

Okan, O. (2014). Economics, national economics and Ziya Gökalp. *Turkish Journal of Sociology*, 2014/1, 3/28, s.123-137

## Economics, National Economics and Ziya Gökalp\*

Oya Okan\*\*

**Abstract:** The purpose of this article is to reveal the parallels between the economic proposals aimed at protecting their nations of Gökalp and List. As known, List is accepted as the inspiration for Gökalp's views, and the founder of the German school of "National Economics". Within the scope of this subject, a brief background of the establishment of economics as a science, and then, the emergence of the concept of "national economics" is provided. The presentation of List's views is followed by Gökalp's views on economic matters in a comparative perspective. Under World War I conditions, which was the beginning of a new history for *national economics* in Turkey, Gökalp, like List, believed that it would not be just to implement the British economic policy in an economically underdeveloped country ravaged by wars. Both had nationalist, protectionist and statist views, and sought to elevate their countries to a status that would allow them to compete with other countries in the new world order.

**Keywords:** Turkey, Economics, National Economics, Ziya Gökalp, Friedrich List

## İktisat, Milli İktisat ve Ziya Gökalp

**Özet:** Bu yazının amacı, Ziya Gökalp ile Friedrich List'in uluslarını korumaya yönelik iktisadi önerilerinin özdeşleşen yönlerini belirlemektir. Bilindiği gibi List, Gökalp'in "milli iktisat" konusundaki görüşlerine kaynaklık eden Alman "milli iktisat" okulunun fikir babası olarak kabul edilmektedir. Bu amaca yönelik olarak öncelikle iktisadın bilim niteliğini kazanması, ardından da "milli iktisat" kavramının oluşmasının arka planına kısaca değinilmektedir. Konuyla bağlantılı olarak List'in görüşleri tanıtıldıktan sonra Gökalp'in iktisadi konulardaki düşünceleri ele alınmaktadır. Türkiye'de *milli iktisat* açısından bir tarih başlangıcı niteliğindeki Birinci Dünya Savaşı koşulları altında, List gibi Gökalp de İngiliz iktisat politikasının, savaşlarla yıpranmış, iktisadi anlamda geri kalmış bir ülkede uygulanmasının adil olmadığını düşünür. İkisi de milli, himayeci ve devletçi görüşlere sahiptir ve ülkelerini yeni dünya düzeninde, diğer ülkelerle rekabete girebilir konuma yükseltmeyi amaçlamıştır.

**Anahtar Sözcükler:** Türkiye, İktisat, Milli İktisat, Ziya Gökalp, Friedrich List

\* The Turkish version of this article has been published before (see Okan, 2012).

\*\* Assoc. Prof. Dr., Istanbul University Faculty of Letters Department of Sociology, oyaokan@yahoo.com.

On the contrary, I am amongst those who find it particularly necessary for the government to have a program of *national economics*. The officials of all states today are men of politics, always appointed by political powers. Yet not all men of politics are experts in economics. (...) Thus, if the administration of a state could be carried out by economist officials, then that state would achieve absolute success in economic matters.  
(Gökalp, 1980, p. 143)

The subject of this article will be to reveal the parallels between the economic proposals aimed at protecting their nations of Ziya Gökalp, and Friedrich List (1789-1846). As known, List is accepted as the inspiration for Gökalp's views, and the founder of the German school of "National Economics". Within the scope of this subject, a brief background of the establishment of economics as a science, and then, the emergence of the concept of "national economics" will be provided. The presentation of List's views will be followed by Gökalp's views on economic matters.

We learn about Gökalp's views on *national economics* from the chapter entitled "Economic Turkism" in his major work entitled *The Principles of Turkism* where he lays out the principles of a new model for society; and also from articles published in the journals *Türk Yurdu* [The Turkish Homeland], *Yeni Mecmua* [The New Journal] and the newspaper *Cumhuriyet* [The Republic] (Gökalp, 1980, 1981, 1982a, 1982b...). These publications feature articles that can be brought together under the general heading of "Economics" and in which the main concepts of classical economics and proposals for economic approaches in the development of the Turkish nation are discussed. The views expressed in the abovementioned works will be treated here insofar as they support, or are related to Gökalp's view of *national economics*. Contemporary debates on *national economics*<sup>1</sup> will not be included, and Gökalp and List's economic theories will form the main axis of this article.

