

The Influence of the Ancient Roman Philosophy on the “Secular Economic Mentality”

Levent Coşkun Erkekoğlu, Marmara University, Turkey
İpek Madi, Marmara University, Turkey

The European Conference on Ethics, Religion & Philosophy 2016
Official Conference Proceedings

Abstract

A “secular economic man” compares the enjoyments and the material benefits with the costs and his exertions. He strives to maximize his enjoyments and minimize the exertions. That ethos is derived from the Ancient Age Philosophy.

The literature for economics accepts that the liberal economic doctrine is based on the Natural Law Philosophy. And the Natural Law Philosophy stands to the Ancient Pagan world view. According to this thought, in the Universe there is natural order. Economic life is a part of the natural order; and the order is not relating to God; individual benefit (self-interest) is the core of the system.

If human aims mostly to pursue his desires, if his ambition controls his preferences; then preventing him from being disloyal or wicked becomes virtually impossible. He would exploit the society in service of his own desires. It is easy to realize that there is no ethical mechanism in this ethos to prevent cruelty. Moreover, it arises from “strong always crush the weak” principle. Thus, justice, according to that mentality, lines up with power, not with the Truth, Right. It can be said that “secular economic mentality” does not have a protective shield for lie, deceit, corruption, skulduggery, insidiousness, etc., hence for sinfulness. “The enjoyments/pleasures/hedonistic alternatives and the consumption” are in fact the testing of the human. And, another important issue is that the human is tested with the devils.

Keywords: Justice, Christianity, Islam, Secular Economics

iafor

The International Academic Forum
www.iafor.org

Introduction

From The Risale-i Nur (“a true commentary on the Qur’an” (Nursî, *The Rays*, 2013, p. 312), Collection:

“O man! You should be aware that there are certain phrases which are commonly used and imply unbelief. The believers also use them, but without realizing their implications. We shall explain three of the most important of them.

The First: “Causes create this.”

The Second: “It forms itself; it comes into existence and later ceases to exist.”

The Third: “It is natural; nature necessitates and creates it.”” (Nursî, 2009, p.233).

We, in this study, are concerned with the relation of the influence of “the foundation stones of the unbelief” (Nursî, 2009 p. 232) on the *justice* (in the belief of *Tawhid* [“The True Christianity” and Islam]) and the “secular economic mentality”. (We referred to The Risale-i Nur to The New Testament, and to The Gospel of Barnabas.)

An Evaluation of the Influence of the Enlightenment and the Naturalist Philosophy on the Economics In Terms Of the *Individual* and the *Universe*¹

The “secular economic mentality” views economic life as a part of the *natural order*; and *the order is not relating to God*; individual benefit is the core of the system. (Erkekoğlu, 2015, p.161). *The Invisible Hand is the “emotion of benefit (self-interest)”*. Adam Smith considered that economic harmonies were not the acts of God but of the individual. (*Genel Ekonomi Ansiklopedisi*, 1988, p.223, 348). Adam Smith who claimed that if it is harmonized with the *natural laws*, “the society will perform *itself optimally*”, gave his work “in the period immediately before the Industrial Revolution”. According to him, when every individual pursues his own interest, “he is involuntarily directed also for the benefit of the society, by an *invisible hand*”. By doing so, “he causes a greater social benefit than that would become when he acted to protect the social benefit”. For him, “it is the natural order of the society where every individual can acquire maximum profit for himself”. Kazgan (2004) explained that for Bentham who replaced Naturalist Philosophy with Utilitarianism, “in fact, he did not do anything else apart from causing a new explanation of the past principles of liberalism”. She also stated that Bentham’s thought had its basis from the Enlightenment and that he took the idea that “the individual is a machine seeking happiness with reason”. Moreover, she said that the period of the Enlightenment, in terms of human happiness, had *equated goodness with its utility* for the ethical behavior. (Erkekoğlu, 2015,p. 128-130; Kazgan, 2004 , p. 58-60). According to the Enlightenment economists: There is natural order in the universe; life is conducted by natural laws not by laws of human being; human being should not interfere to this order, (*laissez-faire*). (Kaya, 2000, p. 26-27.; Erkekoğlu, 2015, p.127) “According to the Enlightenment mentality, only the *reason* can provide all the available information about the human being, the society, the nature and the universe...” (Porter, 2001, p.2).

