison of the similarities between the thinking of Hobbes and Khajeh Tusi concerning the people and the ruler

Similarity	People	Ruler
Hobbes	Differences between religious sects and their involvement in political affairs have led to dire consequences.	Absolute government monarchy
	Citizens cannot change the form of government.	The ruler enforces security and peace for the people.
	People must obey the ruler.	It is not conceivable for the ruler to break the covenant
Tusi	Social rebellion and unrest are due to the disobedience of the ruler and are thought of as the people's rebellion against God be-	The ruler is assumed to make laws
		Absolute government monarchy
		The main task of the ruler is to provide order, peace, and justice.

cause he is chosen by God. The people must be unquestioningly obedient to the ruler. People should not get involved in politics.	Law-making is the responsibility of the ruler. People should not get involved in politics.
--	---

Table 5

Comparison of the differences between the thinking of Hobbes and Khajeh Tusi regarding the people and the ruler

	Similarity	People	Ruler
Hobbes	Human beings are physical creatures with reason. The people's vote constitutes the government. People can only reject the ruler if he fails to provide security or compromises the life of people.		The church must follow the civil ruler. Legitimacy prevails over the social contract The ruler is the sole law-maker The ruler is responsible for making, enforcing, and guaranteeing the law.
Tusi	People should not engage in politics		The ruler is chosen by God and he is charged to preserve the religion The absolute ruling monarchy advises the ruler of religion and to consult with religious scholars God, not the people chooses the ruler The ruler's main obligation is to establish order, peace, and justice Justice is the most important attribute of the king is An ideal king pays attention to religion and religiosity and is just

Table 6

Methodology of Hobbes and Nezam Al-Mulk's view based on a comparing the book Leviathan and Siasat Nameh

Scholar	The relation between the ruler and the people
Hobbes (Leviathan)	Expediency and rule: Individual interest in security provision Natural laws Most desirable government: Most emphasis on absolute governance: 1. A monarchy or the same kingdom 2. All powers for the ruler Consequences of a Civil War (the biggest problem in each government) Scope of governance and the way it is expressed: Absolute authority: the ruler Two cases of disobedience of the ruling authority: 1. The ruling power is eliminated as a result of civil and foreign war

	2. The ruler endangers the life of a person or all his subjects
	Two ways for the ruler to acquire power
	1- Natural powers
	2- Consensus
	The government acquired by force
	Ruler chose by God
Khajeh Tusi	The disorder is the product of the sin people commit, not of the incompetency of the king
(Seir Al-Muluk)	The only coherent political thinking: Iranshahri politics
	The kingdom intensifies the basis of tyranny via reserving the divine right

Conclusion

Here one may conclude that the general and fundamental difference that distinguishes old and traditional political philosophy from modern political philosophy and modern sociology being that traditional political theory considers all the rights and interests for the society as a whole, views the governing body as the executive enforcer for implementing these benefits while regarding people in the community as drops in the invisible and insignificant ocean waves. This is while the modern political philosophy, referred to as

the Theory of Democracy, is based on individual rights and freedoms and is assumed to be the starting point of a social structure where people can take benefit of the rights of their land from their freedom and independence.

As mentioned in the present study, one can conclude that Hobbes based his idea on a social contract, while Khajeh Nezam's political thinking is characterized by the fact that he has sought to pay attention to Islam to combine it with the caliphate. Khajeh's words and behavior suggest she regards more sincerity for religion and worship.

Table 7

A final comparison of Hobbes and Khajeh Tusi's thinking about the ruler

Hobbes	Tusi
Basis of his thought: social contract	His words are based on political analysis and expediency
Government: A man-made institution	An expression of the divine right of a kingdom that aggravates the basis of tyranny
Obligation to obey the rules of the governing person	Justice: The most important attributes of a king
Acquiring security: Accepting absolute monarchy	An inseparable link between land and religion
The only way to eliminate conflicts is to establish an absolute government system	The king must rule based on the peoples' religious beliefs
The scientific and theoretical writing style	Disorder: It is the product of the sins people make, not of the incompetency of the king
In the position of thinker and theorist	Security: more tendency to the king
Content concerning the absolute rule of the government	Literary writing and letter of advice styles
Religion dominated by religion	In the position of politician and thinker
	Content concerning the absolute rule of the government
	Religion dominated by government

