

SULEYMAN THE MAGNIFICENT AS A MODERN LEADER AND DEVELOPMENTS IN OTTOMAN EMPIRE

Modern Bir Lider Olarak Muhteşem Süleyman ve Osmanlı Devletindeki

Gelişmeler

Mutlu KÖSELİ*

Murat Erkan EREN **

SUMMARY

This paper tells the Ottoman Sultan Suleyman the Magnificence from the perspective of modernism. His time and his contribution to the Ottoman Empire examined. Initially his establishment of Laws, and his liberality, munificence and tolerance is examined and the result of this his military contributions were mentioned. This paper concluded that Suleyman the Magnificence is the first Sultan establishing the bases of modern State, even before the Enlightenment period, which is assumed as starting point for modernism movements in the world. This article states that the management of Suleyman's time is not so different than any of twentieth-century state (Lyber, 1913), in some aspects because Suleyman's time has many similar points with the Western States' evolution to modern era when rationalization was dominating their system of public management. Paper also states that developments in Suleyman's time cannot be explained well just with rationalization in the state system, his understanding of liberality, munificence and tolerance are other aspects of his management and had great contribution to development in the state at the time.

Key words: Modernism, Post Modernism, Critical theory, Suleiman the Magnificent, Ottoman Empire.

ÖZET

Bu makale Osmanlı Sultanı Muhteşem Süleyman'ı modernizm penceresinden incelemektedir. Kanuni Sultan Süleyman'ın zamanı ve Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'na katkıları incelenmiştir. Öncelikli olarak kanun yapması, özgürlükçülüğü, cömertliği ve hoşgörüsü ve tüm bunların sonucu olarak askeri başarıları incelenmiştir. Bu makale Muhteşem Süleyman'ın modern devlet anlayışının dünyadaki ilk temsilcisi olduğunu hatta dünyada modernizm hareketinin başlangıcı olarak kabul edilen Reform periyodundan da önce olduğu sonucunu çıkartmaktadır. Bu makale Sultan Süleyman zamanının yönetim anlayışının şu anki pek çok batı devletinin yönetim anlayışından farklı olmadığını ifade etmekte, buna gerekçe olarak da Sultan Süleyman zamanı Batı Ülkelerinin modern çağdaki dönüşümlerinin benzerliklerini gösterdiğini ortaya koymaktadır. Makale aynı zamanda Sultan Süleyman zamanının sadece modernizm ve

* Dr., Bingöl Emniyet Müdürlüğü, mutlukoseli@yahoo.com.

** Dr., Bingöl Emniyet Müdürlüğü, muraterkaneren@gmail.com.

rasyonel yaklaşımların gelişmesiyle açıklanamayacağını, onun özgürlükçülüğü, cömertliği ve hoşgörüsünün yönetim anlayışındaki önemli hususlar olduğunu ve bunların da ülke yönetimine çok olumlu katkılar sunduğunu ifade etmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Modernizm, Post-modernizm, eleştirel teori, Kanuni Sultan Süleyman, Osmanlı İmparatorluğu.*

Introduction

Suleyman only son of Selim 1 (Yavuz Sultan Selim) was born in 1494 at Trabzon, a city at Black Sea coast of Turkey. In 1520 Suleyman succeeded his father as sultan, and ruled the state for 46 years until his death in 1566 as the 10th Sultan of Ottoman state. Besides being the most well known Ottoman Sultan in Turks history, he is also accepted as one of the biggest ruler in the world history.

In his time Süleyman's armies conquered many places from east to west and from north to south. In the west they conquered Hungary, and they advanced as far west as Vienna, and to the east, the Ottoman forces took control of Iraq from Iran. Suleyman's navy captured all the main North African ports, and Ottoman fleet completely controlled the sea. By Suleyman's time Ottoman hegemony was extended over a great portion of Europe, Asia, and Africa (Metropolitan Museum, 2004). Besides his military reputation he is known as the Magnificent to Europeans and to his subjects as the "Lawgiver", he was a brilliant military commander and a praised legislator. The laws made by him, form the basis for many western ones (Kavalcioglu,1997). Suleyman's time known as golden age not only in Ottoman history but also in the world history and it is ranked as one of the most important world powers. Suleyman's contribution to social and cultural fields is always remembered. Exploring his period helps us to determine the outlook of modern Turkey.