The period between the 16th and 18th centuries had been lived as “a deviation process from the Christianity”. Positive sciences had supported the foundation of the mentality of this process which had been its basis. The new religion produced by the positive science and the

¹ This title is cited from the Doctoral Dissertation of Erkekoğlu, (2015), p.134.

² 15th century is also included in this process

reason was “ideology”. *Natural sciences* and *natural order* have been considered as a “model” in the social sciences with a tendency towards “the superiority of *the reason over the Christianity, adoring the human* instead of *the belief in God*”. The following mentality, “*a big fish swallows a little fish*”, has been considered as a law for “the organization of the *natural order* in the society”. Laissez-faire has been the reflection of this mentality’s principle to Economics. (Tabakoğlu, 2005, p.7, 10-11; Tabakoğlu, 2008, p. 22-23; Erkekoğlu, 2015, p. 134,137). The mentality of that period of deviation had phased in 18th Century- European Enlightenment, Renaissance, Naturalist Philosophy, and in some movements during the Middle Age of which the thoughts had been at the basis of Ancient Age Philosophy, i.e. The Schools of The Cynics and Kyrene (Stoics and Epicureans). Their common characteristic is that “they had developed an irreligious life”. (Erkekoğlu, 2015, p.ii, 134-135). After the 19th century, an approval that the centre of the human belief is “reason”, caused the definition of homo economicus (in 1848, by J.S. Mill, *Essays on some Unsettled Questions of Political Economy*). The economic doctrines produced by the Liberalist or the Materialist mentalities (Classical economics or Marxist economics) from the Darwinian and Pantheist principles, continued during the 19th century. (Erkekoğlu, 2015, p.135). In the 20th century, the economic theories had included hyperrational human assumptions, complex modeling and were extremely mathematical. Economics had been mainly dominated by Mathematics and Evolutionary Biology. (Eren, 2011, p. 32-37). For John Stuart Mill, “the behavior of the human being is approximately related to the predictions of the results and to the motives superior to pure animal instincts.” (Mill, 1885, p. 134). Many examples given by Mill include practices that can be called as Lamarckian character development: Rational choices preferred by one generation preset the next generations to strenghten similar choices. In the 19th century, J.B. de Monet Lamarck claimed that structural changes in animals or plants can be induced by the environment. In addition, he claimed that later those are genetically conducted to prospective generations. (Persky, 1995, p.223, 227). In the 21st century, the view for the natural human, in parallel with Pantheist mentality, who lives for ready benefit and maximum hédoné by relying on his reason, being independent of religious belief but dependent on nature, has continued. However, economists have begun to make human assumptions as hyperrational, semirational (partly rational) also. (Erkekoğlu, 2015, p. 136). Eren (2011) noted that in the 21st century, the Mainstream economics’ assumptions which *do not reflect the truth* have been discussed. Moreover, New economics refers to a process by which economics is treated with its advances and different fields affecting eachother. (p.18). “Secular economic mentality”, assumes for human: rationality, egotism and nonsatiation (three axioms out of six); respectively, “preferring the option which brings utility for himself”; “preferring the option which brings utility only for himself”; “always preferring more over less even if having obtained the amount adequate for himself (Madi, 2014,p.112-115) (“*covetousness*”)”. This mentality is based on *individualism* and *materialistic hedonism* principles of the Pagan ideas of the Ancient age philosophy. (Madi, 2015, p.145).

