

## On Intellectual Movements, Atilla Yayla

### 1. The Elements Colouring States and Shaping History

What are the elements that colour and determine the main characteristics of a state's political, legal, and economic system? Who or what, determines whether a state will have a limited, constitutional government or an arbitrary, despotic one; whether the rule of law or the law of rulers prevails; whether there will be a free market economy based on private ownership and free exchange or a command economy directed by a select group of elite men? Perhaps this question should be expanded somewhat and set in an historical context. Why is there such a big difference between the dominant political/social rhetoric of the 19th century and that of the 20th century? Why did the First and Second World Wars, the bloodiest wars in human history, occur in the 20th century? Why is the 20th century considered the age of totalitarianism, while the 19th century is perceived as the age of freedom? Who caused this? Was it the political leaders of the two periods? Was it simply the coincidental efforts of the "heroes" and "doers" whose names are unknown or forgotten? Or, as the Marxists assert, do the tools of production and class warfare shape history and states?

Perhaps it isn't possible to find perfect, absolute, and persuasive answers to these kinds of questions. No doubt, most of these factors and many others, have contributed to the formation of states and the course of history. However, there is one factor that is essential in considering the past and present condition of the world and the colour or essence of its national states. This Factor is the development of ideas and opinion and how they affect the minds and hearts of the people who are these nations. Today, we know that much of the turmoil, the developments, and events of history, considered by Marxist influenced popular culture and history to have been inevitable, were to a large extent dependent on the will of individuals acting alone or in cooperation. There are many examples that demonstrate the role groups and organizations play through the course of history. Their impact on historical developments is not inevitable. The ideas, opinions, and perceptions that informed these individuals and influenced their choices and actions must be considered in order to understand what effect they have upon the nations and periods in which they live.

The 19th century was an era in which freedom and free trade were respected and practiced to such a high degree, because the environment of ideas and opinion describing, explaining, praising, and advising these values had become dominant in the previous 17th and 18th centuries. Together with other factors, these ideas and opinions brought about the emergence of increasingly pro-freedom political and economic structures. The influence of philosophers such as Smith, Hume, Ferguson, Mandeville, Burke, and Locke are clearly evident in these opinions and ideas. However, the 19th century witnessed the gradual retreat of the ideas that defended freedom, the limited state, the value of reason, private property, and free trade before the onslaught of pro-protection, pro-planning, and totalising opinions based on the doctrine of social engineering. These ideas, which gained influence toward the end of the 19th century, were revived and developed by philosophers such as Saint-Simon, Comte, Hegel, and Marx. The disasters of totalitarianism in the 20th century arrived in the wake of the ideas and policies of these philosophers and their followers. In other words, the totalitarianism of fascism, Nazism, and socialism

were not inevitable. They were a reflection in daily life of totalitarian doctrines, which made freedom retreat in the field of thought and subsequently became the dominant ideas and opinions of the age. Thus we can say that, as Hayek stated, it was indeed possible to have prevented such disasters.(1)

Many authors have argued how and to what extent intellectuals and philosophers have been influential in the history of humankind. Perhaps the most interesting words on this subject come from Lord Keynes. Keynes, whose claim was so clearly proven by his own legacy, said the following:

“... the ideas of economists and political philosophers, both when they are right and when they are wrong, are more powerful than is commonly understood. Indeed the world is ruled by little else. Practical men, who believe themselves to be quite exempt from any intellectual influences, are usually the slaves of some defunct economist...” (2)

This statement, written by Keynes in 1936, explains an important fact although it exaggerates the influence of intellectuals. Ideas are extremely powerful. In fact, in the long run, there are no weapons more powerful than ideas. However, the philosophers’ intellectual followers, who circulate, spread, and develop his ideas, adapting them to daily problems, most powerfully demonstrate the power of ideas. If not for these followers, as Peter Bauer says, the importance of philosophers and the ideas formed in books would be exaggerated to the extent that they would mislead us. (3) In other words, the influence of ideas is not the same as the influence of philosophers. The former is more extensive than the latter and it includes the latter though it owes its existence to it. In many cases, ideas expand and get the chance of implementation in more comprehensive ways than their creators predicted.

Therefore, in order to have a measurable effect, ideas need to be conveyed to and adopted by a large number of adherents. The ideas that are successfully promulgated and which attract large audiences influence and shape states and the greater world. As proof of this fact, we may cite the transformation of the systems of such countries as Britain, the USA, Russia and China initiated by the intellectual movements in these countries that emerged and developed in the 19th and 20th centuries.

## II. Intellectual Movements: Historical and Current Examples

The individuals and groups that first adhere to an intellectual movement, engaging in the initial struggle to expand its influence in the world, are indispensable to the eventual success of their movement. They are the individuals responsible for communicating the creative thoughts of original intellectuals to the general population. The history of these intellectual movements provides examples that demonstrate the way ideas became influential and helped to determine the features of various states. These examples can be detected at every point of the political spectrum. In this article, I will mention four examples of intellectual movements, three of them belong to the past and the fourth is contemporary.

### A- The Anti-Corn Law Movement of R. Cobden and J. Bright

Our first example of a powerful intellectual movement is the Anti-Corn Law League of Richard Cobden and John Bright in 19th century England. Cobden and Bright devoted themselves to conveying the free trade views of Adam Smith to a popular audience. They created and conducted a movement, which brought about the annulment of the Corn Laws that had almost completely prevented the importation of corn by enforcing heavy taxes. Cobden and Bright recognized that the Corn Laws were a powerful economic disincentive and catastrophe for the poor who bore the brunt of this misbegotten policy. Together they made not only economic, but also ethical arguments against these laws. Their opponents ranged from the English landowners, who profited from the prevention of imports, to the politicians and bureaucrats who benefited by cooperating with the landowners. Struggling against these laws and their defenders was no easy task. To be effective, it was necessary to conduct a long-term campaign throughout the country. Such a campaign required a great deal of organisation, research, and persuasive ability in order to overcome their opponents in the fields of ideas and fact.

These two men were far more successful working together than they would have been if each had acted alone. Cobden and Bright travelled tirelessly throughout Britain organizing meetings to explain their cause wherever they went. Eventually though, while the numbers of those who shared their ideas increased, it became clear that persuading individuals was not sufficient. They realized that it was necessary to become influential within the Parliament, since the Tories (conservatives) and the Whigs (liberals) remained so committed to defending the interests of the land owners. Cobden managed to enter the Parliament in 1841 and expanded the ground of the struggle.