This paper points out the significant issues that make Suleyman different from his ancestors and his counterparts or successors. Besides, the paper focus on the reasons that make him well know as one of the biggest ruler in the world history. Focus of the paper will be on Suleyman's works, management and contribution to his empire and the rest of the world from modernism and rationalization viewpoint. While he is very well know with his tolerance and his appreciated attitudes towards minorities and other religious members in the state, the paper also focuses on these issues and examines the issue from Habermas's critical Theory approach.

At the end the paper concludes that although real modernism efforts is getting dense around 1800s, he is the first Sultan (king) establishing the bases of modern State, even before the enlightenment period which is assumed as starting point for modernism movements in the world.

This paper give general information about Suleyman the Magnificent and its contribution to state, also focuses on the reasons that make him so well

know around the world, and tells significant points about him under three subtitles which represent his three characteristics; his military conquests, his establishment of laws, and his understanding of liberality, munificence and tolerance. The paper also analyzes his contribution to state from modernist and critical point of view. Paper' start point is that Ottoman Community had being modernized with its own dynamic, before the modernization movement starts in Western Europe (Kafadar, 2004).

Theoretical Concept

Initially a brief definition of modernism and rationalization will ease understanding some similar characteristics of Suleyman's era and later modernist movements, so rationalization and its effects in Suleyman's management will be examined. Besides that the Habermas' Critical Theory can give a better understanding of Suleyman's liberality, munificence and tolerance so the paper will evaluate the Suleyman's era also from this perspective.

Modernism and Rationality

It is not certain that when period of modernism started, but it can be traced to 16 century and became popular with enlightenment period, which begins roughly in the middle of the eighteenth century. It is basically a process of cultural differentiation and social autonomization. The idea of Modernism is a rejection of traditional power, which is mostly God oriented. With the modernism old god and old religion was rejected because they are thought to be part of the traditional power (Patterson, 2003). According to modernist thought there is no supernatural, reality is what you see and science is believed to process happiness.

One of the important issues in modernism is *Rationalization*. It has a catalytic effect on society in modernity (Farmer, 1995). It basically means reason, in a broad sense it is reconstruction in systematic form (Eyerman, 1985). Rationalization as an ideal type and as an historical force appears in much of Weber's writings. He regards the development of rational forms to be one of the most important characteristics of the development of Western society and capitalism. Weber viewed traditional systems as irrational and rely on religion, magic, or the supernatural as a way of explaining the social world and authority. In this sense traditional management style may have no systematic form of development, but may rely on personal insight, revelation, emotions and feelings, features that are non-rational in form. There are some principles of rationality that can be deterministic about what is rational or what is not, some of these are calculability, efficiency, predictability, non-human technology and control over uncertainties (Harmon, 1986).

Rationalization develops out of a man's desire to find consistent means of meeting his needs. It is humanity's increasing desire for mastery over nature to meet human needs through the maximization of control, efficiency, and

predictability that drives the process of rationalization. In the administrative sphere, rationalization has led to the rise of the bureaucratic form of organization, guided by reason, objectivity, and efficiency (Eyerman, 1985). In administrative sphere this has led to dehumanized relationships among personnel bound by objective rules and codes of conduct that maximize efficiency, minimize subjectivity, and produce consistent, predictable results. Weber paints a bleak picture of dehumanized relationships, where love, empathy, and human connection are weeded out in rationalized relations that maximize consistency, objectivity, and efficiency. This idea created the term efficiency. Efficiency requires accountability. Like how much we spent and how much we will get as the profit (Berggren, 1980).

Theoretical Context of Transition from Traditional to Modern

In transition from traditional to modernism; god/religion oriented, mostly monarch and stable societies turns into positivist, determinist, skeptic, rational shape with the underlying lines of development such as; particularism, scientism, technologism, enterprise and those aims mostly; control of groups for effectiveness and efficiency.

