

Received .01-03-2026
Accepted 08-05-2026.

The Science of Human Civilization

Cherrak Hamza

University of Djelfa

Hamza.cherrak@univ-djelfa.dz

Printed ISSN: 2352-989X
Online ISSN: 2602-6856

Abstract:

This article examines human civilization studies as a theoretical framework for analyzing social organization and its general laws, by outlining its main domains and the factors that contributed to its emergence and development. It focuses on the concept of social solidarity (asabiyyah) as an interpretive mechanism for understanding the dynamics of cohesion and power formation, highlighting its relationship to nomadic and urban patterns of settlement and the resulting variations in social cohesion and collective behavior. The article also discusses the role of the scientific method in the study of civilizational phenomena, emphasizing the shift from descriptive narration to inductive analysis and causal explanation. It concludes by affirming the contemporary relevance of this field for interpreting modern social transformations within critical methodological frameworks.

Keywords: Human Civilization Studies – ‘Asabiyyah (Social Solidarity) – Nomadic and Urban Civilization – Scientific Method – Social Organization

1. INTRODUCTION:

The science of human social organization (‘Ilm al-‘Umrān al-Basharī) is considered one of the foundational fields of knowledge in the study of society and its governing laws. It is concerned with analyzing patterns of human association, structures of social organization, and the conditions underlying the emergence, flourishing, and decline of states and civilizations. This field contributed to a shift from purely narrative interpretations of historical events toward an analytical explanatory approach based on identifying the social, economic, and political causes that shape the dynamics of social organization.

Within this framework, *‘asabiyyah* (social solidarity) emerges as a central concept in explaining the dynamics of social cohesion, the construction of authority, and the achievement of dominance, thereby linking patterns of social organization in nomadic and sedentary societies.

This article sets out to examine the science of human social organization in terms of its epistemological domains and the factors that contributed to its emergence and development, with particular emphasis on the concept of *‘asabiyyah* and its relationship to nomadic and sedentary forms of social organization. The article treats this concept as an analytical tool for interpreting variations in forms of social cohesion and patterns of collective behavior. It also seeks to relate this theoretical framework to the notion of the scientific method by highlighting the shift from impressionistic description to inductive analysis, and by linking social phenomena to general laws that are intelligible and subject to explanation. This approach aims to demonstrate the foundational value of the science of human social organization in constructing a systematic mode of social thought that contributes to understanding the structural transformations of human societies in both past and present contexts.

Research Questions:

- What is meant by the science of human social organization, and what are its main epistemological domains in the study of human society?
- What historical and intellectual factors contributed to the emergence of the science of human social organization and the crystallization of its explanatory concepts?
- How is the concept of *‘asabiyyah* defined as a mechanism for explaining social cohesion and the construction of authority within the framework of the science of human social organization?
- What is the nature of the relationship between *‘asabiyyah* and nomadic versus sedentary social organization, and how does this relationship account for differences in patterns of social organization and collective behavior?

2. The Science of Human Social Organization and Its Domains:

The science of human social organization constitutes an independent and innovative discipline in the Khaldūnian conception. It is distinct from the other sciences and arts prevalent in Ibn Khaldun's era, despite the apparent thematic overlaps between them and its field of inquiry. This science is concerned with the study of human association in terms of its general laws, mechanisms, and explanatory domains, including the concepts, methods, and analytical frameworks it entails, as elucidated by Ibn Khaldun in his *Muqaddimah*.

Ibn Khaldun introduces the science of social organization by highlighting two fundamental social facts. The first is cooperation as a necessary condition for human association, given that human beings, by their very nature, are incapable of securing the necessities of life in isolation. This compels them to live in communities and to complement one another in order to satisfy their basic needs. He defines social organization (*‘umrān*) as a form of cohabitation, social intimacy, and cooperation in livelihood, grounded in the human disposition toward association and the exchange of benefits.