The magnificent campaign Cobden and Bright conducted required certain personal sacrifices. Their private lives were constricted and their textile businesses faced difficulties. In 1845 heavy rains brought calamity for corn producers and at the same time spread the potato blight that caused the infamous potato famine in Ireland. These events led Cobden and Bright to intensify their struggle against the injustice of the Corn Laws. Eventually, their efforts bore fruit; the Corn Laws were repealed on the first of February, 1849. The annulment of the Corn Laws removed an obstacle to the increase of wealth and living standards in Britain. (4) In short, an uninterrupted and multi-dimensional struggle led by these two determined, assured, and learned persons brought about a vital change in the economic policies of Britain. This change occurred to the advantage of the whole society and Britain's economy grew rapidly. The poor especially benefited from this change and were able to acquire better nourishment at lower prices.

#### B- F. Bastiat's Union of Free Trade

Our second example is Frederic Bastiat's Union of Free Trade. This movement for free trade was related to the Anti-Corn Laws League in Britain and worked to overcome French trade protectionism. Bastiat, a famous author, journalist, politician and polemicist, established the Union of Free Trade to encourage free trade policies. According to Bastiat, freedom of trade is important and beneficial for all the nations of the world. In spite of this fact, he did not call his organisation the Union of Freedom of Trade or the Union for Gradual Reform of Customs Tariffs. In his opinion, the term "free trade" is the best one

because this term evokes the product of an individual's own labour and his right to use his private property freely.(5)

Bastiat was an adamant advocate of private property; he believed strongly that it is the foundation of civilization. Neither civilisation nor wealth nor peace nor happiness can exist in a place where private property is not recognized and protected. Private property is also the source of law. The law's main purpose is to establish justice, in other words, to protect private property.

As a young man Bastiat did not exhibit a remarkable character or initiative. Bastiat was deeply influenced by the opinions of Adam Smith and his countryman, French economist Jean Baptiste Say, on free trade. As he read British newspapers, he discovered the struggle for free trade conducted by Cobden and Bright and was impressed by it. Bastiat collected material and information about the Anti-Corn Law League and began to write to Cobden. Eventually, he visited Cobden and Bright in Britain. (6) Bastiat began to write about what he was learning. He published articles in various newspapers and magazines and gradually became known in intellectual and political circles.(7) He was not intimidated by the struggle of intellectual debate and his ideas gained influence.

Bastiat's struggle was similar to Cobden and Bright's in many ways. It germinated and grew far from the seat of power in the capital. Cobden and Bright developed their campaign in Manchester – (they are known as Manchester liberals for this reason) and only went to London later. Bastiat began with his Bordeaux Union of Free Trade and afterwards went to Paris. On 10 May 1846 he established the Union of Free Trade, which would conduct its activities throughout the country. In November of the same year, he began to publish a weekly, four-to-eight page newsletter, *Le Libre Exchange* (Free Exchange). Unfortunately, protectionist forces prevented the enactment of a law, which would have reduced the customs tariffs by 50%. This was a serious blow to the advocates of free trade. Bastiat's weekly was closed on 16 April 1848.

According to J. Powell, through his opinions and the implementation of his ideas, Bastiat became a source of inspiration for the advocates of free trade in Belgium, Italy and Spain and even made an impact in Germany.(8) Bastiat engaged in vigorous debate with nationalist and socialist protectionists, especially with Louis Blanc. Meanwhile, he became a Member of Parliament and resolutely continued his struggle for free trade, most of the time by himself. He was severely opposed to the use of law as a tool of plunder.(9) Bastiat was of the opinion that freedom was the natural right of all individuals. Opposing the Marxist notion that conflict between the classes was the substance of social life, Bastiat claimed that, instead, there was a harmony between the economic interests of the different sectors of society. He insisted that economic development would be advantageous for everyone. Bastiat's struggle continued to be an encouragement to the advocates of freedom during the following century. In the United States, Leonard Read was inspired by Bastiat and established the Foundation for Economic Education, one of the first liberal think tanks, an educational organisation which still exists and conducts many successful activities.

The method and working principles of Frederic Bastiat's Union of Free Trade are as interesting as its purpose and can be a guide for similar movements. Let us read Bastiat's own statements:

“From the fact that the Association aims at the complete destruction of the protectionist system, it does not follow that it demands that such a reform be accomplished in a day and result from a single election. Even to return from bad to good and from an artificial state of things to a natural condition, precautions may well be recommended by prudence. These details of execution are for the authorities to work out; the function of the Association is to disseminate and to popularize the basic principle.

As for the means that it intends to make use of, it will never seek them elsewhere than in constitutional and legal ways.

Finally, the Association is completely non-partisan. It is not in the service of any industry, class, or region. It embraces the cause of eternal justice, of peace, of unity, of free communication, of universal brotherhood, the cause of the general welfare, which is everywhere and in all respects identical with that of the consumers.” (10)

France’s approach to free trade and its trade policies experienced many ups and downs and fluctuations, but the torch lit by Bastiat is still giving light. There is an increasingly strong classical liberal vein in Europe’s most statist country and this vein continues to prove and renovate itself especially in the intellectual field.

### C- The Fabian Community’s Cause of Democratic Socialism

Our third example of the effects of ideas and intellectual movements belongs to a different ideological tradition: socialism. The Fabian Society was the most effective representative of “democratic” socialism. It emerged in Britain toward the end of the 19th century and its influence increased enormously until the mid-twentieth century. Although its influence has waned, it continues to affect ideas and policy.

The democratic aspect of Fabian socialism does not stem from its acceptance of liberal democracy as a method for solving social problems or as a type of rule. Like the orthodox socialists, the Fabian socialists, too, are revolutionary socialists; in other words, their ultimate goal is to create a socialist revolution that will destroy private property and the free market. Fabians differ from orthodox socialists because they believe that violence is not necessary to create a revolution. They emerged during a time when voting rights were being continuously expanded as a result of the reforms made by conservatives. At the same time, the number of working class people was continually rising. According to the Fabian socialists, these two developments would ultimately result in the socialists’ rise to power through elections. Therefore, there was no need for a violent revolution; socialism could be established through democratic means.(11)

The founders of Fabian socialism were Sidney and Beatrice Webb. Among its followers were such influential intellectuals as H. G. Wells and George Bernard Shaw. The Fabian Society was established in 1884 and never had many members. It is classified as a British-type of socialism (another one is Trotskism) because of its mild and peaceful methods. Since the Fabians aimed at constructing socialism by making gradual reforms within a constitutional framework instead of changing the system through violence, they expended their efforts on two main groups: intellectuals and bureaucrats. The Fabians

gained prominence in academic circles in Britain, within the University of Oxford and in the London School of Economics, which they established. Their influence later extended to the United States. The Fabian Society eventually succeeded in heavily influencing the British Labour Party. During the period between the World Wars they successfully turned Britain into a socialist state through their control of the Labour Party.(12)

#### D- The Institute of Economic Affairs and the Revival of Liberal Thinking

Our fourth example is also from Britain: the Institute of Economic Affairs (IEA). The IEA emerged in the mid-1950s and is one of the most successful intellectual movements in recent times. Both its supporters and its opponents recognize this fact. The IEA has been considered a model by similar kinds of institutions in many parts of the world. Therefore, it deserves to be considered in a more comprehensive study.