Ziya Gökalp is first and foremost a sociologist. He is the founder of sociology in Turkey, and of the first department of sociology. He is an educationalist, and he gave the first lessons of sociology. He was a member of the Committee of Union and Progress, a journalist, he was one of the Malta exiles<sup>2</sup>, and a political dissident. He was also a member of parliament in the first parliament of the Republic of Turkey, and a politician. The principles of the new Republic were shaped around his writings.<sup>3</sup> Gökalp managed to fit a

<sup>1</sup> For a comprehensive research on the views of Tekin Alp, an important figure in debates of national economics, and his ideological proximity to Gökalp, see (Landau, 1984) and (Landau, 1996).

<sup>2</sup> A group of politicians, high ranking military officers, administrators and intellectuals of the Ottoman Empire, who were sent into exile on Malta after the armistice of Mudros.

<sup>3</sup> For Gökalp's biography, see (Kaya and Turhan, 2006, p. 1-6).

series of interconnected activities within a life span of less than half a century, and thus became the subject matter of a considerable number of studies on his life and work. However, an overview of works on Gökalp reveals that there are a very limited number of comprehensive critical studies on his economic views (Tolga, 1949; Tütengil, 1964a; Önsoy, 1976; Toprak, 1982; Parla, 1989; Toprak, 1995).

Gökalp is not an economist. His interest in economic matters and problems was shaped within the framework of shaping one of the most significant institutions of a new nation, and a new model for society. He believed that a society that had lost its past economic strength could recover by means of the theory of *national economics*, implemented within the framework of the ideology of Pan-Turkism that he systematized.

Gökalp chose to follow the sociology of Durkheim among sociological systems of the day, and “both by applying his sociology to Turkish history, and also by using Turkish and Turkified words in conceptualization he rendered sociology a national science” (Tuna, 1986, p. 52). In line with his understanding of a national sociology, “he sought to explain the identity and fundamental aspects of a society on the one hand, while he assumed duties in the establishment of the new identity, that was either acquired, or was being designed for imposition” (Tuna, 1986, p. 65). Gökalp the sociologist, set forth the path that had to be taken in explaining the change and transformation Turkish society was experiencing, and in determining the direction of civilization.

Within his understanding of sociology, Gökalp states that the development of a nation will take place via sociologists who know and apply the laws of social reality (Gökalp, 1981, p. 136). Gökalp’s interest in economics thus stems from him regarding it within the field of sociology. “As a sociologist, Ziya Gökalp includes economic issues within his system. His interest in economics is clear from his early writings on. From his early writings on he discussed the theoretical issues of the science of economics” (Tütengil, 1964b, p. 48).

Yusuf Akçura states that Gökalp did not accept the economic system of Adam Smith and his followers that was founded on the concept of demand, and that he was also against Marx’s system. According to Akçura, for Gökalp, who adopted the views of neither classical economists nor socialists, the template of the science of economics did not involve material factors such as supply and demand, but the concept of “sociological value” (Akçoraoglu, 1982, p. 36).

In numerous articles where he discusses the theoretical topics of the science of economics, Ziya Gökalp defends the idea that “every nation should have a national economic system.” Its realization requires the examination and as-

assessment of economic facts and the subsequent constitution of a fundamental program of national economics (Tütengil, 1964b, pp. 47-48).

“*National economics* emerged as a topic on the general agenda along with World War I. Wartime conditions necessitated an autarchic solution and prepared the environment for *national economics*” (Toprak, 1995, p. 13). The interventionist and statist German model was discussed in articles by Parvus Efendi, Tekin Alp and Ziya Gökalp published in journals such as *İktisadiyat Mecmuası* [The Journal of Economics], *Türk Yurdu* [The Turkish Homeland] and *Yeni Mecmua* [The New Journal]. World War conditions and the political ebb and flow of the Ottoman Empire led to the liberal economic view falling into disfavor and economic protectionism and the patronage system emerged on the agenda of debate.