“The secular economic man/homo economicus” optimizes (the word “optimum” comes from Latin language and Iuppiter Optimus Maximus (“For the Ancient Romans no assembly could be started without having taken the approval of Iuppiter Optimus Maximus.” Aşkit, 2009, p. 52.) was a pagan god of the Ancient Roman pagans...) which means he chooses the best among alternatives. Homo economicus maximizes the pleasures and enjoyments of his life in this world. Hedonism and individualism arose in Ancient Age, at Rome and Greece; in those movements *self-interest and egoism* are essential. (Madi, 2014, p.4).Those mentalities were

influenced by Stoicism and Epicurism philosophies (Selik, 1980, p.39-43; Erkekoğlu, 2015, p.80-81)³:

- a. Human being discovering the laws of the universe by trusting only reason, should live with respect to the *nature*, he must not be loyal to the state or to God. He must live freedom strictly.
- b. Human being ought to use his mind in order to find pleasure in life, he must not be dependent on the outside entities.
- c. It was Stoicism which has propounded “natural laws” for the first time in the economic doctrines.
- d. “Hedonism” rising in Epicurism considered leading a happy life as “having minimum pain and maximum pleasure”. Phenomena in the universe come into existence with respect to certain laws. Belief in supernatural powers has been described as “futile delusion”.
- e. It can be said that “the Pantheist natural order mentality of the Stoic idea is the *stone* of the liberal economic doctrine in which is inherent the Natural Law Philosophy”. (Madi, 2014, p. 5).

In the Ancient Rome, when the urban-rural stability was destroyed, economic depression proceeded. Meanwhile, Epicurean philosophy became influential in the Roman thought. Epicurean movement appeared towards the end of the Greek Age when the city life had lost its integrationist effect. An idea that “the individual does not need the city for a virtuous life” gained strength. A tendency towards leaving the social life caused “individualist” and materialist mentalities” to improve. The thought that “mankind should aim individual pleasures which would satisfy him instead of social and religious principles” became influential. Hédoné/enjoyment from individual goals was preferred over the pleasures from the social goals and political and ethical responsibilities. (Yalçın, 1976, p.91). For Epicureans, the ultimate aim of the life is achieving “happiness”. Mankind should seek for the line of happiness. But without true knowledge there cannot be a true action, the former is the *donnée* for senses; the latter is the perception of *hédoné* (pleasure) and pain. Mankind should get rid of the fears of God and death. (Epicuros).(Kaliç, 2013, p. 48-49). For Epicureans, philosophy can make people internalize that “everything is related to the natural causes”. A person who lives the situation “of not being hungry, thirsty, not feeling cold” and expects that he could be so in the future, can compete with the biggest god in happiness.” (Gökberk, 1974, p.104-108). The Stoic thought appeared in the Greeks, had many supporters especially in Rome such as Cicero, Epiktetos, Seneca and Marcus Aurelius Antonius. (Karagöz, 2009,p.104-106). Cicero and Seneca were two of the most famous philosophers of Ancient Rome (Dürüşken, 2013, p.126)⁴, tended to Stoics. For Seneca, a wise person is the real master of the universe, fearless, whose virtue is his freewill. (Kaliç, 2013, p. 51, 52). For Stoic thought, wisdom is provided by the natural order. This thought supports Pantheistic idea. (Yalçın, 1976, 91-93).

In the Canonical Gospels, Saint Barnabas is not stated as Apostle. As it appears from “Acts”, Paul met Epicurean and Stoic philosophers in Greece. Barnabas, always following Tawhid, believed in Jesus Christ (PUH) a Prophet of Islam, and had written his Gospel before “the

³ The listing (of a.,b.,c.,d., e., is formed for this work); a.,b.,c.,d., are from the same resources)

⁴ “Praeclari Philosophi Philosophiae Romanae (Prominent philosophers of the Roman Philosophy): Boethius, Titus Lucretius Carus, Epictetus, Seneca, Marcus Aurelius, Marcus Tullius Cicero, Aurelius Augustinus”

Canonical Bibles” were written.(*Barnabas İncili*, 2009, p. 39,49,51). From the Risale-i Nur Collection, “; “So, it is because the philosophy which does not obey the line of religion thus lost its way, that the ‘I’ took the reins into its own hands and ran into all sorts of misguidance. And out of the ‘I’ that was in this position, a tree of Zaqqum sprang forth and engulfed more than half of mankind. Thus, in the branch of power of animal appetites of that tree, the fruits it has presented to mankind are idols and goddesses. Because, according to the principles of philosophy, power is approved. “Might is right” is the norm, even. It says, “All power to the strongest.” “The winner takes all,” and, “In power there is right.” {Footnote: The principle of prophethood says: “Power is in right; right is not in power.” It thus halts tyranny and ensures justice.}It has given moral support to tyranny, encouraged despots, and urged oppressors to claim divinity.”(Nursî, *The Words*, 2013, p. 562-563).