The IEA has two sets of double “heroes”. The first are F. A. Hayek, the great liberal philosopher of the 20th century, and Antony Fisher, the founder of the IEA. The second are Ralph Harris and Arthur Seldon, who personally managed the affairs of the IEA for 30 years.

F. A. Hayek, a prominent economist and lecturer in the London School of Economics (LSE), began the 20th century’s biggest war of ideas by publishing his book, *The Road to Serfdom*. This war of ideas was a late-comer in the fight against totalitarianism, which lost its right wing during the conflagration of WWII, but whose left wing emerged from the ashes revitalized and blossoming anew. One of the main goals of this new war was to undermine the reign of Fabian socialism, which had dominated the intellectual scene in Britain and in continental Europe during the first half of the 20th century. Its ultimate aim was to regain the intellectual prestige and dominance in politics and economics that liberal ideas had enjoyed during the 18th and early 19th century.

This war was not to be easily won. Collectivism was dominant to a large extent in politics and economics, and held absolute sway in all other intellectual areas. Collectivists of various type and many outright socialists controlled the strategic intellectual forums. The stakes were so high that Hayek jeopardised his intellectual prestige and even his living by confronting the collectivists. In fact, after publishing his book he had great difficulty finding a job in any American university, despite his brilliant mind. He only obtained professorship in a newly invented chair at the University of Chicago with the help of a few classical liberal businessmen. He experienced these difficulties because he was a liberal; in other words, because he defended an ideology which was considered dead. He declared himself pro-market in a time when most scholars were competing to extend their arguments for a planned economy. At that time, the hostility towards the free market and pro-market forces was incredibly deep-rooted and widespread and it continued to be so for another twenty to thirty years. In fact, Ralph Harris commented that “talking about markets in the 1950s was like blaspheming in the church”.(13) Twenty years later, in the 1970s, Charles Rowley had to give up his job in his university because he was an advocate of free markets.(14)

Hayek's arguments against leftist and rightist totalitarianism began to spread rapidly after *The Road to Serfdom* was published in the United States. It even appeared in abridged form in the *Reader's Digest*, which had a circulation of millions. One reader who was deeply influenced was Anthony Fisher. He had fought against the Nazis as a British Air Force pilot and lost his brother in the war. After the war Fisher left the army. He read *Reader's Digest* regularly and was greatly inspired when he came across Hayek's book. With the flashes of inspiration gleaned from *The Road to Serfdom* racing through his mind, he visited the author of the book at the LSE. During this visit, unmemorable for Hayek but of profound importance to Fisher, the two young men discussed briefly how far engaging in politics would help to put Hayek's ideas into practice. Hayek discouraged Fisher from trying to implement their ideas by entering politics. He told Fisher that the best method to effectively spread classical liberal ideas was to establish an institution of education. Their conversation ended with this simple suggestion.

Fisher was convinced of the truth of Hayek's words, but he did not have the financial resources to immediately follow his advice. Nevertheless, he determined within himself that eventually he would do so. In 1949, he told Ralph Harris that he planned to found an institution someday that would champion pro-market thought. Harris replied that he would like to run it. When the two men met again six years later, Fisher had become highly successful in the poultry business. They were ready to found their institution. Some time afterwards, Arthur Seldon joined them on a part-time basis, two years later he made it his full time job. Thus, the core of the institution was formed.

Classical liberal ideas have retained an important place in Britain, at least in literature, because of the numerous liberal philosophers who lived and wrote there. Although their influence had significantly waned in the 1950s, the works of such philosophers as Smith, Hume and Locke were still published by British universities, including Oxford and Cambridge. Therefore, the IEA focused their efforts on economic education rather than on reprinting the classics. They also eschewed the trap of getting caught up in daily politics. The executives of the IEA declared the following: "The goal of these efforts was a society in which people would understand free market economics together with an understanding of the moral foundations which govern the acquisition and holding of property, the right of the individual to have access to free competitive markets and the necessity of a secure and honest monetary system."(15)

According to the directors of the IEA, pro-freedom and pro-free market ideas would be useless as long as they were kept in the dusty attics of libraries (precisely where it was in 1950s Britain). It was also not sufficient to just make these ideas popular in university circles and among academicians. They had to be conveyed to a larger audience and adapted to the current problems of the country. In other words, Britain's dreadful problems needed concrete proposals and solutions that were derived from classical liberal theory. Otherwise, Britain would become the first "fourth-world country" of the world, a country that lost its wealth and development and became despondent with poverty and misery. The possibility that this country, the source of so much of pro-freedom thought and the origin of the industrial revolution, could fall into such a terrible state was horrifying.

The IEA believed that the philosophy of free-market economics should be revitalised. However, while defending the free market for its better capacity to create and disperse wealth, they also wished to

demonstrate the moral superiority of the free market system. Without accomplishing this, it would be extremely difficult to realize their goal of restoring the dominance of free market thought. The way to rid Britain of collectivist-protectionist-socialist ideas and policies was to change and develop the climate of ideas and opinion to the advantage of liberals. This would be a long-term and difficult struggle. The IEA set a 20-year target and then embarked on its task.

The IEA was successful in its struggle. From 1956 to 1976, in the time they had allotted, it worked step by step to meet its goal. With hundreds of studies and research projects, the individuals at the institute analysed and produced concrete proposals for solutions to Britain's problems. In the beginning, nobody took them seriously and some deliberately ignored them, but the IEA persevered. Some of those who at one time had opposed the IEA and its followers later found themselves allied with them. The IEA became influential in academic circles, in the universities, and among journalists and politicians. When the IEA, which celebrated its 50th anniversary in 2006, is evaluated as a whole, it is clear that it has been successful to an enviable degree. This, of course, does not mean that its struggle is over; unfortunately the struggle between free market and protectionist ideas and between individualist and collectivist theories will never end.

What factors underlie the success of the IEA? They are the same ones that ensure the success of any kind of movement. We can detect these factors by reviewing the writings and speeches of Ralph Harris, Arthur Seldon, and John Blundell, the current director of the IEA.