The difficulties of restricting the subject might be understood if the intense ideological debates and political environment of the period in which Ziya Gökalp lived (1876-1924) are considered. The environment in which Gökalp received his education, his thoughts took shape and matured was a period during which an empire declined, fell and a new state –a nation-state– was formed. “The most distinctive aspect of the period (...) is Ottoman intellectuals acting with the fundamental concern and thought of finding a solution to the crisis of the state, summarized in the question, *What needs to be done to save the state?*” (Bulut, 2005, p. 93). In this context, Gökalp went a step further than debates around how to save the state, and indicated on which foundations the new state was to be established. The policy of *national economics* would allow the new state to become a member of Western civilization.

### **Economics and National Economics**

Gide and Rist state that the history of economic thought goes back as far as Antiquity and the Middle Ages, but that economics earned the attributes that qualified it as a science only in the first quarter of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, with the emergence of the school known as the Classical Economics (1964). The process that began with the publication of Adam Smith’s *The Wealth of Nations* (1776) was completed with Ricardo and Malthus and economics took its place in history as a new science. The school of Classical Economics systematized, affirmed and universalized contemporary British politics within the framework of production and via concepts such as wealth, labor, value, exchange, market and division of labor. By the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century, the whole of Europe was besieged by Smith’s theory. According to Smith, the invisible hand that provided harmony and balance in society would do the same on an international scale. To this end, all international borders and restrictions had to be removed, and the whole world had to produce for the same common

market. This 'cosmopolitan' view of economics, unfettered by state intervention and with the interests of the individual favored could only be realistic and valid under conditions where Britain's political and economic supremacy was not challenged.

Germany, on the other hand, by the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, was a country where more than half of the population worked in agriculture: the traces of the feudal period were still visible, and the custom tariffs that existed between its various regions meant economic unity had not yet been achieved. Subject to the industrial challenge of Britain and France, Germany displayed neither industrial development nor political unity. Friedrich List proposed the establishment of a national German market and the increase of customs duties for foreign countries and argued for a protectionist economic policy. Smith's theory that proposed free trade and an international division of labor would cause further regression in Germany and prevent it from becoming a world leader.

Another country that faced political, economic and social problems during the same period was Turkey. Beginning in the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the main question of all initiatives forged to find solutions for the country from the *Tanzimat* [Reorganization] period on was "how to save the state." Ottoman statesmen and intellectuals sought the answer in the Western model, the rising power of the period. The industrial revolution and the French Revolution, the harbinger of a new social structure led by new social classes, were in the background of the new model they wished to emulate. Transformation in Britain took place in a relatively smooth manner with the collaboration between the aristocracy and the bourgeoisie; however clashes between social classes and the chaos and problems this led to in France necessitated the intervention of a new science for solutions. Sociology, the science of society, proposed universal solutions, claiming to understand and explain the new social order, or the lack of it. Ottoman intellectuals were training themselves with the works of the British liberal school and French sociologists, and the direction determined by political relations led to them developing and discussing a variety of proposals on different fronts.

In the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the landmass of the Ottoman Empire was under the political and commercial hegemony of Western countries. The British Free Trade Agreement of 1838 "lifted commercial restrictions and trade barriers with Great Britain, and the Ottoman Empire, a huge market, was exposed to British products" (Parla, 1989, p. 14-15). In 1890, it was Germany's turn with the signing of the Turkish-German trade agreement. "(...) both states shall regard each other as the state favored most in trade permissions" (Kocabaş, 1988, p. 77).

Theoretical approaches to economy seemed to follow the same sequence as trade agreements, and by the final decades of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the works of the British School of Classical Economics were being taught in Ottoman schools. In the years that followed the declaration of the II. Constitutional Monarchy (1908), the liberal approach advocated by the Community of Private Initiative and Decentralization and the writers of the journal *Ulum-i İktisadiye ve İctimaiye Dergisi* [Journal of Economic and Sociological Sciences] became prominent. The liberal views and proposals of Mehmet Cavid Bey, the Minister of Finance of the Committee of Union and Progress government, lost favor when war conditions took their toll, and once the search for an ally during the war resulted in the Empire aligning itself with Germany, the German state model and economic approach became the fulcrum of debate.