According to Jung and Piccoli (2001) modernization has been a global process more or less affecting all existing societies, although uneven in degree time and space. In its macro sociological dimension, modernization leads to global structures of world society, represented by the world market, the international system of states and international law while its micro societal dimension is visible in the societal, cultural and economic change of everyday life. In turn modernization has to be seen as an unplanned long-term social process in which social structures are shaped and sustained by the unintended outcomes of the intended acts of social actors. Given the strong emphasis on development, the process of modernization tend to follow relatively similar patterns in the economic, social, and other institutional spheres and once the institutional basics of a modern system are established in any one of these areas they lead to similar structures, and organizational developments on all social spheres and to sustained growth in the common evolutionary direction (Landau, 1984). The more societies became modernized, developed and industrialized the more similar they become, leaving only the area of customs as sort of survival of tradition, varying greatly from one society to another (Landau, 1984).

Traditional societies were perspective as very restrictive and limited and adaptive whereas modern societies were seen as much more expansive and adaptable to a widening range of internal and external environments and problems (Landau, 1984). For Suleyman's state management the situation is different and it is very hard to fit his era into structure of complete transition from traditional to modern, because there are definite effects of traditional factors on management such as religion. Basically Suleyman's management was a traditional model of management, but we can see some kind of developments

in Suleyman's time that shows similarities of later transitions from traditional to modernism. Those are not rejecting the power of god and religion, but establishing bureaucracy, new laws and rules addition to traditional one, and changing traditional structure of some government institutions such as military.

Suleyman needed to go outside the traditional Ottoman management because dominating to a wide area, with a wide range of diversity of people was requiring more than what traditional management style of Ottoman offers. As we see in the examples of transition from traditional to modernizations in last centuries; it emerges as a means to be more productive, effective and efficient for the reason to have more powerful economy and military. In Suleyman's time considering his military campaigns; more effective means; conquering more land. This required a new army instead of traditional one. On the other hand with the new conquered lands the area of state is doubled in Suleyman's time, and ruling such kind of big area with diversity of people required putting additional rules and laws, besides traditional rules, and laws (Juhn, & Piccoli, 2001). This paper emphasis that, modernism is a historical process and represents continuous changes of societal structures from the traditional type to the modern type.

Juhn and Piccoli (2001) states that creation of modern state requires; Establishing a variety of subsystems such as law administration, education, production and services, establishment of global economy, creation of rational science and abstract bodies of law, formation of individualized social personality (Juhn, & Piccoli, 2001). From this perspective Suleyman's era is distinct in 3 areas that rationalization seems effective;

- 1- His establishment of Law,
- 2- His contribution to military system and his military success,
- 3- His natural exercise of justice and the concept of liberality and munificence, in the notion of the sultan as protector, refuge and benefactor of his people (Kunt, & Woodhead, 1995).

Up to here this paper explained some kind of rationalization to be able to explain systematic transformation in Suleyman's time, but explaining meaning of rationality is not enough to explain Suleyman's concept of liberality, munificence, tolerance and his attitude towards minorities and different religion members living in the same geographical area. To be able to give a better explanation to this point evaluating Habermas's perspective and his Critical Theory as well as Habermas' understanding of rationalization will be helpful.

Habermas & Critical Theory

Critical theory, originated from Frankfurt school of Germany, with its roots in the dialectical tradition, is a substantive critique of society and a critique of the theory of knowledge by which that society is known. From the outset, critical theory was rejecting simultaneously positivism and all forms of idealism and the search for another road (Wagner & Zipprian, 1989). It is

believed that better development can be achieved by obeying social norms but that large scale social changes beyond this are impossible (Agger, 1991). The Frankfurt school intellectuals argued that these values which are common in society enhance obedience and discipline but these contradict people's objective interest on liberation. These values function ideologically to abridge people's imagining of what is really possible in society (Dryzek, 1987). Habermas's ideas are very important in this sense. Habermas draw a heavy line between self reflection-communication and casualty-technical rationality. In self-reflection/communication, people rationally discuss alternative social policies and attempt to build consensus about them (Agger, 1991).

According to Habermas; Instrumental rationality, should not became the paradigm of rationality for society; happiness would not come about simply by improving our techniques of social administration, by threatening society and nature as subject to blind, immutable laws that could be manipulated by a group of dominant people (Agger, 1991). According to Agger (1991) Habermas's instrumental rationality is larger and more comprehensive theory of rationality. Instrumental rationality is presented as a specialized language abstracted out of ordinary communication, which in turn, presupposes certain basic norms against which we may locate distortion in any given communication (Eckersley, 1990). According to Habermas the logic of instrumental rationality governs interactions between human subjects. Habermas is particularly notable for his defense of a Kantian conception of rationality. According to his perception; the world of appearance is different from the things themselves so moral beliefs are not subject to the same kind of theoretical analysis as the world of nature (Agger, 1991).