Is A Heaven Withinside “The Secular Rational Economic Men” Possible?

Those who claim that “improving egotism is essential for the individual”, propound that the individual will enjoy the happiness should he interest extremely with himself once (Kirschner, 1996), p. 17-18, 23-25). For Adam Smith, when the individual aims his own interest, he will serve the social interest so that even if he would do so consciously he could not serve insomuch. (Zeytinoğlu, 1981, p.41). “From absolute goodness comes forth goodness, and from the Possessor of Absolute Beauty comes forth beauty. So too nothing devoid of purpose can emerge from the Possessor of Absolute Wisdom.” (Nursî, *The Words*, 2013, p. 97). However, human can make ugly with his freewill. A person will affect the social outcome negatively if he prefers an alternative which provides utility only for himself “with a purpose of improving his egotism and taking an advantage”.(Erkekoğlu, 2015, p. 166).

Kazgan (2004) explained that “*what it has to be* and *what actually is* are confused”; also she claimed that the market models desired to be formed with perfect competition conditions were based in order to explain “what it has to be really” i.e. achieving the maximum for the social wellbeing. The conditions which “*really exist*” were different; moreover, liberal economics with this method of rationality has not seeked “what it has to be” had existed just how and has confused one with the other; and “*a belief that a heaven can be generated in a world with rational humanbeings, has become prevalent*”.(p.56).

Erkekoğlu (2015) showed that “*a heaven is not generated with rational humanbeings*” with the following example (simply with a standart game): Below a game is represented with a table, in which there are two players called 1st secular economic man and 2nd secular economic man, each “preferring the alternative which provides utility only for himself, preferring always more over less even having obtained the amount adequate for himself”; therefore they are egoistic, rational and nonsatiated (covetous) individuals⁵. Two options are offered for each player who makes their preferences without knowing each other’s choices. At the beginning, their economic conditions are assumed as “having wealth and capital abundantly”. The offerings are as follows: “Two doors exist. If you open the first one, only

⁵ A rational economic man “prefers the option which brings *utility for himself*”. An egoistic economic man “prefers the option which brings *utility only for himself*”. In fact, *egotism is the core* for the type of behavior for the homo economicus.

you will be in a Heaven but the persons with whom you have been living will go to the Hell. The other door provides nothing for you (your conditions will not change) but the other people with whom you have been living will go to Heaven.” (In this game, it is assumed that there is not a penalty for the cruel characteristics which choose Heaven for themselves and throw the others to the Hell!) Both players are unaware from each other’s preference and from the outcomes (gain or loss) of each other’s preferences; however, they know that each will affect the other’s situation and preference. Also, for example, if the first player chooses Heaven for himself while the second chooses Hell for the first player, then the outcome for the first player is nothing; i.e. zero gain. (p.169).

Accordingly: 1st rational economic man and the 2nd rational economic man would prefer the option which “provides maximum satisfaction/satiation”. 1st egoistic economic man and the 2nd egoistic economic man would prefer the option which “provides maximum satiation only for themselves”. 1st nonsatiated economic man and the 2nd nonsatiated economic man would prefer “always more over less even if they have got the sufficient amount for themselves”. (Erkekoğlu, 2015, p.169.)