The second fundamental social fact is aggression or conflict, a natural behavior shared by living beings, which necessitates the existence of means of self-defense. Ibn Khaldun argues that human beings were endowed with distinctive faculties—namely, the hand and the intellect—enabling them to manufacture tools and compensate for the natural defensive organs possessed by animals.

Ibn Khaldun emphasizes that cooperation and conflict are both necessary processes for the emergence and continuity of human association. However, such association requires a restraining authority that curbs aggression and regulates relations among individuals, for the mere possession of defensive means is insufficient to regulate human conduct. Hence arises the need for governance and sovereignty as mechanisms for achieving order and social stability, a notion subsumed under the concept of *mulk* (political authority) in the Khaldūnian framework. Ibn Khaldun draws analogies from the animal world to illustrate the principles of leadership and organization, thereby reinforcing the necessity of political authority in human social organization.

The stability of social life is not grounded solely in the political factor; it is also based on two additional factors: the geographical environment and the economic sphere (crafts and modes of livelihood). Taken together, these factors constitute the pillars of the Khaldūnian theory of human social organization. Ibn Khaldun correlates human temperaments and dispositions with the nature of the regions they inhabit, demonstrating the effect of climatic moderation on the prosperity and stability of social organization, in contrast to the harsher conditions of severe environments, which impose less stable modes of life.

Ibn Khaldun links the specialization of certain cities in particular crafts to the nature of social organization and the degree of civilizational development. While most towns

share in the necessary crafts, cities that have attained a higher level of civilization are distinguished by crafts associated with luxury and urban refinement. He maintains that the flourishing of crafts is directly proportional to the level of urbanization and the complexity of social needs, rendering urban social organization a favorable environment for the diversification of trades and professions.

Moreover, Ibn Khaldun classifies modes of livelihood according to both historical and functional criteria: agriculture is regarded as the oldest form of earning a living, owing to its simplicity and naturalness; it is followed by craftsmanship and industry, characterized by complexity and reliance on knowledge and skill; and then commerce as an activity based on exchange and the pursuit of profit, which may also be accompanied by deceptive practices. By contrast, Ibn Khaldun does not classify rulership among the natural modes of livelihood, since it is associated with taxation and authority rather than direct production.

On the basis of these premises, the major domains of inquiry in the science of human social organization, according to Ibn Khaldun, may be identified as follows:

- The methodological foundations of research in the science of social organization, with particular emphasis on the historical method and its importance for understanding accounts of states and analyzing their conditions.
- The geographical environment and its impact on social organization, including demographic distribution, temperaments, modes of livelihood, and patterns of human adaptation.
- Nomadic social organization as the primordial form of human association and historically prior to sedentary (urban) social organization.
- The state, sovereignty, and the caliphate within the framework of political association, with an explanation of the role of *'asabiyyah* (social solidarity) in the establishment and consolidation of the state, and the multiplicity of its forms (kinship, affinity by marriage, clientage, neighborhood ties, and patronage).
- Sedentary (urban) social organization, encompassing the study of cities and towns, and the characteristics of urbanization and social organization.
- Crafts, livelihood, and earning, which approximates the contemporary field of economic sociology in its analysis of modes of production, crafts, and economic activities among nomadic and sedentary populations.
- Sciences and the modes of their acquisition, wherein Ibn Khaldun emphasizes that education and knowledge are natural phenomena within human social organization, anticipating themes central to the modern sociology of knowledge. (**Ibn Khaldun, 2009, pp. 38–69**)

3. Factors Contributing to the Emergence of the Science of Human Social Organization

A range of intellectual, scholarly, and practical factors paved the way for the emergence of the science of human social organization in the Khaldūnian framework. These factors may be summarized in several foundational pillars. The broad intellectual formation of Ibn Khaldun—which brought together the study of history, jurisprudence, and philosophy—played a decisive role in shaping a comprehensive critical vision. This enabled him to move beyond the descriptive approaches prevalent in his time toward constructing an analytical framework grounded in the explanation of social phenomena and the correlation of these phenomena with general laws.