Habermas analyzes the relation of language and reason in shaping the nature and meaning of social life. For him primary villain for critical organization is not bureaucracy as a discrete and objective entity, but the modes of speech, thought, and action that give rise to this mode of organizing social relationships and that permit it to dominate our existence. Critical social theory can be thought of broadly as covering the interactions between the explanatory, the normative and the ideological dimensions of social and political thought (Dryzek, 1987).

Habermas completes his argument for the universal principle. Whenever discussing a claim to validity, one must follow the rules of logical sense. Habermas can derive the principle of discourse ethics: a norm is valid only if it meets the free approval of every person that may be affected (Erckersley, 1990). Critical theory not only seeks to provide traditional theory for social and political change, but also to establish a special (ethical political) relation with the theory's addressees (M. Fleming, 1997).

An Examination of Suleyman's Era and His Contribution to Ottoman Empire from the Theoretical View Point

His establishment of Laws (Suleyman the Lawgiver)

Before mentioning his contribution to the state's law, talking about state system in earlier Ottoman would give us a better understanding.

The Character of Ottoman State System

In the Ottoman state management there were two powerful institutions described by Lyber (1913) as "Ottoman' ruling Institution" and "Moslem Institution of the Ottoman Empire."

The Ottoman ruling Institution included the Sultan and his family, the officers of his household, the executive officers of the government, the standing army composed of cavalry and infantry, and a large body of young men who were educated for service in the standing army, the court, and the government. These men wielded the sword, the pen, and the scepter. They conducted the whole of the government except the mere rendering of justice in matters that were controlled by the Sacred Law, and those limited functions that were left in the hands of subject and foreign groups of non Moslems. The most vital and characteristic features of these institution are, first, that its personnel consisted, with few exceptions, of men born of Christian parents or of the sons of such; and second, that almost every member of the institution came into it as the sultan's slave, and remained the sultan's slave throughout life no matter to what height of wealth, power, and greatness he might attain.

The Moslem institution of Ottoman Empire included the educators, priests, consultants, and judges of the empire, and all who were in the training for such duties, besides certain allied groups, such as dervishes, or monks, and emirs or descendants of the Prophet Mohammed. These men embodied and maintained the whole substance and structure of Mohammedan learning, religion, and law in the empire. They took part in the government by applying the sacred law as judges, and in these capacities they paralleled the entire structure of administration to every corner of the empire. In direct contrast to the Ruling Institution, the personnel of the Moslem Institution consisted, with hardly an exception, of men born of Moslem parents, and born and brought up free (Lybyer, 1913).

Early Ottoman State System and Law

Ideology and legitimacy of government of the Ottoman Empire was based on Islam (Inalcik, 1973). Although Ottoman Sultans are Turk, their empire was founded on Turkish soldiers, the state language was Turkish and the Sultans traced their lineage to Central Asia, they never claimed that they were ruling a Turkish Empire, instead they claimed that were ruling Muslim state and they took their duties as the leader of Islam very seriously. Their biggest duty was to protect Islam as well as advance the cause of Islam in the world. As a result of this understanding they respect the law and tradition of Islam also Christian and Jewish subjects of Islam were to be free to practice their religions

(McCarthy, 1997). As a result of this, Islam and its rules is dominant in the Ottoman state management from the establishment of Ottoman empire, the emperor of the Turks has no other ordinance and no other laws which regulate justice, the state and other aspects of life other than Koran (Lybyer, 1913).