Firstly, by resisting attractive and seductive opportunities and fields of engagement not directly related to its goals, the IEA has managed to function as a think-tank/intellectual movement and to remain so. It has become successful thanks to its consistency and determination in these matters. It has not identified itself with any political movement and it has not committed the mistake of joining a political party. The Fabian Society had made this error in 1945 and had left the intellectual field, creating a vacuum. In Blundell's opinion, this vacuum made the IEA's task easier.(16)

Secondly, the continuity of its staff was an important contribution to the success of the IEA. This continuity was not only maintained in the long-term partnership of Harris and Seldon, the locomotive of the IEA, but also in all the personnel at almost all levels. Many staff members worked in the IEA for decades.

Thirdly, the consistency of the IEA's work has had an important role in its success. This consistency is only possible by focusing on the long-term character of the struggle and ignoring the lure of popularity, prestige, and short-term victories. Long-range thinking and calculation also improves intellectual purity and helps to avoid the pursuit of unnecessary compromise and concession. However, the IEA has not fallen into dogmatic orthodoxy because of its intellectual purity. It has fully benefited from all the schools within the liberal tradition – from the Virginian school of economics, the Austrian school, the Chicago school and others. It also takes full advantage of individual talents and approaches to economic thought.

The fourth factor, which has contributed to the success of the IEA is its location. Unlike the Cobden-Bright movement and Bastiat's Union of Free Trade, the IEA has always been located in the national



capital, London, and in similar central locations. The geographically small size of England makes this particularly beneficial.

The IEA witnessed perfect cooperation in the partnership of Harris and Seldon. These partners were the epitome of courtesy, enthusiasm, optimism and fun. The harmony between Harris and Seldon made it easier for the IEA to stay away from internal disturbances and to focus its attention and energy on its main purpose.(17)

The final important attribute of the IEA's success was its financial independence. Ideological independence requires three things, avoiding political entanglement, abstaining from intellectual orthodoxies and finally, maintaining financial autonomy. The IEA has never sought any support from the taxpayers' money. When voluntary donations were made, they had to be unconditional.(18) Financial independence requires that sources of income be as diverse as possible. An institution should never depend upon a single donor or even a few large donors. The IEA successfully fulfilled these requirements.

The experience of the IEA demonstrates that IEA-type institutions can function in two fields of effort. The first is the effort to affect a country's policies directly. This requires the ability to directly influence policy makers. The second is the efforts aimed at influencing the climate of ideas and even creating a new climate of ideas and opinion in the determination of major policies. Although it is necessary from time to time to conduct research and activities that concern current events, success in the long term depends on dealing with principles, producing intellectual material, and leaving the duty of practical politics to others. Blundell summarised the opinion of Hayek on this matter as follows: "Practical people who concern themselves solely with current day-to-day problems tend to lose sight of, and therefore influence on, the long run. This is because of their lack of idealism. In a paradoxical way the principled, steadfast ideologue has far greater long-term influence than the practical man concerned with the minutiae of today's problems."(19) The IEA has become successful since it has concerned itself with principles and has never sacrificed principles for the sake of the contemporary.

### III- The Conditions of Success for Intellectual movements

The success and survival of intellectual movements depend on certain conditions, which should be understood and explained. The story of the IEA gives an idea of what these conditions could be. Nevertheless, the conditions of success need further examination, especially from the perspective of liberal intellectual movements.

#### A- Intellectual movements should Remain Intellectual movements

To be successful, each intellectual movement should remain an intellectual movement. To this end, it should emerge as an intellectual movement, should be decisively conscious that it is so and should demonstrate the determination and will to remain so. There are two distinct dangers for intellectual

movements in this respect. The first one is the danger of radicalisation. Radical activism, which does not exhibit the imperturbability that is essential in an intellectual movement, creates a slippery base, providing momentary pleasure and excitement, but harming the intellectual movement in the long run. Activism is primarily emotional but a movement's adherents should keep their ideological principles paramount. Of course, this does not mean that intellectual movements must avoid all enthusiasm or that all excitement undermines an intellectual movement. In fact passion and fervour are an extremely important part of intellectual movements. Those who do not feel excitement in their life are resigning themselves to an ordinary life. However, excitement should never suppress intellect and reasoning in any intellectual movement.

The second danger for an intellectual movement is the temptation to become politicised; to replace intellectual activity with political activity or to become a part of a political movement. The requirements of intellectual activity are considerably different from those of political activity and they cannot exist together within the same framework. If an intellectual movement becomes entangled in political activities, politics and opportunism may cause them to become partisan or to be perceived in such a way. Partisanship will narrow the movement's extent of influence and engage its energy in quarrels over daily affairs and ordinary events, thus causing it to lose sight of its principles. Intellectual movements should be careful to remain intellectual movements, avoiding political party affiliation and the false choices they present.

There have been many intellectual movements that failed because they did not understand these concepts. The best example is the Fabian Society, which was one of the most important ideological movements in the history of thought. As mentioned before, the Society made a big mistake by tying its fate to the British Labour Party in the 1940s and lost its effectiveness shortly thereafter. An example from our own country, Turkey, is the Movement of New Democracy (YDH), which "blew like a storm" in our country in 1994-95 and then suddenly died. Actually, the YDH never really became an intellectual movement because it was based only on enthusiasm, good intentions, and hope. But it did have remarkable human resources and created an extraordinary wave of excitement. If it had developed into an intellectual movement, it could have been very effective in Turkey. However, because it maintained its initial structure, it inevitably disintegrated.

Modern political parties cannot be the pure conveyors and representatives of ideas or ideology. Parties have the characteristics of coalitions; coalitions in both ideas and human resources. A party cannot seek ideological purity as well as continue to carry out its functions as a political party. If it tries it will succeed at neither. In the programme of each party, there may be some things that are right and some things that are wrong from the perspective of an intellectual movement. Intellectual movements must not hope for an uncompromising political party. They should never put all their hopes in one political basket. For an intellectual movement, the representation of its ideas in more than one party is better than the existence of a pure political party that claims to defend its ideas. In fact, a party programme's advocacy of a policy is no guarantee that that policy would be implemented as promised if the party came to power. Many times different parties will unexpectedly support or hinder the ideals of an intellectual movement.

In Britain and the United States parties with liberal tendencies have taken many steps that strengthen the state's role in the economy. In Turkey, a leftist party – DSP – pioneered the enactment of privatisation in the constitution. Therefore, intellectual movements should avoid all appearance of involvement in political parties and their rivalries. Ignoring this principle for any reason would be suicidal for the movement. In the long term, intellectual movements are far more important and effective than political parties.