There was no unified, powerful German state until the final quarter of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. It is possible to speak of small, state-like formations within Germany in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century. Following Napoleon's invasion, the 39 duchies reached an agreement on national unity (Coşkun, 1997). Political unification was finally achieved by Bismarck in 1871, but the economic foundation of the union had begun to form earlier. Work on a customs union had begun in 1815, and were completed in 1834. In 1819, Friedrich List, consultant to the German Trade and Industry Union, argued for the lifting of customs duties, the establishment of a national market and the introduction of a protectionist economic policy that raised customs duties for foreign countries. "His defense of liberal trade policies between German states at such an early date, enabled the establishment of a free trade zone across the whole of Germany, and ultimately, the *Zollverein*" (Galbraith, 2004, p. 92). List's ideas laid the economic foundations of German nationalism, and led to the birth of the doctrine of *national economics*.

#### **Friedrich List and National Economics<sup>4</sup>**

Friedrich List, the architect of the statist and protectionist German economic model, rejected liberal universalism and proposed a policy of protection that suited the needs of the newly developing German industry. List argued

<sup>4</sup> Friedrich List (1789-1846) became a professor of economics at the University of Tübingen, and in 1819 was appointed consultant to the German Trade and Industry Association. In 1820 he became involved in politics, and was imprisoned due to his liberal views, escaping to the United States of America. In 1827 he published "Outlines of American Political Economy", followed by the "National System of Political Economy" in 1841, committing suicide in 1846. Friedrich List's theory was included in a very limited manner in works on history of economics and introduction to economics, and he virtually does not feature in many translated or original works. In writing this section of the article, my main source was Gide and Rist's work titled *A History of Economic Doctrines*. In addition to the quotes from Galbraith's work, I also made use of a limited number of other works (Ulutun, 1978, p. 397-400; Özgüven, n.d. p. 101-107; Koloğlu, 1960, p. 109-111; Kazgan, 1980, p. 200-202).

for the lifting of customs duties within the borders of the country to resist external competition, for free trade between German states and for protection against foreign countries. According to List, harmony between the interests of all countries was inconceivable, this was a relationship based on a conflict of interests.

List's protectionism protected German industry from British industry, and became a significant factor in Germany's industrialization. List's views were criticized in his own country for being liberal because of his defense of a customs union, however, the same views were adopted in economically underdeveloped countries of the period, and the theory of *national economics* retained its importance in the history of economic thought.

According to List, the classical school's claims to universality, which overlooked the social structures of different countries, were invalid. He draws attention to the diversity of the historical and geographical conditions of countries and argues for *economic nationalism*. Against the classical school's concept of "exchange value" List developed the "theory of productive power". In his theory of productive power, List also displayed the importance of industrialization. Against the classical school's view that prioritized the preferences of the individual, he advocated the orientation of demand towards national goods and the development of national industry as a priority. List argued that an ideal balance needed to be established between forms of production, and explained that the balance between agriculture and industry was the main principle of the division of labor. As an economic individual, every human being represented the power of the nation he or she belonged to. In this context, the productive sources of a country had to be treated and taken into consideration as a whole.

In terms of national forces of production, the capital of a country included not only material capital, but also factors such as culture, innovation and organization in production, laws, governments, social security, public order, ethical and religious belief systems and the level of education. Industrialization has both economic and social value. The development and protection of industry was also important in terms of Germany's agricultural policies. Therefore, agriculture had to be kept outside the scope of protectionism. Germany needed cheap food and raw materials for industry to develop, and only if agricultural products were imported from foreign countries could its industrial products reach competitive levels in foreign markets.

*The national system of political economy*, his work published in 1841, sets forth the historical stages of the economic development of nations. His theory of stages of development defines "economic life (...) as an ongoing process that continues through consecutive stages of development; in other words, the

combination of primitive or savage, pastoral, agricultural and the familial and mature agriculture, industrial and commercial activities” (Galbraith, 2004, p. 93). It was clear that not every society would achieve the balance between agriculture-industry-trade. However, countries that possessed the necessary raw material and human resources, like Germany, could achieve perfection by striving for a balance between agriculture and industry. And in order to find balance between agriculture and industry the state had to establish a manufacturing industry.

