



2687-5640

PREMIUM E-JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

Yıl / Year : 2021
Cilt / Volume : 5
Sayı / Issue : 14
ss / pp : 292 -304

<http://dx.doi.org/10.37242/pejoss.2140>
Araştırma Makalesi / Research Article
Makale Geliş / Received : 19.05.2021
Yayınlama / Published : 30.06.2021

Dr. İpek MADİ

Marmara Üniversitesi Ortadoğu ve İslam Ülkeleri Araştırmaları Enstitüsü, İstanbul/Türkiye

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7836-9885>

A CRITIQUE ON SOME NATURALISTIC PHILOSOPHERS' DOCTRINES OF POLITICAL ECONOMICS-ADAM SMITH

Abstract

The mentality of “naturalistic atheism” for political and economic lives considers- due *natural law philosophy* or assumption of *necessitating of nature*-oppression (like exploitation) as if it is natural, rational or righteous, for this mentality non-egoistic and materially powerless individuals have not completed their *stage of evolution* as Darwinist theories claimed and exploitation provides utility for the oppressors. The reason is that “naturalistic political economic thought” declares “*life is conflict*” for social-economic lives.

Philosophers of “naturalistic political economic thought” have considered the order in the universe as *it forms itself*; a false comprehension and misguidance. Adam Smith, a naturalistic and *enlightened* (i.e. illuminatus) philosopher, used the term “Invisible Hand” to express a “naturalistic order” for economic life. He claimed that human addresses *his own self-interest* and not to others’ humanity but to their *self-love*. That suggestion is based on declaration of several assumptions such as “*natural enmity of social bodies*” which include many numerous contradictions.

Considering his *self-interest as the lord over everything* has driven mankind to a lowest degree as accepting abasement for some level of utility. While satisfying his greed, that *naturalistic human* (of “naturalistic political economic doctrines”) attacks the economic rights of the weak, the poor and cancels every one’s right for his own benefit and ambition.

The incoherence and unreasoning consequences of foundation stones behind “*invisible hand*” and its derivatives in Political Economics can be proved by referring to fundamentals of Christianity and Islamic economic doctrines.

Key Words: Invisible Hand, Economics, Natural Law, Doctrine, Religion.

1. Introduction

Mankind desires to reach happiness in family life, social and economic life etc. Besides, human desires “happiness of others” if he is “human”. Because a fortunate man is happy at both his own joy and that of all the others ¹. Respect, compassion, public order, security and mutual confidence, economic stability, frugality, brotherhood, (true) justice and balance,

¹ The comment is made by referring to the following sources: Nursî, *The Words*, 2013:27.

cleanliness, mutual assistance are some of what human innate dispositions desire to reach happiness for himself and others. Innate dispositions of mankind demand the opposite of what the Naturalistic and Materialistic mentalities suggest in social life, due to their consideration of “natural law” in social-economic life. For instance, Hobbesian view suggests: *homo homini lupus* (Gökberk, 1974: 293). Based on Naturalistic view of social life, human is considered self-interested, self-centered, egoistic, conceited, and pessimistic. Then, everyone is enemy for him².

Some philosophers supposed as brilliant continued on a way of considering universe and human (hence social, political and economic lives), corruptively affecting well-being, welfare, happiness in social, political and economic lives. “They could not have seen its reality”; “those who called everything their corrupted minds could not reach a superstition, who were using Nature to justify unbelief” (Nursî, *The Flashes*, 2011: 232).

Economic life concern is on managing limited resources in societies. i.e. managing the balance of people desires. Whether the way of managing is made by planning or it performs freely; with scarcity and unlimited desires of mankind, the issue cannot be solved only by measuring, calculating or writing over-scientific models on Economics. As economic life is a part of politics (since politics means the art of managing society), and society is made of individuals, the way of managing cannot be value-free. All managing are based on certain mentalities.

In social, political and economic lives, Naturalistic view of universe and human i.e. a doctrine based on the view “*necessitating of Natural Law*” induces corruptive consequences for society and mankind. Natural law philosophy and the doctrines relying on it such as Liberal or Socialist doctrine have not provided any happiness to societies and never can.