<p>Left side-outcome: payoff of the “ 2nd secular economic man”</p> <p>Right side-outcome : payoff of the 1st secular economic man</p>	1 st secular economic man’s strategies		
2 nd Secular Economic Man’s strategies		Nothing for me, Heaven for the others	Heaven for me, Hell for the others
	Nothing for me, Heaven for the others	Heaven; Heaven	Hell; Heaven
	Heaven for me, Hell for the others	Heaven; Hell	0;0

Table 1: 1st secular economic man and the 2nd secular economic man⁶

By analyzing the table, it can be said for the 2nd secular economic man the following: He will choose Heaven for himself irregardless of what the 1st secular economic man chooses. If he makes a sacrifice (indeed, the sacrifice is nothing but giving up the Heaven although he has got the sufficient wealth and capital for living) and chooses nothing for himself; it is certain that 1st secular economic man “will always choose Heaven instead of zero for himself” since “as a course of his nature (!)” he is egoistic, rational and nonsatiated (covetous). Also 2nd secular economic man caused by his own egotism, rationality and nonsatiation, will choose the option which “provides utility i.e. Heaven for himself-*rationality*”, which “provides utility only for himself i.e. if he is in the Heaven but even the 2nd secular economic man burns in the Hell, he will choose being in the Heaven-*egotism*”, will always prefer more over less

⁶ The Table is from the Doctoral Dissertation of Erkekoğlu, 2015, p. 170.

even if he has got the sufficient amount i.e. if he chooses zero for himself (his conditions do not change) by knowing that there is a possibility to maximize the social benefit; however it is not important for such a one (also there is a probability that if 1st secular economic man chooses Heaven for himself, he (2nd) will go to the Hell inasmuch as “life is a struggle with regard to law of nature, the method is being the strong, being strong is possible with rationality, the rational is the winner, in this struggle for survival ‘as a course of human nature (!)’ maximum satiation is obtained by improving egotism in order to survive, thus there is no other way than ‘the strong crush the weak’”) therefore he will choose Heaven for himself-*nonsatiation*. (Erkekoğlu, 2015, p. 170).

Since the method of thinking of the 1st secular economic man is not different from the 2nd, his type of behavior and his decision process are the same. The Nash equilibrium (Jehle and Reny (2000) explained for Nash equilibrium that it is “the most common concept of noncooperative equilibrium”. Every economic actor “must be doing the very best” he can, given the actions of all other actors (p. 160)) for this game is “Heaven for me, Hell for the others; Heaven for me, Hell for the others”; the pay-offs are “0;0”. (Erkekoğlu, 2015, p. 170).

In accordance with egotism, rationality and nonsatiation, unconcern for a situation in which even somebody else dies (even that person goes to Hell), maximum satiation for himself in a situation in which even somebody else dies (even that person goes to Hell), covetousness in a situation in which even somebody else dies (even that person goes to Hell), are some results that can be seen in this representative game. Finally, it is clear that *a naturalistic and materialistic belief of the “secular economic mentality” as “a heaven can be generated in a world with rational humanbeings” is not true*. (Erkekoğlu, 2015, p. 171).

Moreover, it is clear that egoistic, rational and nonsatiated individuals’ behaviors “do not naturally restore the social interest to an optimum condition”. Since here (in this game), the solution which can be defined as socially optimum (the best solution) is the preference of “Nothing for me, Heaven for the others” which brings the payoffs “Heaven; Heaven” (certainly be preferred by the true believers of God !). Also it is certain that no method could provide this equilibrium (the best solution for the society) with “the assumption of egoistic, rational and nonsatiated nature of human”. (Erkekoğlu, 2015, p. 172.)

About “Justice” in “True Christianity” and Islam, and “True Rationality”:

From The Risale-i Nur Collection: “Fifth Satanic Stratagem: “Truly, egotism man’s most dangerous vein. It is his weakest vein, too. They can make people do terrible things by encouraging it.”; ... “In any event, the service of the Qur’an around which we are gathered does not accept the ‘I’, it requires the ‘we’. It says: “Don’t say ‘I’, say ‘we’.”” (Nursî, *The Letters*, 2010, p. 488).

“All the believers were one in heart and mind. No one claimed that any of his possessions was his own, but they shared everything they had.” (New Testament, Acts 4: 32); “To the Jews who had believed him, Jesus said, “If you hold to my teaching, you are really my disciples. *Then you will know the truth, and the truth will set you free.*” (New Testament, John 8: 31-32).