#### B- Intellectual Movements Should Not Try to Rediscover the Whole World

If an intellectual movement, especially a liberal intellectual movement wants to be successful, it should not try to rediscover and recreate the world of ideas. It should not completely reject and deny the previous accumulation of humanity's wisdom. Rather, it should try to make use of these accumulated ideas and should not be taken by the ludicrous desire that it, alone, can provide the answers to all dilemmas. Our ancestors, too, faced most of today's problems, though they are commonly assumed to be new. Many ideas, which we consider original were voiced and discussed thoroughly by others many centuries ago. To be a powerful and effective intellectual movement, it is important to benefit from these discussions, to learn from the writings and experiences of previous generations. No matter how intelligent and clever we are, we will not attain new heights of thought or truth by ignoring history. We can only advance by building on the previous achievements of human thought, by understanding and interpreting it accurately, and by contributing to it.

Those who do not understand this will never become an intellectual movement. The YDH provides our example once again. Intellectuals within the YDH, with many good intentions, conducted "brain storming" on a weekend and considered that what they produced by this effort was an intellectual product. If any of these products had any meaning or value it was because they were extensions of previously developed thoughts. Anything else disappeared without a trace. It is not easy to produce an idea or ideology. Most new ideas are faint copies of older thought processes.

#### C- Intellectual movements should not be Local and Narrow-Minded

The successful intellectual movement must avoid narrow-minded interests and localism. Narrow-mindedness can have different manifestations. It is narrow-minded to assert that: "our race is the most superior race and that nothing can be learned from the experiences of the other races." Stating that our religion comprehends all truths and that we do not need to look at other religions and other sources – ideologies, philosophical movements, and human experiences – is another type of narrow-mindedness and localism. Thinking that our ideology comprehends all aspects of human life and that there is nothing to be learned from other ideologies and other sources – religions, traditions, philosophical movements, etc. – is also narrow-minded and a form of localism. Believing that our leader is the most knowledgeable, that he can establish unfailing and unchangeable principles and that we should reject and be indifferent to everything outside his statements and principles is also narrow-minded and

indicates localism. Narrow-mindedness and localism turn intellectual movements into cliques defending dogmas.

Unfortunately, Turkey is very prone to narrow-mindedness and localism. These tendencies can be found in almost every section of our society. Even some liberals have fallen under the yoke of some form of narrow-mindedness. But the greatest victims of narrow-mindedness and localism are the collectivists, whether chauvinist nationalists, socialists or Islamists. According to some nationalists, the places beyond Kapıkule have no importance. Everybody and everything on the other side are enemies, aliens and evil.(20) Most socialists are of the opinion that there is nothing to be learned from other ideologies, especially liberalism. Therefore, they do not gather information about liberalism by reading the works of liberal philosophers, but attempt to criticise liberalism using information from the works of authors hostile to liberalism; although actually they only imagine that they are criticising liberalism. The position of some Islamists is an odd one that includes features of both nationalism and socialism. They are pro-state control from one perspective, but at the same time, they complain about the pressures of the state. On the one hand, they condemn the spreading of Christianity, through its use of the word and concept of “the missionary”, which supposedly has a pejorative meaning, and they call on state authorities to prevent missionary activity, but, on the other hand, they speak of freedom of religion. While they demand that the state should oppress and punish missionaries in Turkey, they are pleased with the fact that Islam spreads among the native nations of Europe. They welcome the increase in the number of mosques in Europe, but they complain about the initiatives of opening churches in Turkey.

Some Islamists are not content with the belief that Islam is sufficient for everything and there is no need for anything else in a place where Islam exists. They also want to impose their truths on others through the use of state authority. They are of the opinion that belonging to a religion completely comprehends and consumes an individual’s identity and they prefer the identification of individuals with their own religious choices. Therefore, for example, the concept of “Muslim” in their religion holds a political, legal and economic meaning as well as religious one. Unfortunately this stance is considerably ambiguous, obscure and changeable. Thus, these kinds of Islamists exhibit another type of narrow-mindedness and localism.(21)

#### D- Intellectual Movements should be Constructive, not Destructive

To be successful, an intellectual movement should be constructive, not destructive, and should inspire hope, not hopelessness. An intellectual movement that aims to destroy everything causes fear in society and provokes negative reactions in many people and circles. In fact, it is not necessary in any society to destroy and to reconstruct everything; in fact it is not possible. There are things in societies, which can never be destroyed or erased and furthermore whose abolishment is unnecessary. Development and advancement are better achieved by reforming existing policies, eliminating mistakes gradually and replacing them with ideas that are true and correct. This is especially true for liberals. Liberalism is an ideology that serves humanity and it is ethically superior to other movements, therefore its ideas must be implemented in a humane and respectful manner.

Every idea which asserts that one race is superior to another, one religion to another, one way of life to another or one class to another, and that this superiority should be ratified and established, is sectarian. It cannot create a circle of hope and opportunity that encompasses everyone and it cannot function in a way that will benefit everyone. Chauvinist nationalism, which believes that its own race is superior to all others, alienates citizens that do not belong to that race; and it is meaningless for foreigners who belong to another race. For example, setting aside its anti-Semitic features, what does German Nazism mean for a Turk or a Britain? In the same way, if we believe that only our religion contains the absolute truth, and allow that truth to be imposed by state authority on others; the result will be the repression of other religions and of the diversity within the state religion. In addition, if we consider, as the Kemalists do, our way of life to be the only and best way of life, we cannot found intellectual movements which will include other ways of life and which will give hope to the people belonging to those ways of life. The mentality of socialism based on class conflict is clear. Socialist intellectual movements are a call for class warfare; these calls differ merely on which sections will be destroyed, how wide these sections are and, what methods will be used to destroy them.

The point we can derive here is the following: a constructive intellectual movement, which will give hope to all sections of society, should be based on truth, which takes the pluralism of the society as its base, which respects pluralism and which does not aim to prune this pluralism in any direction. Liberals are lucky in this sense. Liberalism presents a material and normative framework for society. Natural social pluralism can live within this framework. At least this possibility is more likely in liberalism than in the ideas and ideologies that advocate conflict and superiority. Therefore, liberal intellectual movements should not be sectarian, should not use language which provokes sections of society against each other, should give people hope for the future and should not promise the well-being of a particular group on condition of the annihilation or inferiority of another section of society. Liberal intellectual movements should also be honest in their observations, analyses, and promises regarding human and world conditions. They should continue their search for a better society. They may even propose a utopia, as Hayek states, but they should not abuse the hopes and dreams of people by presenting this utopia as a thing that can be reached easily in one night.

#### E- Intellectual Movements should Stop Being Marginal and should become Dominant

An intellectual movement, which wants to be successful, has to promote itself so that it may grow from a marginal intellectual movement into a dominant intellectual movement. No matter how true an idea is it will not command considerable influence in the life of society as long as it stays in the minds of people and only adorns their dreams. Becoming successful requires dominating the environment of ideas and opinion. This means having powerful sources, philosophers and intellectuals who will inspire the intellectual movement continually; it also means increasing the number of people who will convey these ideas to the masses by translating them into easily understandable forms. In this context, having an influence in the determination of educational curriculum is of great importance.