Moreover, Ibn Khaldun's engagement in political life, his practical involvement in matters of governance, and his proximity to circles of sultans and rulers profoundly deepened his awareness of the mechanisms of power and their social foundations, as well as the nature of relations among groups and states and the transformations and conflicts that characterize them. This direct engagement with political and social realities enabled him to observe patterns of collective behavior and manifestations of social organization and civilizational decline, thereby reinforcing his inclination to search for general laws capable of explaining such phenomena.

In addition, Ibn Khaldun's critical reading of earlier historians' works led him to identify errors, exaggerations, inconsistencies, and occasional departures from the natural laws of social organization and the principles governing human association. This critical awareness prompted him to call for a rigorous methodological approach to the evaluation of historical reports, based on comparing narratives and assessing their plausibility in light of social regularities and the laws of social organization.

On the basis of this combined intellectual and experiential background, Ibn Khaldun concluded that it was necessary to establish an independent science devoted to uncovering the general principles governing human association, which he articulated as the science of human social organization. He precisely defined the subject matter of this science as the study of social phenomena, the analysis of their transformations, and the examination of the reciprocal relations among the components of society and the interconnected effects that arise from them at the political, economic, and cultural levels.

This science is distinguished by a methodological orientation grounded in rational inquiry into social facts, their critical scrutiny, and the rejection of the uncritical transmission or acceptance of reports. In this context, Ibn Khaldun conceives education and knowledge as acquired dispositions (*malakah*) and classifies teaching among the crafts, arguing that mastery of knowledge is not achieved merely through comprehension and awareness, but through the formation of a stable disposition produced by practice, training, and systematic internalization (Shams al-Dīn, 1991, pp. 31–32).

4. The Concept of ‘Asabiyyah :

4.1 Linguistic Meaning:

In *Lisān al-‘Arab* by Ibn Manzur, *‘aṣabah* refers to paternal kin, so called because they “encircle” and support a person; to “seek support through them” means to be strengthened by their protection. In the Prophetic tradition, it is stated: “He is not of us who calls to ‘asabiyyah or fights for ‘asabiyyah.” The terms *‘asabiyyah* and *ta‘aṣṣub* denote partisanship, defense, and advocacy; “we showed ‘aṣabiyyah for him” means “we supported him.” *Aṣabat al-rajul* refers to one’s group who rally to his cause; *‘aṣaba al-qawm* denotes the elite among a group who gather around someone. The semantic field of the term thus indicates intense attachment or strong inclination toward a person or cause (**Ibn Manthur, n.d., p. 2966**).

Another derivative from the same root is *ta‘aṣṣub* (fanatic attachment/partisanship). Linguistically, it may suggest gathering, yet it does not denote merely physical aggregation but rather symbolic or affective cohesion. It expresses an individual’s sense of being an inseparable part of the group to which they belong, as well as a persistent disposition that impels the individual to embody this belonging through complete self-effacement within the group. In this state, the individual’s distinct personality and individuality are diminished, as they come to assume the collective identity of the group (**Al-Jabiri, 1994, p. 168**).

4.2 Technical (Conceptual) Meaning:

Ibn Khaldun defines *‘asabiyyah* as a socio-psychological bond that links the members of a particular human group, grounded either in material kinship (ties of blood) or in symbolic/affective ties (alliances). This bond is continuous but becomes especially manifest and intense in times of danger that threaten individuals and the group. He regards *‘asabiyyah* as a natural phenomenon whose purpose is unity, cohesion, and mutual support in repelling aggression and preventing injustice, with its primary source being kinship and blood ties (**Ahsan Ismail, 2007, p. 272**).