2. Fundamentals of Naturalistic Philosophers’ Doctrines on Human and Economic Life

Main fundamentals of Naturalistic economic doctrines are the following:

- i. Life is conflict, a wild survival and rivalry,
- ii. human reason conducts all behavior, human reason /rationality is defined in terms of seeking benefit and utility in all preferences,
- iii. egoistic human nature in terms of preferring maximum utility only for himself (self-centeredness, self-interestedness) /economic activities should maximize self-interest
- iv. everyone is the master/judge of himself (conceitedness),
- v. covetous human nature always preferring more over less (greed, ambition)
- vi. force brings right

Any behavior according to all above is behavior due *natural law* or *necessitating of nature*; for the success in economic life according to Materialistic mentality. For instance, exploitation may be rational (according to this view) for someone since it can provide utility for himself even it causes cost and pain to others. For “individual benefit” is assumed fundamental instead of “mutual benefit”.

In this supposedly naturalistic life, all individuals are supposed to struggle; by this way the strongest gets the biggest pie (or the entire). If other die of starvation (all individual requirements cannot be met, so society goes in struggle accordingly) it is not an issue for naturalistic human since his utility is created and satisfied (in a market). He behaves

² The comment is made by referring to the following sources: Nursî, *The Words*, 2013:27

according to rationality principle (of “Naturalistic economics”). He is supposed to survive in economic life due to his egotism. This wild rivalry and enmity is considered as “necessitating of nature”.

If evaluated in view of communities, such mentality induce negatively nationalist and racist policies; since essentials are not on mutual benefit i.e. are on a zero-sum game in which a complete destruction of others’ gains may be considered rational (as it may provide utility for some part) and natural.

For the Mercantilist period, as Sir Josiah Child suggested that «If the colony was compelled to trade only with home country, it would possible for production and employment to increase and in home country to obtain surplus.» For Child, colonies could be useful if only they were markets for home country; they may provide raw materials required to import from other countries and be source-country to maintain cheap labor. (Kazgan, 2004:45) Since this doctrine was on a goal of providing “greatest treasury only for home country” even if other countries’ means of production may be exploited (in accordance with “Naturalistic view of economic life”).

The mentality behind this is the “naturalistic atheism” such that the oppressed –if not egoistic and materially powerful-have not completed their *stage of evolution* as Darwinist theories claimed; so that for those who are oppressors it is considered rational, natural and righteous (as force brings right according to natural law) to exploit anything from others (the oppressed, the weak, the poor).

Thus, it is not possible to prove that this mentality does not induce grief, unkindness, destruction, hostility, oppression, imbalance and injustice for individuals and for society as a whole; or induce happiness of all; or maximize social welfare. Only a minority could have a transitory gain from their exploitation.

One of the unreasonable and contradictory aspects is the discussion of justice and fairness of policies based on *natural law*, in addition to assume impossible and invalid fundamentals above.

3. A Brief Critical Analysis on Inter-Contradictory Naturalistic Thoughts of Adam Smith on Social, Political and Economic Lives

Adam Smith was *illuminated* in Edinburgh (Smith, *Ahlaki Duygular Kuramı*, 2018:1). He met David Hume in 1750, with whom he had much common in views (https://www.philosophybasics.com/philosophers_smith.html) and as Heilbroner stated, Voltaire for whom he felt deeply respect (<https://www.britannica.com/biography/Adam-Smith>). He was introduced by Hume “the great literary salons of the French Enlightenment” (Heilbroner, <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Adam-Smith>). He came to know Jean D'Alembert, Claude Adrien Helvétius, Anne-Robert-Jacques Turgot, Benjamin Franklin, André Morellet and Francois Quesnay in Paris. (https://www.philosophybasics.com/philosophers_smith.html).

Smith rejected Christianity; there has been a common belief that he was a Deist, and “he even had a grudging respect for Hume's Atheism”. (https://www.philosophybasics.com/philosophers_smith.html). He stated that a deep shock for senses is the idea of being completely dead; a dead person faces a danger of being forgotten by all; the most powerful poison of happiness is the great fear towards death. (Smith, *Ahlaki Duygular Kuramı*, 2018:18-19).

Isaac Newton, in his writing *Mathematical Principles of Natural Philosophy*, defined a new “natural order of universe”. For his contemporaneous, John Locke, state’s duty was nothing