Simply the function of the Ottoman state; The people paid the taxes, the Sultan collected them. In return he protected the state and Islam, defended its people and provided the other services that Sultan deemed desirable. This was actually the pattern in most monarchies before modern times. The Sultan also constrained by tradition and law. Islamic law has the absolute authority and even Sultan had to obey and he could not change the law (Lybyer, 1913). In Islamic tradition, laws originally derived from the Qur'an and called the Sharia, and universally applied across all Islamic states. Nobody has power overturn or replace these laws. For the law that is codified by Suleyman the word "*kamun*" is used. Kanun has a very specific reference which refers to situational decisions that are not covered by the Shari'ah. Even though the Shari'ah provides all necessary laws, it's recognized that some situations fall outside their parameters. In Islamic tradition, if a case fell outside the parameters of the Sharia, then a judgment or rule in the case could be arrived at through analogy with rules or cases that are covered by the Sharia (Inalcik, 1973).

Suleyman's Contribution to Law (Kamun)

Suleyman has all the characteristics of an Islamic ruler. The reign of Suleyman in Ottoman and Islamic history is generally regarded as the period of greatest justice and harmony in any Islamic state. The Europeans called him "The Magnificent," but the Ottomans called him Kanuni (The Lawgiver). The most important thing that made his place in Islamic history and worldview is his codification of laws (Inalcik, 1973).

Suleyman's time experienced an explosion of new laws, which is independent from the Sharia (Islamic Law). By his time, the kanun were a complete and independent set of laws that is large and more important than the Shari'ah. Kanun was consisting of regulations that dealt with organization of government and the military, and also dealt with the taxation and treatment of the peasantry (Hooker, 1996).

Suleyman's contribution to laws can be considered a step that took Ottoman from traditional and carry it to modernization. It is basically a rationalization in terms of reconstruction of state structure in systematic form (Eyerman, 1985). "*The distinction between traditional and modern appears in the types of legal / rational authority.*" (Juhn, & Piccoli, 2001 p.5). Suleyman's reorganization of government with kanun is a type of rationalization. In modernist systems legal forms of domination rely on impersonal purpose and obedience to abstract norms, on the other hand traditional forms of domination is rely on a strictly personal loyalty and norms that are sanctified by traditional. The legitimacy of traditional ruler is claimed for and believed in by virtue of the

sanctity of age, old rules and power, mostly rely on religion (Juhn, & Piccoli, 2001).

Islamic law originally not only to regulate the government of Ottoman State, but also conduct of its individual members. In Suleyman's time, the empire got bigger and reached its climax, it extended over three states and became an empire of a very diverse mixture of different culture and nations. At Suleyman's time Ottoman is the biggest power of the world and as a result of these developments state needed for arrangements of new law to regulate every aspect of life and regulate relation among societies. To be able to arrange new laws, fundamental principles of Islamic law must left intact, but in the matter of their application it would be possible to supplement them and give greater latitude. Indeed it was essential to do so, unless the modern Ottoman was to lose touch with the precepts of the Koran and be untrue to the faith that he professed. Suleyman saw the need and resolved to meet it and the jurists and theologians rendered him great service by giving him their expert opinion on just how far he could go without actually transgressing the law (Merriman, 1944).

Codification of laws is Suleyman's most lasting contribution to the Ottoman State system. Because of emerged needs, Suleyman's law experts recorded a great body of law that included managements system of the state and more. New designed laws (Kanun) do not based on religious principles but they were based on rational. The codes emphasis;

- The power of the Sultan and government over people and property,
- How officials named and their rights and obligations,
- How the bureaucracy function,
- The right of Sultan to confiscate property etc.

Like those Suleyman's law codes regulates many areas that traditionally were matters of the sultan and his deputy authority. Suleyman's laws covered obligation of both rulers and ruled (McCarthy, 1997).

According to Kunt, & Woodhead (1995) Suleyman's legislation and the areas that it covers seems far too insignificant to the western mind to justify his Turkish title of "Kanuni" but he at least did much more than any Sultan. Suleyman's association with law was particularly is a result of the emerged need to develop administrative bureaucratic structures to deal with the increasing size, diversity and complexity of the empire consequent upon territorial gains in Europe, North Africa and East of Anatolia.

Suleyman' Contribution To Military

His contributions also include military system, which can be described as transforming from traditional approach to modernist as we understand today's perception. The Ottoman Empire began as a military state; Sultans distinguished themselves as military leaders (McCarthy, 1997). Long before the reign of Suleyman, empire had chased to depend mainly on nomadic Turkish particular assignment, rather than for the mainstay of the army. In

traditional system was a complicated mixture of regulars, volunteers, raiding horseman, infantry, 'feudal' troops who lived on their own lands, vassals and others. A number of other military functions were performed by freeborn troops called azaps, as guards to save major roads, mountain passes, trade depots, and other strategic and commercial areas.