Accordingly, *‘asabiyyah* may be understood as a bond linking members of a single group through ties of neighborhood and blood, uniting them within a shared milieu and rendering them cohesive and mutually supportive in times of hardship in order to preserve that bond. Ibn Khaldun further maintains that *‘asabiyyah* rests on two foundations. The first is material kinship, namely blood ties, which encompass members of the household and the clan who share consanguineal relations; cohesion is reinforced through endogamous marriage within the clan bearing the same lineage, a practice particularly evident among the families of tribal leaders in order to preserve blood ties across generations. This form is commonly referred to as tribal *‘asabiyyah*, denoting the blood-based bond among members of the tribe, which itself consists of multiple clans, each possessing its own internal *‘asabiyyah*.

The second foundation is symbolic or non-consanguineal kinship, namely alliance, which may arise from social interaction among individuals who are not related by blood but are bound by shared interests, such as engagement in a particular occupation or other forms of cooperative association.

5. Asabiyyah and Nomadic–Sedentary Social Organization

Ibn Khaldun begins by defining *‘umrān* (social organization) as deriving from habitation and settlement—that is, co-residence and dwelling in towns or encampments for the sake of social intimacy, and the satisfaction of needs that arise from the human disposition toward cooperation in securing livelihoods. Accordingly, the foundation of human association lies in cooperation and the fulfillment of livelihood-related necessities. Ibn Khaldun observes that nomadic populations are characterized by courage and roughness, whereas sedentary populations tend toward timidity and luxury as features of their respective modes of life. On this basis, *‘asabiyyah* reaches its greatest intensity and strength among nomads, owing to the harshness of nomadic life and the rigors imposed by subsistence conditions and life in tents. He argues that nomads rely on necessities in their conditions of life and are unable to attain what lies beyond them; necessities precede luxuries and are prior to them, for human beings first require the necessary and only attain refinement and luxury once necessities are secured. Thus, the roughness of nomadic life precedes the refinement of sedentary civilization, and nomadic habitation is characteristic of tribal groups endowed with strong *‘asabiyyah* (Ibn Khaldun, 2004, pp. 248–251).

Ibn Khaldun further maintains that nomads are closer to moral virtue than sedentary populations by virtue of their courage, cooperation, asceticism, and solidarity in times of joy and hardship—traits that reflect the manifestations of *‘asabiyyah*, including mutual defense and group loyalty (Ibn Khaldun, 2004, pp. 248–251). Consequently, *‘asabiyyah* is stronger among nomadic groups than among sedentary ones. This difference is attributable to the structure of social organization itself: nomadic groups are more closely bound by kinship and mutual familiarity, resembling a single household. Their cohesion rests upon unity of lineage and common origin, as well as shared modes and conditions of livelihood.

By contrast, sedentary populations are less mutually acquainted due to the diversity of lineages and the plurality of affiliations and backgrounds, as well as differences in crafts and modes of life within urban social organization. Their association is primarily grounded in the requirements of livelihood and urban life within the frameworks of everyday social interaction. Accordingly, *‘asabiyyah* varies in nature and degree between nomadic and sedentary populations along several indicative dimensions:

- Mutual acquaintance: Nomads are more mutually acquainted due to shared blood ties and lineage, whereas urban populations are socially heterogeneous, comprising diverse groups and individuals united primarily by co-residence rather than common ancestry.