but practicing laws of nature; because for him laws of nature were superior to government's practices. Renaissance and Reform also had impacts on the rational and secular foundations for the explanation of social order, individual and social relations. It was on these foundations, a new comprehension about universe which functions by natural laws, mechanic order, provides balance between forces. A view of universe in which a balance, an order forms itself, had been controlling natural sciences such as physics, chemistry and biology. Same view later influenced comprehension of "state" by affecting Political theory. Adam Smith, in this framework, used *Wealth of Nations* to explain an order in economics. Every individual behaves according to his own sake in free market, as if an "Invisible Hand" guides them like in Newton's universe. Later neoclassicals such as Walras, Pareto claimed optimal conditions for market economy based on many assumptions. (Smith, *Milletlerin Zenginliđi*, 2016:x,xi,xii). Indeed, for any state with no Pareto optimal condition, concepts like market efficiency, rational prices, competitive market system based on free entrepreneurship *are meaningless*. Those make sense only if Neoclassical economists assume at first an existence of Pareto optimum; then, *by definition*, one can tell about the gain for everyone (participating), "efficient allocation of resources", "rational" prices etc. (Hunt and Lautzenheiser, 2016:555). Also basics for Pareto optimum is that "an optimal condition in which it is not possible to make an individual's position (according to his evaluation) better without making another individual's position worse (according to other individual's evaluation)". *If one corrects the terrible conditions of the oppressed, then the conditions of the oppressors get worse* (definitely according to oppressors' evaluation). For this, "natural enmity of social bodies" is a priori assumed. (Hunt and Lautzenheiser, 2016:559).

In fact, "*natural enmity of social bodies*" was a claim of Thomas Hobbes, as he claimed mechanic laws that could support social sciences; so that he proposed natural law rules for political life. (Stokes, 2018:132-134). (As cited in Erkekođlu, 2015: 97-98) Gökberk explained that he was materialistic in the sense according to him "everything was based on natural causes being always the same everywhere". For some, his thought corresponds with Darwin's movement in 19th century. For Hobbes, due to main motive for human behavior as "survival", human maximizes his benefit from nature. Therefore, "*bellum omnium contra omnes*"- (everyone is in struggle with another)- and "*homo homini lupus*"-(every individual is an enemy of the other; a man is a wolf to another man). Egoistic human nature is prone to protect "his survival", considers everything "good and ethical" accordingly. Gökberk, 1974: 288-294).

Smith claimed that unexpected consequence of activities motivated by *self-interest* is providing social order by "invisible hand". He developed economic principles from Natural Law Philosophy. Prices, wages, behaviors, equilibrium and other concepts have been defined "natural". (Smith, *Milletlerin Zenginliđi*, 2016: xiii,xiv,xv,xvi).

Some of contradictory claims based on Naturalism about human relations are as follows: For Smith, as Stoics claimed, *human is main central himself, others shadows. Nature desires* people for whom others wish to do kindness, to be preferably people who have done well by. For happiness, *mutual kindness/doing good reciprocally* is necessary. When doing kindness, *indebtedness (gratefulness) may not be sufficient to meet* that behavior. If human does not pursue *deserved profits from his kindness*, along with gratefulness from others he will decuple the result. Source of kindness is again kindness and *the greatest greed of human is being loved by others*. In order to reach this greatest greed, it is necessary to show the real love to others. (Smith, *Ahlaki Duygular Kuramı*, 2018: 319,327,328).

Some critiques may be the following:

- i. If human is main central for himself, one cannot claim about “real love to others”. Moreover, if “others are shadows”. Because: In Gospel, “If you are guided by the Spirit, you won't obey your selfish desires. The Spirit and your desires are enemies of each other. They are always fighting each other and keeping you from doing what you feel you should.” (Galatians 5: 16-17;) . ““*Those who love themselves, love no one else*” (Nursî, *The Words*, 2013: 741).”
- ii. If “life is conflict”, then mutual assistance is the opposite of conflict. Mutual kindness is a requirement of mutual assistance. Thus, as union of opposites is impossible, mutual kindness is an impossibility in a social-economic life based on *natural law*.
- iii. One cannot do any kindness with the hope of gratefulness from somebody else. Indebtedness gratefulness from people is a kind of seeking profit, benefit; it is an investment not doing good. Similarly, “one cannot *deserve profits from his kindness*” since by definition it is kindness not an investment. Moreover, real love for someone does not expect anything in return. Because,
“Love for Enemies: “But to you who are listening I say: Love your enemies, do good to those who hate you, bless those who curse you, pray for those who mistreat you. If someone slaps you on one cheek, turn to them the other also. If someone takes your coat, do not withhold your shirt from them. Give to everyone who asks you, and if anyone takes what belongs to you, do not demand it back. Do to others as you would have them do to you. “If you love those who love you, what credit is that to you? Even sinners love those who love them. And if you do good to those who are good to you, what credit is that to you? Even sinners do that. And if you lend to those from whom you expect repayment, what credit is that to you? Even sinners lend to sinners, expecting to be repaid in full. But love your enemies, do good to them, and lend to them without expecting to get anything back.” (Gospel, Luke 6: 27-35).
- iv. An answer for “*the greatest greed of human is being loved by others*” may be as follows; Seeking divine pleasure is the sole aim of human according to “divine religious economic doctrines”. God’s pleasure can be won by gaining and preserving sincerity (sincerity is the opposite of egotism and greed which *invisible hand* of Smith suggests). Because,
«And those who, before them, had settled in the homeland, and had accepted faith. They love those who emigrated to them, and find no hesitation in their hearts in helping them. They give them priority over themselves, even if they themselves are needy. Whoever is protected from his natural greed—it is they who are the successful.» (Qur’an, al-Hashr 59:9)
- v. Nature itself, is “blind, deaf and unthinking”. It is not absolute power, “not a power, cannot possess power” indeed. It “cannot be the Lawgiver”; “cannot be the source”. (Nursî, *The Flashes*, 2011:239, 244).