We propose the following “justice” from The Risale-i Nur. It is explained by two parts: Pure justice and relative justice.

“Pure Justice: “the rights of an innocent man cannot be cancelled for the sake of all the people. An individual may not be sacrificed for the good of all. In the view of Almighty God’s compassion, right is right, there is no difference between great and small. The small may not be annulled for the great. Without his consent, the life and rights of an individual may not be sacrificed for the good of the community. If he consents to sacrifice them in the name of patriotism, that is a different matter.

As for relative justice, a particular is sacrificed for the good of the universal; the rights of an individual are disregarded in the face of the community. The attempt is made to apply a sort of relative justice as the lesser of two evils. But if it is possible to apply pure justice, to apply relative justice is wrong and may not be undertaken.” (Nursî, *The Letters*, 2010, p. 71).

Similarly, from The Gospel of Barnabas,: “Then, the scribes and Pharisees being assembled, Jesus said to them: 'Tell me: if one of you had an hundred sheep, and should lose one of them, would you not go to seek it, leaving the ninety and nine?’” (Chapter 201).

We understand that “Justice is with Compassion”. Not the compassion of the human, but The Compassion of Almighty God... If human pities accordingly, it will be “true compassion”...From The Risale-i Nur Collection: “For those who freely consent to indulge in harmful actions may not be pitied. They are not worthy of it.” (Nursî, *The Words*, 2013, p. 160).

Thus, for a “true rationality”: one must not prefer the option which is harmful/damaging (evil) for himself (and for the public), and one should prefer the auspiciousness/benefaction; the alternatives which meet the requirements (legal and allowed by religion).

From The Risale-i Nur: “...all immorality and instability in the social life of man proceeds from two sources:

The First: “Once my stomach is full, what do I care if others die of hunger?”

The Second: “You work, and I’ll eat.””(Nursî, *The Letters*, 2010, p.319).

According to “the secular economic mentality”, meeting totally the requirement of one person and victimizing the others can be considered as “rational and efficient since a utility in the market is created...” Therefore, “a true rationality” may provide us a welfare and happiness in this world and thereafter. Our aim is not rendering the world to the best-living mode or style; but our aim is *to save both this life and our lives in the Heaven*.

Conclusion

Erkekoğlu (2015) explained that homo economicus or “the secular economic man” does not have a belief in the hereafter and his entire aim is maximum and ready worldly (secular) benefit (p.133,215). Madi (2014) stated that the human assumption of the “secular economics” originates in Darwinian view; i.e. “*strong always crush the weak by struggling in order to survive*” (p. 128). Homo economicus struggles for ready and maximum interest.

Thus, there is nothing to limit this individual's satiation in this world. It is certain that maintaining justice is impossible with the mentality principles of which the human assumption is "secular".

Islamic world view considers "Power is in right (Nursî, *The Words*, 2013, p. 563)", by ensuring the justice. In the Islamic mentality, the individual's aim is not to maximize his self-interest; but "achieving high morality with compassion" is important. It is essential to live in peace and brotherhood, not to struggle with each other. The aim is not self-satisfaction by improving egotism, but to live for God's sake. For this, the principle is to cooperate, to support each other and to help each other. It is essential for the strong to protect and support the weak. "The secular economic mentality's principles for the individual are contrary to "the Islamic economic doctrine", to "the True Christian economic doctrine" as well; since: "Let no man seek his own, but every man another's wealth." (*New Testament*, 1 Corinthians 10:24,); "Whereupon, there came to him a doctor! saying: 'Master what must I do to have eternal life?' Jesus answered: 'How is it written in the law?' The temper answered, saying: 'Love the Lord thy God and thy neighbour. Thou shalt love thy God above all things with all thy heart and thy mind, and thy neighbour as thyself.' Jesus answered: 'Thou hast answered well: therefore go and do thou so, I say, and thou shalt have eternal life.'" (*The Gospel of Barnabas*, Chapter 30) "Prefer your brothers' souls to your own soul in honour, rank, acclaim, and in the things your soul enjoys like material benefits, and even in such innocent, harmless benefits as informing a needy believer about one of the fine truths of belief." (Nursî, *The Flashes* (Revised 2009 edition), The Twenty-First Flash, p. 217). In Islam and in the "True Christianity", based on the belief of *Tawhid*, the principle is that the parts of integrity should support each other's wellbeing. The principles of integration, of union are from the belief in One and Only One God, Allah. (Erkekoğlu, 2015, p. 148).