It is a common belief that the most important field of power in the state is the field of political power. However, when evaluating the long-term, it becomes apparent that the most important field of power is

the field of intellectual power. Ideas have more power than people or parties. The people, who use both bureaucratic and political power, are the conveyors, vehicles and subcontractors of ideas. Therefore, struggles for power are conducted primarily in the field of ideas. It is difficult for people, who cannot win in the field of ideas, to achieve power effectively or to rule the country even if they do come to power.

After nation-states emerged and centrally-controlled education became widespread, educational activities became one of the most important fields of in the competition of ideas. Modern educational systems, in which millions are subjected to standardized education, are unfortunately targeted by all kinds of ideologies. Repressive and totalitarian movements and regimes, which do not particularly champion freedom, attribute extraordinary importance to the ideological education controlled by the state.

Collective and centralized educational activities tend to brainwash rather than open up the minds of the people. It does not inform them of distinct worlds, or teach them reasoning and the proper use of knowledge. This problem appears in democratic countries as well as totalitarian states because it stems from the method of education as much as its quality. It is clear that an education system financed by the public, controlled by a central authority and made compulsory by the state is always a dangerous weapon. Those who have a predilection for social engineering always try to capture this weapon. As Bastiat asked, "why do political parties undertake the job of directing education?" It is because they realize the truth of the following remarks of Leibniz: "Make me the director of education, I will undertake the job of changing the world." (22) Yes, in fact, as stated by George Roche while explaining Bastiat's opinions, "the real war has to be waged and won not in the field of politics, but in the field of education." (23) The following statement of Paul Samuelson, who was one of the most influential economists of the 20th century, also makes this point: "I do not care who rules the countries provided that I write the textbooks used in the schools." (24)

Intellectual movements cannot be indifferent to the field of education because any idea that does not appear in the educational system's textbooks has little chance of success. Its presence in textbooks means an idea has stopped being marginal and has become a part of the dominant movement. Therefore, every intellectual movement, willingly or unwillingly, consciously or unconsciously, directly or indirectly, seeks this end. However, there are and should be differences between intellectual movements in their methods of affecting education and textbooks. It is seen that totalist, collectivist intellectual movements, which favour social engineering, complain about the content of education rather than its type. They do not wish to abolish collective and compulsory education but they are anxious to ensure that only their ideas are taught in the educational system. The approach of liberal intellectual movements concerning this issue is entirely different. According to the liberal opinion, the structure of the existent modern educational system is faulty and dangerous, independent from its content. Indeed, the structure has a considerable impact on the content. If the liberal movement attempts to control education in order to promote their ideas it will find their own weapon turned against them. They will ultimately reduce their hope of winning the war of ideas. Liberal intellectual movements ought to make the decentralisation of education its primary goal, and relegate influencing the content of textbooks to a secondary measure.

Truth is not a guarantee of victory. John Milton, who said that the truth does not need tactics and strategies and that its mere existence is sufficient, was mistaken.(25) Perhaps ultimately the truth will indeed be victorious. However, ultimate victory is not the only consideration, the cost undertaken to achieve that victory is also important. Was it necessary to live through the terrible experiences of totalitarianism in the 20th century in order to learn that totalitarianism was bad? It was already known that totalitarianism was based on erroneous philosophical foundations, a faulty understanding of humanity, and a commitment to destructive social engineering. It was possible to prevent the experiences of Soviet socialism, German Nazism, and Italian Fascism. But liberalism was first defeated by socialist ideas in the field of thought and only then did these countries fall into the clutches of totalitarianism. For example, the German School of History, which was hostile to a liberal order, had become dominant in the field of ideas long before Hitler came to power.(26) To be free, it is necessary to defend freedom rationally and passionately and to do this insistently and constantly. As Hume stated, no freedom has been lost suddenly and as the result of only one major battle.

#### F- Intellectual Movements should Cover Every Field

To be successful, a liberal intellectual movement should pursue its intellectual struggle in almost every field, not just in one or two fields. It is insufficient to defend freedom only in the fields of economics and political thought; the same effort should be expanded to enter the fields of law, sociology, literature, philosophy, art, and culture, because the war of ideas is made everywhere. Ideas hostile to freedom in the field of literature may be conveyed effectively to more people than those who are influenced by the arguments for freedom in the field of economics. Moreover, many people who defend freedom in their own field and understand its significance in their area of expertise will strangely applaud the attitudes, ideas and practices of repression in other fields outside of their practice. These people do not show as much concern for the freedom of others as they do to for their own freedom; for example, while they defend freedom in art, they oppose freedom of religion; while they demand political freedom, they ignore economic freedom; while they demand freedom of religion for themselves, they call for suppressing others' freedom of religion. Therefore, freedom should be defended systematically, consciously, and consistently in every field and a rich literature of freedom relevant and available to everyone should be established.

Works of history have a special importance in defending freedom. Hayek shares the opinion that most people get their economic opinions through the study of history rather than through the study of economics.(27) In fact, although capitalism has benefited and advanced humanity dramatically and though it is superior to socialism in every respect, it has a worse reputation than socialism, which has made humanity suffer more than any other ideology. The reason for this may be traced, in part, to the novels of Charles Dickens and the histories of capitalism written by Marxists. The inventors of the term capitalism were socialists. In other words, socialists even exercised the power and privilege of creating titles for their rivals.(28) Therefore, works of history are very important and without creating a balance in this field, liberals will be unlikely to win very often in the war of ideas.

#### G- Intellectual Movements should be a Centre of Attraction

The success of a liberal intellectual movement also depends on the emergence of liberal environments of ideas and on these environments' becoming centres of attraction. It is important to be considered not only a representation of the truth but also a potentially powerful social force in order for an intellectual movement to become a centre of attraction. Truth and power certainly attract people. People rarely create new centres of attraction. Most people become parts of environments that already exist and they often do this without making a conscious or purposeful choice. Therefore, being a ready milieu, an existent environment is very important for every intellectual movement. In Turkey, the Islamists and socialists are in this situation. There is no need to launch special efforts for the emergence of new Islamist and socialist movements. Such movements that are nurturing Islamists and socialists are already functioning. On the other hand, liberals have not yet created an environment that is sufficiently widespread, that possesses an internal dynamism or that has the capacity to reproduce itself. The necessity of constituting a centre of attraction naturally requires that liberals come together and cooperate as much as possible. It is often difficult to achieve this kind of close cooperation and union for liberals because they are not people who typically come together willingly within a chain of command or hierarchy or who enjoy the atmosphere of a closed community. Often their characters, apart from their ideas, do not conform easily into such highly disciplined and determinative mass formations. However, they need the synergy created by togetherness. Therefore, liberals face the duty of developing the ways and methods of liberal togetherness and organisation. In this issue, there are unfortunately no examples that sufficiently illuminate the way to do this. Liberals will have to learn how to be a centre of attraction by experiencing togetherness.