According to List, what made a country great was not the reserve of values it possessed in store at any given time, but its ability to produce value. The power to produce wealth is far more important than wealth itself. Hence, it was only nations that had reached the final stage in the *stages of development*, that had completed its industrialization and formed collaboration between agriculture and industry and as a result, had established its national unity in line with the necessary material and spiritual conditions that could attain the *power to produce wealth*.

And in order to achieve industrialization, state intervention is a must. List states that state intervention is imperative in order to assemble the necessary conditions for the emergence and development of industry and opposes the classical school in almost all his works. He criticizes the economists of the classical school who emphasize the individual with cosmopolitanism. List, the defender of a national system of economics against international economics, argued that the classical school “did not allow any nation to reach a higher level, or to display its true value” and accused them of “trying to pass on these laws that were the product of their own selfishness as scientific work”. He described the British economists’ defense of free trade as hypocrisy.

### **Ziya Gökalp and National Economics**

*The principles of Turkism*, Ziya Gökalp’s “founding manifesto of the New Republic” (Kaya and Turhan, 2006, p. 5) that revealed the *cultural* qualities of Turkish society and its *civilizational* aspect, was published in 1923. Gökalp was now a member of parliament that shaped the ideological charter of the founding cadre of the new state. Gökalp considered the replacement of Eastern civilization by Western civilization almost as a natural law, and regarded the realization of such a change in Turkey as a necessity. Ottoman civilization, along with the religion of Islam, had to be replaced by Turkish culture, and Western civilization. The task of Turkism was to search and find Turkish culture, and also to carry out a full indoctrination of national culture with Western civilization (Gökalp, 1976, p. 40).

In his division of culture and civilization, Gökalp regarded economics in the field of civilization. The civilizational orientation of the new period and the new state was clear. Therefore,

There is no handicap in transferring in their entirety the tried and tested methods and techniques of the West in our economic causes, we do not need to seek an original path. Besides, any personal view that takes the conditions of the country into consideration may find room for application in our economic life. (Tolga, 1949, p. 9)

A model intellectual of his age, Gökalp wrote on almost every subject, and penned many an article on economics. Tütengil summarizes the development of Ziya Gökalp's economic views as follows:

1- In the early period of his writings, the interest he showed in the economic life of Diyarbakır and its environment developed along the lines of *national economics*. Folk ideas, which he traced in proverbs, and religious provisions, which he used as the basis of his thought, led to him ascribing more responsibility to the state in economic life. The views he put forth in his articles for the *Diyarbakir* and *Peyman* newspapers and those he expressed in 1923 as he examined the program of the People's Party are fundamentally the same views.

2- Large-scale industry, a subject he persistently emphasized, was imagined alongside state protectionism. He was against liberal economics, and did not support socialism either. Somewhere between the two systems, he supported solidarism, a system that favored the interest of society over individual interests.

3- Economic progress largely depends on division of labor, professional organization is important; the state must become an economic state in order to successfully intervene in economic life. Foreign capital is not hazardous within the framework of mutual cooperation, and for a limited period. Economic patriotism means the State observing a policy of 'national economics'.

4- A national industry can only be founded by the State, and by way of a national initiative. Banks and companies must be nationalized (Tütengil, 1974, p. 120-121).

Gökalp was neither a liberal nor a socialist, he was in favor of property belonging to the state, but he did not reject private property outright. He sought a balance between professional organizations in the formation of a division of labor and between social and individual interests, which makes him a solidarist. In brief, he was a nationalist and a statist.

The essence of Ziya Gökalp's views on economic matters can be followed in the "Economic Turkism" section of his work *Türkçülüğün esasları* (*The principles of Turkism*). Gökalp begins his assessments with examples from the

economic life and the industrial and commercial activities of the Turks both during their nomadic and sedentary periods. From their nomadic period on, Turks carried out industrial and commercial activities in line with the conditions of the period, and established political and economic unions within their zone of sovereignty. As retold in the stories of Dede Korkut, Turks should achieve the economic prosperity of their past in the future too. However, wealth and welfare must belong to society. The path of action here is not to abolish private property like the communists and the socialists, but to preserve the existence of both types of property. According to Gökalp, solidarism is the system most suitable to Turkish culture. The wealth amassed via the use of surplus value in favor of society must then again be used for the good of society. The social ideal of Turks should be to retain private property, prevent individuals from seizing social wealth, and preserve the accumulation of wealth (Gökalp, 1976, p. 170-175).