Therefore, Christians and Muslims should unite against deifying the economic means (and the nature, the causes, any idols etc.) which are the testings of the mankind. Naturalistic and materialistic (and all thoughts implying unbelief) mentalities of the "secular economics" cannot provide happiness neither in this world nor hereafter, certainly.

References

Aşkit, Ç. (Ağustos, Eylül, Ekim 2009). Tanrılarla Barış İçinde Yaşamak, *Doğu Batı Düşünce Dergisi* (Romalılar II, Yıl: 11, Sayı: 50), Kızılay/ Ankara: Doğu Batı Yayınları.

Barnabas İncili (8. Baskı), (2009). (M. Yıldız, Trans.), İstanbul: Elif Kitabevi.

Dürüşken, Ç. (2013). *Felsefecilere Özel Latince/Descartes Latince Öğreniyor*, İstanbul: Alfa Basım Yayım Dağıtım San. Ve Tic. Ltd. Şti..

Eren, E. (2011). “Yeni” İktisatta Ortak Noktalar, *İktisatta Yeni Yaklaşımlar* (1. Baskı), İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Erkekoğlu, L.E. (2015). *Seküler İktisadi Doktrinin Eleştirisi Çerçevesinde Ortadoğu-İslam Toplumunda Ekonomik Entegrasyonun Esasları*, Doktora Tezi, İstanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi, Ortadoğu ve İslam Ülkeleri Araştırmaları Enstitüsü.

Genel Ekonomi Ansiklopedisi (Cilt 1), (Mart 1988). Hazırlatan: Akbank, Basım: Milliyet Tesisleri.

Gökberk, M. (Aralık 1974). *Felsefe Tarihi* (Üçüncü Basım), İstanbul: Bilgi Yayınevi.

Jehle G. A. & Reny P. J. (2000). *Advanced Microeconomic Theory* (2nd ed.), Addison Wesley.

Kaliç, S. (Mart 2013), *100 Büyük Düşünür* (3. Baskı), İstanbul: Maya Kitap.

Karagöz, H. (Ağustos, Eylül, Ekim 2009). “Stoisyen Düşüncenin Roma Hukukuna Etkisi ve Doğal Hukuk (Ius Naturale) Anlayışı”, *Doğu Batı Düşünce Dergisi* (Romalılar II Yıl:11, Sayı:50), Kızılay/ Ankara: Doğu Batı Yayınları.

Kaya, Y. (2000). *Aydınlanma Çağı ve Felsefesi* (1. Baskı), İstanbul: Tıglat Matbaacılık.

Kazgan, G. (Haziran 2004). *İktisadi Düşünce veya Politik İktisadın Evrimi* (11. Basım), İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.

Kirschner, J. (Kasım 1996), *Egoist Olma Sanatı*, (A. Arıtan& S. Günay, Trans.) İstanbul: Arıtan Yayınevi.

Madi, İ. (Spring 2015). Homo Economicus’un Doyumsuzluk-“Açgözlülük” Aksiyomunun Semavi Dinler Perspektifinden Değerlendirmesi (Evaluation On the Nonsatiation-“Covetousness” Axiom of Homo Economicus According to Divine Religions”), *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi (Electronic Journal of Social Sciences)* (Volume 14, Issue 53), (pp.145-163).

Madi, İ. (2014). *Ortadoğu Dinleri Açısından Homo Economicus ’un Analizi*, Doktora Tezi, Marmara Üniversitesi, İstanbul: Ortadoğu Araştırmaları Enstitüsü.