#### H- Intellectual Movements should not try to Act as Practitioners

Producing ideas and developing policy proposals is a different process than the implementation of them. Being an able man of ideas does not mean being a good practitioner or a successful politician, bureaucrat or technocrat. There is a kind of division of labour among intellectuals and practitioners. But trying to do both is neither possible nor necessary. As stressed by Hayek, those dealing with ideas should care about general principles and should try to influence trends and should leave the details and the action to the practitioners.

Avoiding the role of practitioner forces an intellectual movement to avoid becoming a political party and attempting to fill the shoes of bureaucrats and technocrats. There are limits to the power and capabilities of both humans and movements. Therefore, the ideal is solidarity through the division of labour. Everybody should concentrate on his or her own specialty; intellectuals should be busy with ideas and politicians and bureaucrats should care about policy making and directing the state mechanism effectively.

#### I- Intellectual Movements Should Adamantly Maintain their Independence



Intellectual movements, which want to be successful, should take care to protect their independence. There are different aspects of independence. The first one is organisational independence. As I have mentioned earlier, intellectual movements should not become a branch of a political party. Secondly, liberal intellectual movements should also be independent financially. Liberal ideological movements should eschew any form of taxpayer funded financial assistance. When they work together with institutions that receive money from the state, they should delimit their general or specific fields of activity carefully. They should not get involved in disputed fields and should be open and transparent in their work. They should take care to stay within the limits of the law in their activities. Liberal intellectual movements need to protect their independence against not only the state, but also against big corporations, businesses and trade unions. Liberals are not and should not be the defenders of the interests of any groups. They care about general principles and the benefits which they provide to society, they do not concern themselves with the interests of any sectors or classes. Therefore, when liberal intellectual movements get assistance from private companies or organisations, this assistance should not be unconditional. Intellectual movements should never be made dependent on only one source of income. More sources of income mean more independence as well as more capabilities.

#### J- Intellectual Movements should be Vigilant against the Seductiveness of Money and Rank

Money is a seductive force. It should be remembered that there is no necessary relationship between the existence of a liberal intellectual movement and considerable financial resources. In other words, the opinion that it is necessary to have money to be an intellectual movement is untrue. This claim reverses the true order of things and puts the cart before the horse. Before all else, there should be opinions, ideals to be defended and causes to be pursued. Money, if it is necessary, will come later. No matter how rich you are you cannot start an intellectual movement by hiring a few people; on the other hand, we see that many intellectual movements became influential in history without a lot of money. Great care should be taken to not allow money, which is not an important factor at the beginning, to become the main factor in the later stages of an organisation.

An assessment from the liberal perspective will likely produce the following reflections on this principle. In its essence, a liberal intellectual movement depends on a readiness and idealism. People, who perform concrete functions, should be paid in return for their labour and expertise. But people who participate for purely mercenary reasons and are not inspired idealism, should not be made a part of the intellectual movement, but rather should be employed only temporarily.

Those occupying key positions within liberal intellectual movements should carefully review and consider generous offers of money and rank made by the state or private or political parties. It is natural to want to earn money and achieve social rank. This, of course, is a legitimate desire. But intellectual movements should not be made the tool of profit and rank-seekers and those who prefer the opportunities of money and rank should diminish or completely cut off their relations with the intellectual movement and should not present themselves as the representative of that movement.

## K- Intellectual Movements should be Institutionalised

One of the most important conditions of success for intellectual movements is institutionalisation. One or a few individuals usually play the leading role in the emergence of an intellectual movement. In fact, this is natural. But there is a close relationship between the degree of its success and its institutionalisation.

First of all, an intellectual movement should not be identified with a single person. No matter how talented or brilliant a person is, the survival of the movement should not depend on his or her existence. The number of people and area of influence comprised by the intellectual movement should be expanded gradually. This is the first step in institutionalising an intellectual movement. In other words, the door should be kept open to eager newcomers who have the necessary talents and characteristics. An intellectual movement identified with the same individuals and represented by the same individuals for many years is proceeding in the wrong direction. New names and new talents should rise constantly within the movement and the areas in which the movement is interested should be expanded. To do this, there should be a harmony within the movement. Everybody willing to do so should find an environment appropriate for exhibiting his or her talents and encouraging his or her individual development.

No matter which talents they possess, individuals need each other's expertise and support. No one can do everything alone. No one can know everything. Regardless of the extent of our abilities, we may not be able to create the effect that we desire when we are alone. I should mention here a remark of my late teacher, Prof. Aydın Yalçın. A. Yalçın used to say: "In order to stop the wind it is not sufficient to be a high mountain alone, the wind will go around it. It is necessary to be a chain of high mountains." An intellectual movement will be successful if it can constitute a dam by creating many mountains instead of depending on one mountain. Therefore, intellectual movements should not be identified with individuals, they should be institutionalised. This does not require repudiating the contribution, efforts and quality of each individual. On the contrary, an institutionalised intellectual movement paves the way for motivated, thoughtful and effective people to attract the interest and respect that they deserve.

Another requirement and reflection of institutionalisation is that, in intellectual movements, the ranks, especially the ranks of leadership and management are not occupied by the same person or persons permanently and that these ranks are left to or shared with new comers when it is necessary. Every person has limited energy and capability. Nobody can run at the same speed forever. Intellectual movements should not be considered a marathon undertaken by one person but a relay run by many people working together. An intellectual movement remains successful by renewing its ranks of leadership with new converts who have fresh energy for the battle. There is no standard way of doing this; each movement will choose its own way. In this context, it should not be forgotten that intellectual movements have some characteristics peculiar to them. Democratic methods, elections etc., are not the only or even the most appropriate way of doing this. In a liberal intellectual movement, which has to march with a limited number of people, people should come to certain ranks by their own efforts and talents, not by votes or appointment. Those, who have proved that they deserve to be in certain ranks and are willing to occupy these ranks, should not be blocked arbitrarily.

Another requirement of institutionalisation is that principles and rules should be dominant in the internal functioning of an intellectual movement. In an environment where momentary sympathies, antipathies or arbitrary tendencies are dominant, small disagreements and conflicts can turn into destructive polarisations and clashes. Especially in liberal intellectual movements, obeying the rules and trying to negotiate and to solve problems without accumulating them is a beneficial virtue that should be emphasized.