- **Cooperation:** Stronger among nomads due to mutual familiarity and kinship; weaker among urban populations due to diversity and differentiation.
- **Endurance:** More pronounced among nomads because of the hardships of subsistence and harsh living conditions, reinforced by familial and social upbringing; weaker among urban populations due to relative ease of life and favorable living conditions.
- **Hardiness:** Stronger among nomads in view of their endurance and harsh living conditions; weaker among urban populations.
- **Needs orientation:** Nomads prioritize the satisfaction of basic necessities required for daily subsistence, whereas urban populations extend their pursuits to luxuries and refinements.
- **Cohesion:** Nomads exhibit strong internal cohesion due to collective mobility and sustained solidarity, making differentiation among members difficult; cohesion is comparatively weaker in urban settings owing to heterogeneity and differentiation.
- **Aggressiveness/defensiveness:** More pronounced among nomads as a result of hardship and roughness of disposition, linked to group loyalty and defense, particularly when collective existence and continuity are threatened; less pronounced among urban populations, where gentler dispositions and risk-avoidance prevail in times of hardship.
- **Moral dispositions:** Nomads display entrenched moral qualities such as mutual compassion, solidarity, modesty, altruism, and protective zeal; urban populations, by contrast, are more prone to fragmentation, diminished norms of modesty and restraint, and weaker altruistic commitments.
- **Luxury:** Predominant among urban populations due to access to refinements and ease of life; largely absent among nomads because of the difficulty of subsistence and the primacy of necessities.
- **Interests:** Among nomads, interests tend to be shared and collective due to cohesion and cooperation; among urban populations, interests are more likely to diverge and conflict because of social differentiation, the rise of individualism, and the prioritization of private over public interest (Ibn Khaldun, 2004, pp. 248–251).

6. Nomadic and Urban Modes of Life:

Ibn Khaldun distinguishes between two fundamental modes of social life: nomadic (*badawī*) and urban (*ḥaḍarī*). He argues that nomadic groups represent the earliest and most elementary form of human settlement, preceding urban civilization. The nomads differ from urban dwellers in the nature of their economic activities, which Ibn Khaldun describes as their “modes of livelihood.” He classifies nomadic subsistence into two main types: agriculture (including cultivation and planting) and pastoralism, based on the rearing of livestock such as sheep, cattle, and goats, along with the benefits derived from these activities.

The cooperation of nomadic groups in securing sustenance is generally limited to what

is necessary for survival and rarely exceeds the level of basic needs, due to their limited productive capacity and their frequent inability to generate surplus. Ibn Khaldun explains the transition from nomadic to urban life as a result of economic expansion that leads to prosperity and comfort. Once nomads acquire surplus resources beyond their immediate needs, they tend to seek stability and ease, cooperate in producing more than mere subsistence, diversify their food and clothing, refine their material culture, expand their dwellings, and eventually establish towns and cities, thereby adopting an urban way of life.

In contrast to nomads, urban populations enjoy greater material comfort and a higher standard of living, as they possess resources that exceed basic necessities. They select refined garments such as silk and brocade, construct houses and palaces, channel water into their dwellings, and improve architectural forms. Since urban life represents a more advanced and developed stage of social organization than nomadic life, urban livelihoods are primarily based on crafts and trade rather than on herding or agriculture, which contributes to increased wealth and sustained prosperity.

Urban civilization is characterized by relative stability and prosperity, whereas nomadic life is marked by economic limitation and restricted access to surplus. Instability is particularly evident among camel-herding nomads, especially during winter, when pastures in arid regions are insufficient to sustain camels, which require warmth and are difficult to manage during calving seasons. This ecological constraint compels them to migrate continuously in search of grazing lands.

Accordingly, Ibn Khaldun maintains that nomads historically precede urban populations and that the desert constitutes the original foundation of civilization, while cities represent a later and more developed extension of it. He analogizes this relationship to that between necessity and luxury: necessity is the origin, whereas luxury is a derivative outcome. Hence, the roughness and simplicity of nomadic life precede the refinement and sophistication of urban culture.

Ibn Khaldun further classifies nomadic groups into three ranks according to their livelihoods and patterns of mobility. The first rank consists of those who depend primarily on agriculture and farming and typically inhabit villages and mountainous regions. The second rank includes pastoralists who raise sheep and cattle; they are more mobile due to their need to seek wide pastures and water sources. The third rank comprises camel herders, who are the most mobile, roam the furthest into desert regions, and are the least stable in their settlements due to their distance from sources of warmth and grazing during winter. Consequently, they are the furthest removed from urban civilization and the most inclined toward harsh and rugged modes of life.