Considering “an imaginary, insignificant, unconscious nature” as “an *invisible hand* interfering the life in all past and future with all power and wisdom” is a great contradictory assumption. For the economy as a whole, or even in a particular decision making-process, considering statements similar to the following: “*nature necessitates* (Nursî, *The Flashes*, 2011:238) this or that economic activity/decision, or a *natural-equilibrium*, welfare level reaches the maximum level *itself*, etc.” means accepting “a nature, a force” in each being, animate creature and even in each economic policy regulated by human and in any material result, such that *each of all has a godhead* having “infinite knowledge, infinite will, infinite

power, infinite wisdom”.³ “How can something which does not possess hands wise and powerful enough to reach all the past and all the future interfere in the life of the earth?” (Nursî, *The Words*, 2013:709)

For Smith, within free market system, efficiency can be reached, as if an *invisible hand* –he used the term in *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, 1776 - guides all households and firms. (Mankiw, 2014: 5, 10,11) However, if markets fail in allocating resources efficiently, government may intervene in order to promote efficiency (and equity).

A critique may be as follows: If natural order (=invisible hand of Smith) provides efficiency, then why do markets fail in efficiency? If natural order requires everything functioning and *forming itself* without exterior involvement, then why shall government intervene in economic life? If ‘efficiency reached by “natural order of Smith”’ is apriori goal of the market, then one may ask the reason why societies have not been so happy so far and discussed for a truly fair allocation or distribution. Moreover, there is an assumption that “nature necessitates”; inasmuch as nature is the whole universe and assumed as a force, then why an inequality, inefficiency, a disequilibrium, a chaos etc.?⁴

For Smith, every individual is assumed to maximize his own pleasures and enjoyments satisfying his benefit (by the guidance of his egotism, ambition and greed); then the maximum welfare of a society is achieved itself. (Erkekoğlu and Madi, 2016:2).

A critique may be as follows: Is it at all possible that if everyone instead tried to maximize social welfare, the outcome would be worse for social welfare i.e. if every individual does not maximize the welfare of the sum of individuals/society, welfare of society will be maximized! Can it be any way probable that such happiness (supposed maximum welfare) may be reached –according to *natural law*- by self-centeredness, self-interest, egotism, greed, ambition, self-interestedness, sordidness of every member of society; which induces unhappiness for every member of it? Such incoherence of “Naturalistic Economics” has been assumed in many theories of it.

From Gospel:

“The Parable of the Rich Fool: “Watch out! Be on your guard against all kinds of greed; a man’s life does not consist in the abundance of his possessions.” (New Testament, Luke 12: 15); “The Old Life and the New: “Put to death, therefore, whatever belongs to your earthly nature: sexual immorality, impurity, lust, evil desires and greed, which is idolatry.” (New Testament, Colossians 3:5).

From a true commentary on the Qur’an:

“You should know that value and importance do not lie in quantity and number. For if man is not a true human being, he is transformed into a diabolical animal, and the more man increases in animal greed, the more animal he becomes-like some Europeans and their imitators. You can see that with regard to quantity and number,

³ The comment is made by referring to the following sources: Nursî, *The Flashes*, 2011: 238-239)

⁴ “Yes, the universal wisdom of the universe, which is the greatest manifestation of the divine name of All-Wise, turns on economy and lack of waste. It commands frugality. And the total justice in the universe proceeding from the greatest manifestation of the Name of All-Just, administers the balance four times, the verses in Sura al-Rahman, *And the firmament has He raised high, and He has set up the balance [of justice],* In order that you may not transgress [due] balance.* So establish weight with justice and fall not short in the balance* , (35:7-9) indicate four degrees and four sorts of balance, showing its immensity and supreme importance in the universe. Yes, just as there is no wastefulness in anything, so in nothing is there true injustice or imbalance. The cleanliness and purification proceeding from the name of Most Holy cleans and makes beautiful all the beings in the universe. So long as man’s dirty hand does not interfere, there is no true uncleanness or ugliness in anything.” (Nursî, *The Flashes*, 2011: 398).

men are extremely few in comparison to the boundless numbers of animals, and yet they are sovereign rulers over all the animal species and God's vicegerents on earth.” (Nursî, *The Flashes*, 2011:166).