In Suleyman time Ottoman army was a composite force, which was formed of a salaried standing army and of units similar to the feudal levies of medieval Europe. In his time the Ottoman military had evolved into a regular army with cannon corps, quartermaster corp. etc. Besides, navy designed in the same way, not until the time of Suleyman the leader of the navy took place in the imperial council. As a result of this Ottoman military efficiency increased and Ottoman Empire doubled their land during Suleyman's time, by conquering many places in three different continentals (McCarthy, 1997).

He assured success by redesigning the army in a systematic form and can be described as rationalisation (Eyerman, 1985). Suleyman initiated ten campaigns against Europe and three others in Asia during his reign (Bridge, 1983). When he started his duty as Sultan the surface area of the empire was 6.5 million km² and when he died in 1566 it was 14.893.000 km² (the area of 1.998.000 km² in Europe, the area of 4.169.000 km² in Asia, and the area of 8.726.000 km² in Africa) (Kavalcioglu, 1997).

His Military Campaigns to Europe

His military success starts with his invasion to Hungary and capturing Belgrade in 1521 only one year after his becoming Sultan. In 1522 Ottoman captured Rhodes from the Knights of St John Adrian of Utrecht elected as Pope Adrian VI. In 1526 Turks annihilate the Hungarian forces at the battle of Mohacs and kill King Louis of Hungary. Suleyman organized his military expedition towards Germany in the year of 1529. He besieged Vienna for 19 days, but he could not take it. In the course of this military expedition, it was one of the greatest movements of raids in the history (Bridge, 1983). All of the Austria and the Southern Germany is affected badly by this attack; three years after this attack Suleyman's armies had another expedition towards Germany. In 1537 Suleyman invaded Austria and captured Graz, after that Germany signed 'Istanbul agreement and officially acknowledged the superiority of Ottoman Empire.

In 1537 Suleyman declared war on Venice, raids southern Italy and besiege Corfu, but couldn't take it. 1543 is the year that Turkish fleet in alliance with France attacked to the coastal towns of Italy; Nice is captured and sacked, and Toulon occupied by the Turks. Barboros (Admiral of Ottoman Navy) attacked to coastal towns of Italy truce was signed between Suleyman and Ferdinand. The eight military expedition (1538) was organized against Moldavian prince because of his rebellion. A state of peace was established with Venetia in 1540. In 1541 Hungary was captured and added to Ottoman

lands under the name of Budin Governorship. King Ferdinand tried to recapture Budin with a last effort; however, his army composed of 100.000 people was totally destroyed in front of Budin in 1542. Suleyman's tenth military expedition was aiming to recapture the castle of Estergon that was the strongest castle in Hungary that had been under the domination of Germany and he conquered the castle in 1542. A peace agreement is signed in 1547 between, the King Ferdinand and Ottoman state. According to this agreement, King Ferdinand was considered to be equal in rank to the grand vizier (prime minister) in protocol, and Ferdinand accepted to pay annual tax and some other heavy conditions (Ozturkler, 2004).

Military Campaigns to East

In the East the Safavids were a continual threat due to their appeal to the heterodox and semi-nomadic inhabitants of eastern Anatolia (McCarthy, 1997). Suleyman wanted to deal with this threats and left from Istanbul in June 1534 for Bagdat until April 1535 in this campaign he had achieved two results, one of the results is formation of new province in Erzurum (a city in east part of Anatolia) and he also conquered Iraq. There had been no serious conflict with Persia since 1536. Nonetheless, local hostilities flared out from time to time in the border regions; the Sultan and the Shah still vied with each other for the uncertain allegiance of the chieftains, Muslims as well as Christian, of Armenia and the Caucasus. In the summer of 1548 Suleyman marched to Tabriz but found that the Shah had chosen to abandon it, instead of fighting for it, on the way back to Istanbul he also captured Van, and it became an Eastern frontier city (Parry, 1976).