According to Gökalp, public property and private property must exist together. Gökalp opposed the liberal viewpoint, which did not include social benefit and solidarity, and what he meant with the term public property was not social or collective property but state property.

The economic ideal of the Turks, on the other hand, should be to establish large-scale industry in the country. An economic revolution could only be achieved with national economics and large-scale industry. And this could only be achieved with protectionism. On this matter, Gökalp opted for the “tried and tested method of the West” and chose the theory of *national economics* as his guide.

“In Germany, Friedrich List, exposed that the science of economics developed in Britain was not a general and international science, but merely a system (of national economics) unique to Britain” (Gökalp, 1976, p. 176). British economics did and could not adjust to the conditions in Turkey. Britain was an industrial country; it had displayed significant development thanks to its mining industry and sea trade. The support of the state was not required in economic life. But the conditions here were entirely different. In Turkey, where there were quite a small number of private entrepreneurs and virtually no large-scale industry and techniques, economic life could not be improved without the guidance of the state. “Praise be to God that today we know that Manchester economics suits only the life in Britain, and that every nation generates a national system of economics that suits itself” (Gökalp, 1982a, p. 164).

Gökalp states that Germany managed to develop enough to compete with Britain by implementing a policy of national economics, and adds that we, too, could set aside protectionist policies and implement liberal policies once

we have reached such a level. Gökalp called our economists to fulfill their duty in line with this aim.

The task of Turkish economists is first and foremost to study and examine the economic reality of Turkey, and then to use this objective examination to draw up a scientific and thorough program for our national economics. Once this program has been shaped, every single individual should work towards building large-scale industry in our country and the Ministry of Economics should act as a general organizer in charge of these individual activities. (Gökalp, 1976, p. 176)

According to Gökalp, “a contemporary state is a state that possesses large-scale industry” (Gökalp, 1982b, p. 170). And for a contemporary state to possess and realize large-scale industry it needs a nation formed of individuals who work on the basis of a division of labor and within the framework of a program of *national economics*. “A nation that displayed a military miracle at war can also display an economic miracle at the time of peace” (Gökalp, 1982b, p. 163).

Foreign capital may be used until the Turkish State, formed of individuals in solidarity who share a common conscience, generates the necessary capital for industrial investment. Gökalp likens a country without capital to a body without blood, and does not object to foreign capital entering the country into national capital forms. However, all the incorporated companies to be established should be Turkish companies (Gökalp, 1980, p. 164-165).

Gökalp indicates that the British economic policies implemented since the *Tanzimat* [Reorganization] period played a significant role in the underdevelopment of the country, and states his belief that Turks will no longer remain as soldiers and officials as they did in the past, and that with an entrepreneurial spirit, they will start to act as industrialists and tradesmen in economic activities to reach the aim of the program of *national economics*.

### **Conclusion**

Ziya Gökalp lived at a time of transition from the multinational Ottoman Empire to the nation-based Republic of Turkey, during a time of change and transformation inundated with political, economic and social problems. During his relatively short life span (1876-1924) he did not remain insensitive to the problems of the society he lived in, he made proposals for the solution of these problems, and assumed significant duties in the reinstatement of Turkish society as a thinker. He also made proposals for the development of state policies suitable to the conditions of the period during the changes that took place in the world in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century and the first quarter of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Gökalp's interest in economics is neither exclusive nor unique. As a

sociologist who wanted to establish a new social order, he showed interest in economics as one path among many for society to become part of a new field of civilization. He believed that the industrial leap he regarded as necessary for the Turkish nation to reach the level of Western civilization could be achieved with policies of *national economics*.

“National Economics” is the economic policy advocated by Friedrich List in the specific political and economic conditions of Germany in the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Germany’s contemporary position was the inspiration of List’s views. German industry, still in its infancy, could not compete with the advanced techniques and intense productive activities of Britain. List proposed protectionist policies in the field of economics in order to deal with the economic and political hegemony of Britain. Protection was the central thesis of List’s theory. List defined Britain’s economic policies as “cosmopolitan” and regarded the proposal of the classical school and Smith for an international division of labor and free trade as unscientific.