One of the most reliable signs of institutionalisation is continuity and permanence in activities. Instead of constantly testing new kinds of activities, an intellectual movement should continue patiently, insistently, and even obstinately the activities proven to be beneficial and effective. It is more appropriate to constantly conduct a few activities rather than numerous temporary, ineffective activities, which are irrelevant to each other. Followers of intellectual movements cannot feel and think like politicians or businessmen, who expect practical results from every activity. Sometimes, it seems that activities are not producing any effect (profit in the language of businessmen). Even in this case, activities should be continued because the investments of intellectual movements are the ones whose return comes about in the long run. In some unfortunate situations, the duration might exceed a lifetime. Under normal conditions, intellectual movements can expect to bear fruits satisfactorily in 20 to 30 years.

## Conclusion

I have stated in this article that some of the most important factors in determining basic characteristics of political, legal and economic systems in the world are ideas, intellectuals and intellectual movements. I have tried to explain what makes these movements successful by observing the examples of historical and current intellectual movements, including my own experiences and observations in the Association for Liberal Thinking. As may be expected, I have done this by referring to liberal ideas and liberal intellectuals. I do not claim that my findings, opinions and claims regarding this issue are completely comprehensive and sufficient to answer every question. I believe that this discussion should be the subject of more comprehensive studies, and that as new intellectual movements emerge and present new examples we should study them as well. Nevertheless, I feel that I have made a start in an undeveloped subject and have prepared some arguments for the others to debate.

Although my opinions regarding the importance of ideas and the place of intellectual movements in social life, which I believe are indispensable, are very strong, this does not mean that I am of the opinion that political leadership, political movements, bureaucracy, media and other social factors have no impact and role in determining the basic characteristics of countries. Of course, each of them has important, even indispensable roles in the discussion. Intellectual movements cannot replace them or undertake their work. What I would like to emphasise is that ideas are the essential determining factor on the character of an age, especially in the long-term. Ideas are indispensable; but their survival is dependent on politicians, bureaucrats and law personnel and the attitudes and activities of the different elements of social life. If intellectual movements and those who take action and implement policy are not sufficiently active in a country, responsible people should immediately begin to rectify the situation.

Since Turkey lacked ideological diversity, the Association for Liberal Thinking (ALT) was established in 1992 as an intellectual movement and has been able to reach an important point after a 10-year march. How the ALT emerged and how I assess its present situation and future prospects will be the topic of another article.

## Notes

\* Published originally in Turkish: “Fikir Hareketleri Üzerine”, Liberal Thought, n. 28, 2002, Ankara.

\*\* Prof. Dr., of political economy, Gazi University, Ankara and President of ALT.

(1) The following work has to be read in order to understand the intellectual-philosophical bases of the 20th century totalitarianism: F. A. Hayek, *Kölelik Yolu*, (translated by Yıldırım Arsan, Ankara: Liberte, 2001).

(2) J. M. Keynes, *The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money*, London: Macmillan, p. 383, quoted by John Blundell, *Waging the War of Ideas*, London: IEA, p. 63.

(3) Peter Bauer, *From Substance to Exchange*, Princeton: New Forum Books, 2000, pp. 4-5.

(4) For the details of the struggle and personalities of R. Cobden and J. Bright, see Jim Powell, *The Triumph of Liberty*, The Free Press, 2000, pp. 122-130.

(5) Frederic Bastiat, “Protectionism and Communism”, *Selected Essays on Political Economy*, translated from French by Seymour Cain, George B. De Huszar (ed.), New York: The Foundation for Economic Education, Inc. Irvington on-Hudson, 1995, the fifth edition, p. 17.

(6) Powell, op. cit., p. 255.

(7) F. Bastiat was one of the authors, who had a powerful style witnessed by the history of thoughts. He occasionally resorted to humour to express his opinions. His most important article in this sense is “The Petition of Wax Producers”. The whole Turkish text of this article can be found in the website of the Association for Liberal Thinking. [www.liberal.org.tr](http://www.liberal.org.tr)

(8) Powell, op. cit., pp. 256-257.

(9) Frederic Bastiat, *Law (Hukuk)*, translated by Yıldırım Arsan, Ankara: LDT, 1998.

(10) F. Bastiat, “Protectionism and Communism”, op. cit., pp. 198-199.

(11) Atilla Yayla, *Siyaset Teorisine Giriş (Introduction to Liberalism)*, Ankara: Siyasal Kitabevi, 1998. For a weak and ingenuous, native version of democratic socialism, which demonstrates that some socialists did not learn any lessons from all these experiences, see Sadun Aren, “Değişme, Küreselleşme ve Sosyalizm”, *Cogito*, No. 31, Spring 2001, pp. 59-67.

- (12) Roger Scruton, A Dictionary of Political Thought, London: Macmillan, 1986, p. 187.
- (13) Blundell, op. cit., p. 94.
- (14) "Charles Rowley'le Mülakat", Piyasa, No. 3, Summer 2002.
- (15) Blundell, op. cit., pp. 21-22.
- (16) Blundell, op. cit., p. 30.
- (17) Blundell, op. cit., pp. 29-30.
- (18) Blundell, op. cit., p. 22.
- (19) Blundell, op. cit., p. 36.
- (20) A short, but nice article on the meaninglessness and absurdity of the claim that the roots of thoughts are outside the country has been written by Gülay Göktürk. "Kökü Dışarıda", Sabah, 17 July 2002.
- (21) A newspaper article I read recently was highly progressive. The author explained his uneasiness about the descriptions such as "Liberal Islam" and "Socialist Islam" (I am myself not happy about them) and continued as follows: "You see that they try to do some things on behalf of Islam and Muslims. Socialists and liberals try to make use of Islam since their ideologies are not sufficient." I can understand the mentality of the author. But, perhaps, the opposite is true. Cannot it be that some other things need to be added to Islam since Islam is not sufficient, for example it cannot answer some questions answered by ideologies?
- (22) George Roche, Free Markets, Free Men, The Hillsdale College Pres, 1993, p. 151.
- (23) Roche, op. cit., p. 155.
- (24) Mark Skousen, The Making of Modern Economics, New York: M. E. Sharpe, p. 351.
- (25) Atilla Yayla, Liberalizm, Ankara: Liberte Yayınevi, 2000.
- (26) Hayek, Kölelik Yolu.
- (27) Blundell, op. cit., p. 36.
- (28) Ralph Raico, "Kapitalizm ve Tarihçiler", translated by Niyazi Tanılır, Piyasa, No. 1, (Winter 2002), p. 75.