In April 1554 Suleyman himself commanded the armies and moved against Persia, after a series of fight a former peace, the first to be made between the Ottoman and the Safavids, was signed at Amasya in May 1555. Peace consisted for two decades and set what became the permanent border between Anatolia and Iran. (Parry, 1976, & McCarthy, 1997).

All these achievement in terms of military campaigns is a result of his transformation military from traditional style. Reconstruction of Ottoman army in systematic form helped Suleyman to have more powerful military force and get more effectiveness, which resulted getting more land. These development in military were necessary, because Suleyman was the most powerful ruler of the era and he needed more sophisticated and disciplined army to ensure consistency of power. Besides, he needed to control this much power in an appropriate way. This triggered him to make changes in the army and to the whole system. This shows similarities with the industrialization era of the Western States and the domination to workers with rationalism as in Fordist type which has been considered the embodiment of rationality and efficiency within mass production (Berggre, 1980).

His concept of liberality, munificence and tolerance

Besides its military achievements and codification of law, Süleyman's time is also well known for its tolerant and good attitude towards religious and ethnic communities. Because the Ottoman Empire extended on a very large area, it has subjects from many different religion and race and origin living in the same geographic area, and they lived in peace. Muslim, Christian and Jewish families lived together in the Ottoman Empire, and Christians and Jews freely practiced their religion, customs, and laws (McCarthy, 1997).

According to the Ottoman system, a non Muslim citizen or a shepherd boy can be grand vizier (prime-minister). Süleyman's eight grand viziers were all humble Christians brought to Ottoman Empire as slaves. Most top civil administrators and the Janissaries were the same. Süleyman's admiral also was a pirate who ruled the Mediterranean, known to Europeans as Barbarossa and he led the fleet of galleys on attacks against the coast of Italy, Spain and North Africa. (McCarthy, 1997).

Jews, Christians were allowed to practice their own religion, and their benefit is not only limited to that. A very large number of peasants in Anatolia and elsewhere were protected by the Sultan's government from any kind of exploitation. At that time countries conquered by the Turks in the Balkans were often so much better threaded by their new master than they had been threatened by their feudal overlords, who had been their fellow Christians, so they positively welcomed the change (Bridge, 1983).

In terms of legal regulation and laws, Christian and other religion world belong to the sphere of secular and not of religious affairs (Parry, 1976). Besides the Moslem Institution, there were Greek and Armenian and Jewish national institutions and to some circumstance there were organization of the foreign colonies. Each of these institutions rested on their own religion, and all were totally independent of the Moslem Institution since they were based on personality instead of territory (Lyber, 1913).

In the state system of Ottoman; rendering of justice belonged to the Moslem Institution, but many internal matters were left to be regulated by the subject nationalities, and those were organized by churches, and by the foreign colonies, under their own laws. It is seem that these were by no means so extensive as are the activities of a progressive twentieth-century state (Lyber, 1913).

If we could only see the examples of rationality without any ethical perception in Süleyman's time there would not be this much tolerance, munificence, and liberation to subject nations, or to other religion members. There would be only norms that should be obeyed by every people of the empire without considering whether it is appropriate or not appropriate to their religion, tradition, and other specific needs which differ from culture to culture, and this would threaten society and nature as subject to blind, immutable laws that could be manipulated by a group of dominant people, but Süleyman's ideas

in this perspective match with Habermas's ideas. Habermas states that the logic of instrumental rationality governs interactions between human subjects (Agger, 1991). Moral beliefs are not subject to the same kind of theoretical analysis as the world of nature. Habermas can derive the principle of discourse ethics: a norm is valid only if it meets the free approval of every person that may be affected (Erckersley, 1990). By giving liberation to subject nations Suleyman acquire every nations', minority and religious group members' support and approval.

Conclusion

Kanuni (the Lawgiver) Sultan Suleyman, is one of the biggest ruler not only in Turkish history but also in the World history. His period is considered as the most glorious and excellent era that the Turks had obtained in the history (Gokmen, 1987). His military empire expanded greatly both to the east and west, and he threatened to overrun the heart of Europe itself. To understand his time the paper gave a brief definition of his time and his contribution of the Ottoman Empire in three areas; firstly his Military conquests, secondly his establishment of Laws, and thirdly his liberality, munificence and tolerance.