In comparing the moral dispositions and cultural traits of nomadic and urban societies, Ibn Khaldun contends that nomads are closer to virtuous qualities than urban dwellers, as their way of life is nearer to the original human disposition (*fiṭra*). The human soul, in its initial state, is more receptive to virtue and moral formation, and cooperation in

securing subsistence is deeply ingrained in nomadic communities. Urban populations, by contrast, tend to become immersed in luxury and worldly pleasures, which may lead to moral corruption and the erosion of virtuous character.

He also argues that nomads are generally more courageous than urban dwellers. Urban populations rely heavily on political authority and its agents for protection and defense, whereas nomads are compelled to defend themselves with their own means. As a result, strength and fortitude become ingrained traits in nomadic character. Moreover, close dependence on political authority and administrative structures in urban settings tends to weaken individual courage, as systems of coercion and discipline suppress personal assertiveness, in a manner analogous to educational practices grounded in authority and obedience.

In urban societies, the state assumes the function of social regulation and the prevention of injustice, and its agents protect cities from external aggression. In nomadic tribes, however, social order is maintained through the authority of elders and leaders, while defense is undertaken by young men distinguished by bravery and martial prowess.

Within this framework, the concept of '**aṣabiyyah (group solidarity)**' emerges as one of the most central notions in the science of civilization. It denotes the natural bond of kinship and the ties of lineage and affinity that generate mutual support and collective defense when members of the group face injustice or danger. Group solidarity is deeply rooted in human nature and constitutes the basis of cooperation, mutual assistance, and collective strength. Since nomadic societies represent the earliest stage of civilization, they tend to display stronger solidarity and greater courage due to the cohesion generated by blood ties and kinship relations. By contrast, the mixing of lineages—especially in urban environments—leads to the weakening, and potentially the dissolution, of group solidarity (**Ibn Khaldun, 2009, pp. 96–101**).

7. The Scientific Method and Its Principles of Application in Ibn Khaldun and Arab-Muslim Scholars:

7.1 Definition of the Scientific Method:

The scientific method, in its essence, is an effective and constructive mechanism through which humans engage with the realities of their world. It relies on the interplay and dialogue between the capacities of the mind and the data provided by the senses, a mechanism inherent in every human intellect. It represents the clear path that scholars follow to structure their research and constitutes the optimal basis for reaching results and conclusions upon which further knowledge can be built. Researchers emphasize that, regardless of the modesty of discoveries in uncovering the secrets of the universe, the greatest significance of the scientific method lies in embodying a rational and productive way of thinking that can be applied to any

context to achieve informed outcomes (**Salatniyah & Al-Jilali, 2009**).

Another scholar defines it as the systematic path of inquiry characterized by several essential features: phenomena and their components, as well as the relationships among them, exist independently of the individual, their opinions, orientations, or perceptions. These phenomena are governed by fixed laws that regulate and guide them in an orderly manner. Through the scientific method, it is possible to ascertain the properties of these rules and the procedures by which they operate. It serves as the means to reach truth, or a set of truths, in any given situation, test their validity in other contexts, and generalize them to formulate what is conventionally called a "theory," which represents the ultimate goal of every scientific investigation. (**Badawi, 1977, p. 26**).

Abdul Rahman Badawi further defines it as “the path leading to the discovery of truth in the sciences through a set of general principles that govern the course of reason and guide its operations until a conclusion or piece of knowledge is reached” (**Badawi, 1977, p. 5**).

The scientific method is also defined as “a set of rules established to achieve truth in science, or the procedure followed by a researcher in studying a problem to uncover truth” (**Shroukh, 2003, p. 5**).

It is a systematic framework based on cognitive operations and procedures aimed at investigating the research subject and discovering its facts.

7.2 The Scientific Method in Ibn Khaldun and Arab-Muslim Scholars:

Many prominent scholars contributed to historical studies before and after Ibn Khaldun, including Al-Tabari and Al-Masudi, who preceded him, and Al-Maqrizi, who followed and was influenced by his methodology.