Mill, J.S., (1885). *Principles of Political Economy*, Abridged, with Critical, Bibliographical, and Explanatory Notes, and a Sketch of the History of Political Economy, By J. Laurence Laughlin, Ph. D. Assistant Professor of Political Economy in Harvard University, The Project Gutenberg EBook, Release Date: September 27, 2009 [Ebook 30107]

New Testament (New International Version), (1999 by International Bible Society). Turkish/English, İstanbul: Kitabı Mukaddes Şirketi.

Nursî, S. (reprinted with corrections 2014). *The Letters* (New Edition 2010), (Ş. Vahide & others Trans. from the ‘Mektûbat’), İstanbul: Sözlere Publications.

Nursî, S. (2013). *The Rays* (Revised edition), (Ş. Vahide Trans. from the Turkish ‘Şuâlar’), İstanbul: Sözlere Publications.

Nursî, S. (March 2013). *The Words* (New Edition), (Sözlere İngilizce Tercümesi, Trans.) İstanbul: Sözlere Publications.

Persky, J. (Spring 1995). Retrospectives: The Ethology of Homo Economicus, *Journal of Economic Perspectives* (Volume 9, Number 2), (pp. 221–231).

Porter, R. (2001). *The Enlightenment* (Second Edition), G.Britain: Palgrave Macmillan, First Published.

Selik, M. (Şubat 1980), *100 Soruda İktisadi Doktrinler Tarihi* (3. Baskı), Gerçek Yayınevi.

Tabakoğlu, A. (Ekim 2008). “İslam İktisadı”na Giriş, İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları.

Tabakoğlu, A. (Kasım 2005). *Toplu Makaleler II İslam İktisadı*, İstanbul: Kitabevi.

Yalçın A. (1976). *İktisadi Doktrinler ve Sistemler Tarihi*, Ankara: Ayyıldız Matbaası A.Ş..

Zeytinoğlu, E. (1981). *Ekonomik Sistemler*, İstanbul: İ.İ.T.İ.A. Ekonomi Fakültesi Yayınları.

Nursî, S., “The Twenty-First Flash”, *The Risale-i Nur Collection, The Flashes (Revised 2009 edition)*, p. 217, Retrieved from:
[http://www.nur.gen.tr/en.html#leftmenu=Risale&maincontent=Risale&islem=read&KitapId=494&BolumId=8748&KitapAd=The+Flashes+\(Revised+2009+edition\)&Page=217](http://www.nur.gen.tr/en.html#leftmenu=Risale&maincontent=Risale&islem=read&KitapId=494&BolumId=8748&KitapAd=The+Flashes+(Revised+2009+edition)&Page=217)

Nursî, S., “The Twenty-First Flash” *The Risale-i Nur Collection, The Flashes (Revised 2009 edition)*, p. 232, Retrieved from:
<http://www.nur.gen.tr/en.html#leftmenu=Risale&maincontent=Risale&islem=read&BolumId=8750&KitapId=494&KitapAd=The+Flashes+%28Revised+2009+edition%29>

Nursî, S., “The Twenty-First Flash”, *The Risale-i Nur Collection, The Flashes (Revised 2009 edition)*, p. 233, Retrieved from:
<http://www.nur.gen.tr/en.html#leftmenu=Risale&maincontent=Risale&islem=read&BolumId=8750&KitapId=494&KitapAd=The+Flashes+%28Revised+2009+edition%29>

“Acts 4: 32”, *New Testament*, Retrieved from: <http://incil.info/kitab/act/4>

“1 Corinthians 10:24”, *New Testament*, Retrieved from: <http://incil.info/kitab/co1/10>

“30: Eternal Life”, *The Gospel of Barnabas*, Retrieved from:
<http://barnabas.net/index.php/chapters/422-chapter-30-eternal-life>

“John 8: 31-32”, *New Testament*, Retrieved from: <http://incil.info/kitab/joh/8>

“201: The Woman Taken in Adultery” *The Gospel of Barnabas*, Retrieved from:
<http://barnabas.net/index.php/chapters/389-201the-women-taken-in-adultery>

Contact email: yeniekonomist@yahoo.com

Contact email: r.ipekmadi@gmail.com