War conditions led to liberal views falling out of favor, and when the Ottoman Empire allied itself with Germany in World War I, the policy of *national economics* gained prominence in Turkey, and “the year of 1915 was considered the beginning of a new history for *national economics*” (Toprak, 1982, p. 28). Like List, Gökalp too, believed that it would not be just to implement the British economic policy in an economically underdeveloped country ravaged by wars. Turkey had to, like Germany, first establish its industrial facilities with the support of the state, and without overlooking agriculture, attain a level in both fields to compete with developed nations. Turks could find out what kind of a policy of *national economics* they should follow by carrying out research into their own historical realities and their cultural qualities.

The similarities between List and Gökalp do not end here. Both List and Gökalp did not remain indifferent to the problems of their country. They sought to relieve their countries from the throes of the process of nation building, and to elevate their countries to a status that would allow them to compete with other countries in the new world order. Their views are nationalist, protectionist and statist. They were also educationalists and intellectuals of the period they lived in. They published in newspapers and journals in addition to their main works in order to create a national union and conscience. They presented their intellectual identity to the service of the state, Gökalp also served as a member of parliament. Gökalp was exiled and imprisoned for their views. They both attempted suicide. List was successful, whereas Gökalp carried the wound of his failed attempt in his brain throughout his life, and died at a relatively young age because of an illness in his brain.

The following question is important in linking with the present day the policy of *national economics* advocated by List and Gökalp: If they witnessed the global policies of today, could List and Gökalp still advocate their policy of *national economics*?

We have no common conscience with the nations of Europe and America. Consequently, the exchanges we carry out are not the manifestations of an international division of work. They are our economic parasites. And we are their social parasites. (...) Foreign capital should enter our country not as a pathological, but a normal parasite. Yet as much as it is our parasite, we will also be its parasite. (Gökalp, 1980, p. 166)

These are the views of Gökalp on the matter. According to this view, as long as we do not share a common conscience with foreign investors, exchanges will not constitute an “international division of work” in the real sense. Economic life, according to List’s theory of “productive power” where he sets out to historical stages of the economic developments of nations, is a process that continues by passing through stages of development. The final point is a nation that has achieved a balance between agriculture-industry-trade. Gökalp, too, defines a five-stage process of development, composed of the stage of family industry; the stage of small handicrafts; the stage of home industry; the stage of the workshop; and the stage of the factory (Gökalp, 1982b, p. 166-169). According to this, in the same manner that Germany achieved an internationally competitive position when it reached List’s final stage, Turkey will only take its place in international competition once it attains the “stage of the factory”, the fifth and final stage in Gökalp’s process.

**References | Kaynakça**

Akçoraoglu, Y. (1982) Gökalp Ziya Bey, *Ziya Gökalp'in ölüm yılında yazılanlardan seçmeler* [An anthology of essays published on the year of Ziya Gökalp's death], Ed. Zeki Yağmurdereli, Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları [Ministry of Culture Publications].

Bulut, Y. (2005) Türkiye'de sosyoloji sınıflamaları ve Ziya Gökalp [Classifications of sociology in Turkey and Ziya Gökalp], *Sosyoloji Dergisi* [Sociology Journal], Series 3, Issue 10, İstanbul: İÜEF.

Coşkun, İ. (1997) *Modern devletin doğuşu* [The birth of the modern state], İstanbul: Der.

Galbraith, J. K. (2004) *İktisat tarihi* [A history of economics], Ankara: Dost Kitabevi.

Gide, C. and Rist C. (1964) *A history of economic doctrines*, Tr. R. Richards B. A., Bristol.

Gökalp, Z. (1976) *Türkçülüğün esasları* [The principles of Turkism], Ed. Mehmet Kaplan, İstanbul: MEB Basımevi.

Gökalp, Z. (1980) *Makaleler IX* [Articles IX], Ed. Şevket Beysanoğlu, İstanbul: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları: 359 [Ministry of Culture Publications: 359].

Gökalp, Z. (1981) *Makaleler VIII* [Articles VIII], Ed. Ferit Ragıp Tuncor, Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları [Ministry of Culture Publications].