Muhammad ibn Jarir al-Tabari, in his *History of the Prophets and Kings*, explains his methodological approach to historiography:

“Let the reader know that my reliance in this book, on everything I have recorded, is based on the reports I have received and the chains of transmission I have ascribed. I do not claim knowledge derived by reason or inferred by reflection except in very small measure; the accounts of the past and contemporary events are only accessible through the reports of informants and transmitters. If any reader finds a report in this book objectionable or astonishing because its veracity is unclear, let them understand that it was not presented by us personally but transmitted to us through intermediaries, and I have recorded it as it was transmitted to me” (**Al-Tabari, 1918, p. 5**).

Ali ibn al-Husayn al-Masudi, in *Muruj al-Dhahab wa Ma'adin al-Jawhar*, similarly notes that he recorded only what he could verify and what had been reliably transmitted by previous authors (**Ibn Khaldun, 1993, p. 108**).

Al-Maqrizi, a student influenced by Ibn Khaldun, explains his approach in *Al-Mawa'iz wa al-I'tibar*:

“In this book, I adopted three approaches: transmission from authored books of the narrative sciences as received from my teachers and eminent scholars, observation of what I personally witnessed, and reflection on what I saw” (Daoudi, 2011, p. 50).

This demonstrates that, despite Al-Maqrizi’s tutelage under Ibn Khaldun, he lacked full capacity for analysis, induction, and inference. More broadly, it highlights the difference between Ibn Khaldun’s methodological rigor and that of earlier Arab-Muslim scholars, whose approaches suffered from several deficiencies, including: failure to observe causes of events and conditions, uncritical acceptance of reports, insufficient verification and revision, errors and misconceptions, reliance on imitation and tradition, widespread ignorance, lack of discernment in transmission, and failure to exercise critical reasoning in evaluating reports (Daoudi, 2011, p. 51).

8. CONCLUSION:

The article concluded that the science of human civilization represents a foundational attempt to understand the laws governing human society from an interpretive perspective that goes beyond mere historical description to analyze the underlying causes and social structures influencing the emergence of states and transformations in civilization. It was shown that the concept of ‘asabiyyah’ (group solidarity) constitutes a central analytical tool for interpreting patterns of social cohesion, power relations, and structural differences between nomadic and urban civilizations, reflecting the impact of environment and modes of living on collective behavior and the structure of authority.

Moreover, linking the science of civilization to the concept of the scientific method highlights the importance of employing approaches based on induction and causal analysis in the study of social phenomena, thereby contributing to the development of a more coherent and objective social knowledge.

Accordingly, revisiting the concepts of the science of civilization in light of contemporary social methodologies offers significant interpretive possibilities for understanding current social transformations, provided these concepts are subjected to critical re-examination that accounts for changing historical contexts and the economic and political structures of modern societies, integrating classical theoretical heritage with the requirements of contemporary scientific research.

9. Bibliography List :

- Ibn Khaldun. (2004). *The Muqaddimah* (A. M. Al-Darwish, Ed.). Damascus, Syria: Dar Ya'rub.
- Ibn Khaldun. (2009). *The Muqaddimah* (2nd ed.). Beirut, Lebanon: Dar Sader.
- Daoudi, L. (2011). The scientific method in Ibn Khaldun's economic analysis. *Damascus University Journal of Economic and Legal Sciences*, 27(4).
- Shorroukh, S. D. (2003). *Scientific research methodology for university students*. Annaba, Algeria: Dar Al-Ulum for Publishing and Distribution.
- Shams al-Din, A. A. (1991). Educational thought in Ibn Khaldun and Ibn al-Azraq (Islamic Educational Thought Encyclopedia, Philosophers Section). Beirut, Lebanon: The International Company for Book Publishing.
- Badawi, A. R. (1977). *Methods of scientific research*. Kuwait: Al-Wakala for Publications.