References

- Akbari, Ahmad Reza (2008). *Khajeh Tusi and the Philosophy of Policy Writing*, Monthly of History and Geography, No. 128
- Bakaiyan, Amir Hossein & Esmaeil Hosseini Goli, (2015). A Comparative study of the theory of government in the thinking of Maverdi and Khajeh Nasir Tusi, Central Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran
- Bashiriyeh, Hossein (2003). *History of Political Thinking in the Twentieth Century*, Volume 1, Marxist Thinking, Tehran, Ney Publishing
- Behzadi, Marziyeh (2016). The Political Thinking of Khajeh Nezam al-Mulk Tusi, *Jundishapur Quarterly*, 2(6). Summer
- DeFouche Cour, Charles Henry (1998). *Ethics: Ethical Concepts in Persian Literature from the Third to the Seventh Century AH*, Translated by Mohammad Ali Amir Moezzi and Abdolmohammad Rouhbakhshan, Tehran, University Markaz Press, and French Iranian Studies Association, Iran
- Enayat, Hamid (1986). *Political Thinking in Contemporary Islam*, Tehran, Khazmi Publications
- Eslami, Ruhollah, and Khajeh Sarvi, Gholamreza (2013). Power Technologies in the Khajeh Nezam Al-Mulk's Siasat Nameh, *Journal of Strategic Policy Research*, 1(4), Spring
- Feldman, I (2001). *Freedman as motion*, University Press of America
- Fetcher, Iringa (1966). *Leviathan odder Stuff, Form und Grewal eons kirchlichen und bürgerlichen States (suhrkamp taschenbuch wissenschaft)*
- Ghaderi, Hatem (2013). *Political Thinking in Islam and Iran*, Vol. 13, Tehran, SAMT
- Ghazali, Abu Hamed (1968). *Nasihah al-Muluk*, Tehran, Majles Press
- Haeri Yazdi, Mehdi (2016). *Wisdom and Government*, electronic version via PDF file.
- Halabi, Ali Asghar (1989). *History of Iranian Philosophy*, Tehran: Zovar
- Hedayati, Abolfazl (1999). *The Political Behavior of the Nezam Al-Mulk*, *Islamic Government Quarterly*, No. 13
- Hey, Malek-Yahiya, and Amini, Vahid (2009). The Concept of Natural Law and International Law in the Political Thinking of Thomas Hobbes, *Journal, Private and Criminal Law Research*, Spring and Summer, vol 11
- Hindu Shah, Nakhjavani (1978). *Tajarab Al-Salaf*. By Abbas Iqbal Ashtiani, Tehran, Tahoori
- Hobbes, Thomas (2001). *Leviathan*, translated by Hossein Bashiriyeh, Tehran, Ney Publishing
- Javanpour Heravi, Aziz (2007). *Basics of Political Management in the Thinking of Khajeh Nezam Al-Mulk Tusi*, *Management Sciences*, Vol. 3
- Lal Alizadeh, Mohammad (2016). A Comparison of the Relationship between Freedom and Security in the Political Thinking of Thomas Hobbes and John Locke, *Journal of Existence and Understanding*, 3(2), Fall and Winter
- Leidman, Sean Eric (2002). *History of Political Ideas (from Plato to Habermas)* Translated by Saeed Moghadam, Akhtaran publishing

- Mahmoudi, Seyed Ali (1998). *Theory of Freedom in the Hobbes and Locke's Political Philosophy*, Tehran, Institute for Humanities
- Malek, Ahmad (2000). *View of the Book Siasat Nameh or Seir Al-Muluk*, *Monthly of History and Geography*, No. 34
- Manouchehri, Abbas (1997). *Power, Modernism, and Postmodernism*, *Political and Economic Information*, Nos. 121 and 122
- Mansouri, Ali, and Gholami, Maryam (2011). *A Comparative Study of Abu Hamed's Political Thinking*, *Sokhan Quarterly*, No. 15
- Mirmousavi, Seyed Ali, and Maktabi, Ehsan (2013). *Religion and Government in the School of Social Contract*, *Political Sciences*
- Morshedlu, Javad (2004). *A Historical Approach to Hobbes' Political Thinking*, *Journal Research History*, Fall, No. 20
- Neyshabouri, Zahiruddin (1978). *Seljuq Nameh*, Tehran, East
- Niazi, Ahmad Ali (2010). *Objectives and Obligations of Religious Government*, *Political Knowledge*, 2(1), Spring and Summer
- Ranjbar, Maghsoud (2006). *The Concept of Security in Medieval Thinking*, *Quarterly Journal of Strategic Studies*, No. 31, Spring
- Sabzehei, Mohammad Taghi (2007). *Civil Society as a Social Contract: A Comparative Analysis of the Hobbes, Locke, and Rousseau Thinking*, *Public Law Research*, Article 3, 9(22), Fall
- Safa, Zabihullah (1976). *History of Rational Sciences in Islamic Civilization until the Middle of the Fifth Century*, Tehran: University of Tehran Press
- Safi, Omid (2010). *Politics/Knowledge in the Islamic World*, translated by Fazeli, Mojtaba, Tehran, Research Institute for Cultural and Social Studies
- Schmitt, Carl (2001). *Der Leviathan in der Staatslehre des Thomas Hobbes, Sinn und Fehlschlag eons politischen Symbols Taschenbuch*
- Sharif, Mohammad (1991). *History of Philosophy in Islam*, Volume 2, Tehran, University Markaz Publishing
- Tabatabaei, Javad (2007). *The Decline of Political Thinking in Iran: Discourse on the Theoretical Foundations of Iran's Decline*, Tehran: Kavir
- Tuck, Richard (1997). *Hobbes*, translated by Hossein Bashiriye, *Tarh-e-Now*, First Edition, Tehran
- Tully, James, and Behrouzslak, Gholamreza (2004). *Skinner Methodology in Analyzing Political Thinking*, *Political Science*, No. 28
- Tusi, Khajeh Nasir al-Din (2001). *Akhlaghe Naseri*, In collaboration with Mojtaba Minavi and Alireza Heidari, Tehran: Kharazmi
- Younesi, Mostafa, and Akbari Karimabadi, Nouredin (2015). *A Comparison of Hobbes' Methodology in Establishing and Forming a Government with Emphasis on Leviathan*, *Quarterly Journal of Philosophical-Theological Research*, 16(4)
- Yousefi, Gholam Hossein (1958). *The old of politics*, *Literary papers*, Nos. 13 and 14