The paper concludes that Suleyman is the first Sultan (king) establishing the bases of modern State, even before the enlightenment period which is assumed as starting point for modernism movements in the world and the management of Suleyman's time is not so different than any of twentieth-century state (Lyber, 1913), in some aspects because Suleyman's time has many similar points with the western states' evolution to modern era when rationalization was dominating their system of public management.

What Suleyman did in military and legal system is a rationalization movement which can be described as "*a systematic form of transition*" and this paper pointed some systematic forms of transitions in Suleyman's time. Developments in his time cannot be explained well just with rationalization in the state system, because his understanding of liberality, munificence and tolerance also should be evaluated. Habermas's perception of rationality can well identify Suleyman's behavior about liberality, munificence and tolerance.

Considering developments in Suleyman's era; rationalization movement were not different than the development in Europe in modernization period which occurred 100-200 years after Suleyman's time. From this point; if Suleyman's management understanding could be continued, it would be possible that Ottoman had transformed from traditional and completed all the phase of modernization before any Western civilizations did, even they could identify the problems of modernization and try to eliminate them by continuing through a post modern perception of management hundreds years before it started to be pronounced in world literature.

REFERENCES :

- Agger, B. (1991) Critical Theory Post Structuralism, Postmodernism: Their sociological relevance. Annual reveal of Sociology v.17-105-131, Retrieved on 21 March 2004 from Jstor database.
- Berggre, C. (1980) Changes in the Rationalization Pattern and Organization of work within Mass Production. Acta Sociologica, v.23. n. 4
- Bridge, A. (1983) Suleiman the Magnificent, Granada Publishing, NY
- Dryzek J. S. (August, 1987) Discursive Design; Critical Theory and Political Institution. *American Journal of Political Science*. V. 31. n. 3 656-679.
- Eckersley, R. (December, 1990) Habermas and Green Political Thought; Two Road Diverging. Theory and Society v. 19, n.6, 739-776.
- Eyerman, R. (1985), Rationalizing Intellectuals. Theory & Society, Nov 85, Vol. 14 Issue 6, p777, 31p. Retrieved on April, 1, 2004 from Ebscohost Database.
- Farmer, D. J. (1995) Language of Public Administrations, The University of Alabama Press, Alabama.
- Fleming, M. (1997) Critical Theory between modernity and postmodernity. *Philosophy Today*, Spring 1997, 41,1 p.31
- Hamon, M. (1986), Organization Theory for Public Administration, Chatelaine Pres, Burke, VA.
- Hooker, R. (1996) world Wide Web <http://www.wsu.edu:8080/~dee/ottoman/ottoman.htm>
- Juhn, D., & Piccoli W. (2001) Turkey at Crossroads. Zed Books, NY.
- Kafadar, C. (2004) Osmanlı, Modernleşme Serüvenini Kendi Dinamikleriyle 16. Yüzyılda Yaşadı, *Zaman Gazetesi*, 04.11.2004.
- Kavalcioglu, T. (1997), Süleyman the Magnificent. Newspot, 1997,2.
- Landau, J. M. (1984) Atatürk and the Modernization of Turkey, Westview Press, Inc. Colorado.
- Lybyer, A. H., (1913). The Government of Ottoman Empire in the Time of Suleiman the Magnificent, Harvard University Press.
- Merriman, R. B. (1944), Suleiman The Magnificent, Harvard University Press, MA.
- Inacik, H. (1973) The Ottoman Empire-The Classic Age 1300-1600. Praeger Publishers, NY.
- Oguz Gokmen (February, 1987) Antika, *The Turkish Journal Of Collectable Art* , I:23.
- Planetexplorer, (2004), Available online at <http://planetexplorer.online.discovery.com/ref/history/histsuley.html>
- Parry, V.J. (1976) A History of The Ottoman Empire to 1970. Cambridge University Press, NY
- Patterson, D., (2003) Harvard Journal of Law and Public Policy, (Vol.26)
- The Metropolitan Museum of Art, (2004) Available on [http:// www. Metmuseum. org/toah/hd/suly/hd_suly.htm](http://www.Metmuseum.org/toah/hd/suly/hd_suly.htm)
- Wagner, G., Ziprian, H. (1989) Habermas on Power and Rationality. *Sociological Theory Vol. 7*, No. 1 (Spring , 1989), 102-109.