Gökalp, Z. (1982a) İktisadi mucize [Economic miracle], *Makaleler VII* [Articles VII], Ed. M. Abdülhaluk Çay, Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı [Ministry of Culture Publications: 359].

Gökalp, Z. (1982b) İktisadi tekamülün merhaleleri [Stages of economic progress], *Makaleler VII* [Articles VII], pp. 163-170.

Kaya, T. and Turhan, R. (2006) Ziya Gökalp'in yaşam öyküsü [Ziya Gökalp's Biography], *Sosyoloji Dergisi* [Journal of Sociology], 3<sup>rd</sup> Series, 13<sup>th</sup> Issue, İstanbul, pp. 1-6.

Kazgan, G. (1980) *İktisadi düşünce veya politik iktisadın evrimi* [Economic thought or evolution of political economy], İstanbul: Remzi.

Kocabaş, S. (1988) *Tarihte Türkler ve Almanlar* [Turks and Germans in History], İstanbul: Vatan.

Koloğlu, M. (1960) *Ekonomi doktrinleri tarihi* [A History of Economic Doctrines], Ankara: Doğuş.

Landau, J. M. (1996) *Tekinalp: Bir Türk yurtseveri (1883-1961)*, İstanbul: İletişim.

Landau, J. M. (1984) *Tekinalp: Turkish patriot, 1883-1961*, İstanbul and Leiden, Netherlands Archaeological-Historical Institute.

Okan, O. (2012). İktisat-milli iktisat-Ziya Gökalp. *Ziya Gökalp* içinde (s. 283-297), K. Tuna ve İ. Coşkun (Ed.), Ankara, Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı.

Önsoy, R. (1976) Ziya Gökalp'in iktisadi görüşleri [Ziya Gökalp's economic views], *Tarih Enstitüsü Dergisi* [The History Institute Journal], İstanbul: İ. Ü. Edebiyat Fakültesi Yayını [Publication of the Istanbul University Faculty of Literature], Issue 12, p. 41-50.

Özgüven, A. (n.d.) *İktisat bilimine giriş* [Introduction to the Science of Economy], 5<sup>th</sup> Edition, İstanbul: Filiz.

Parla, T. (1989) *Ziya Gökalp, kemalizm ve Türkiye'de korporatizm* [Ziya Gökalp, Kemalism and Corporatism in Turkey], İstanbul: İletişim.

Tolga, O. (1949) *Ziya Gökalp ve iktisadi fikirleri* [Ziya Gökalp and his economic views], İstanbul: İ. Ü. İktisat ve İktisadiyat Enstitüsü Neşriyat no. 14 [Istanbul University, Institute of Economics and Sociology, no. 14].

Toprak, Z. (1982) *Türkiye'de "milli iktisat" (1908-1918)* ["National economics" in Turkey (1908-1918)], Ankara: Yurt.

Toprak, Z. (1995) *Milli iktisat-milli burjuvazi* [National economics-national bourgeoisie], İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt.

Tuna, K. (1986) Ziya Gökalp'in milli sosyoloji anlayışı [Ziya Gökalp's understanding of a national sociology], *Sosyoloji Konferansları* [Sociology Conferences], Book 21, İstanbul, pp. 51-67.

Tütengil, C. O. (1964a) Ziya Gökalp'in iktisadi görüşleri [The economic views of Ziya Gökalp], *Sosyoloji Konferansları*, Beşinci Kitap, İstanbul: 1964-1965 Ders Yılı, İktisat Fakültesi İktisat ve İktisadiyat Enstitüsü [Sociology Conferences, Book Five, İstanbul: 1964-1965 Academic Year, Faculty of Economics, Institute of Economics and Sociology], p. 122-141.

Tütengil, C. O. (1964b) *Ziya Gökalp üzerine notlar* [Notes on Ziya Gökalp], İstanbul: Varlık.

Tütengil, C. O. (1974) Ziya Gökalp ve ulusal iktisat [Ziya Gökalp and national economics], *Ziya Gökalp Dergisi* [Ziya Gökalp Journal], Issue 1, Ankara: November, pp. 120-121.

Ulutan, B. (1978) *İktisadi doktrinler tarihi* [A History of Economic Doctrines], İstanbul: Ötüken.