“O crazy head and corrupted heart! Do you suppose that Muslims do not love the world, or that they do not think about the poverty into which they have fallen, and that they are in need of admonishment so that they do not forget their share of the world? Your supposition is false, your surmise, wrong. Their greed has increased; that is the reason they are impoverished. Because for Muslims, greed causes loss and indigence. The saying: "The greedy is subject to loss and disappointment" has become proverbial. (Nursî, *The Flashes*, 2011: 168)

Another contradiction in *The Invisible Hand*, such as: Smith argued that in civilized society man always relies on the need of “the co-operation and assistance of great multitudes”(Smith, *The Invisible Hand*, 2008: 15) ; besides he supposed the life “as conflict”. For naturalistic view, life is conflict; whereas for Divine religious doctrines, mutual assistance is a principle of life such that all beings coordinate each other by a mutual help. Then, if life is conflict for Smith, why “human nature expects for co-operation”? Is “an invisible hand” strong-minded and does it have a will to decide sometimes conflict sometimes mutual coordination with respect to a need for another ‘natural force’ which is supposed to be another perfect will and supposed not to be in contradiction with any other ? Moreover, Smith argued that - in *The Invisible Hand*-“life is scarce sufficient to gain the friendship of a few persons”, “man has constant occasion for the help of his brethren and it is in vain for him to expect it from their benevolence only” ”(Smith, *The Invisible Hand*, 2008: 15). So, if nature necessitates “conflict”, then why “that nature in human being” necessitates mutual assistance”?..

In *The Invisible Hand*, Smith stated that “it is *not from the benevolence* of the butcher, the brewer, or the baker that we expect our dinner, *but from their regard to their own interest*”. He claimed that human addresses himself, *not to others’ humanity but to others’ self-love*, never interacts with the desire of his own necessity but of others’ advantages. While animals are obliged to support and defend themselves, they do not receive advantages from their abilities; for men different results of their abilities and “most dissimilar geniuses are of use to one another”, through exchange, barter or anywhere each may purchase some part of the products of others’ abilities in which an opportunity is ready. (Smith, *The Invisible Hand*, 2008: 16,19).

Some answers are as follows:

From Gospel:

“Then Mary took about a pint of pure nard, an expensive perfume; she poured it on Jesus’ feet and wiped his feet with her hair. And the house was filled with the fragrance of the perfume. But one of his disciples, Judas Iscariot, who was later to betray him, objected, “Why wasn’t this perfume sold and the money given to the poor?” It was a year’s wages. He did not say this because he cared about the poor but because he was a thief; as keeper of the money bag, he used to help himself to what was put into it. “Leave her alone,” Jesus replied. “It was intended that she should save this perfume for the day of my burial. You will always have the poor among you, but you will not always have me.” (*New Testament*, John 12:3-8).

From the Collection of Risale-i Nur:

“Alluding to this, Imam Abu Hanifa said: "There can be no excess in good, just as there is no good in excess." That is to say, just as in good works and benevolence there can no excess or wastefulness-on condition they are for the deserving, so there is no good at all in wastefulness and immoderateness.” (Nursî, *The Flashes*, 2011:196)

Division of labor for Smith, was a consequence of “*natural self-interest*”. (Smith, *Milletlerin Zenginliği*, 2016: xvii). It increases the production as follows: Suppose production of sewing needles is done by only one person. For this, the same person must bring the metal from the land, smelt it, break the wires up, then he could make one sewing needle in a year. Therefore, the price of that needle would involve all the cost in that year. If division of labor was made, two thousand sewing needles can be quite easily produced daily, en masse.(Smith, *Hukuk Üzerine*, 2018:203-204).

However, truth is not as Smith claimed: *The division of labor is not a consequence of (natural) self-interest/egotism/natural enmity, but rather it is because of sincerity (the opposite of egotism in economic life as “true union of true brothers”)*. Below, are truths from Christianity and Islam for the social-economic life:

i. From Gospel:

“For the time will come when men will not put with sound doctrine. Instead, to suit their own desires, they will gather around them a great number of teachers to say what their itching ears want to hear. They will turn their ears away from truth and turn aside to myths.” (New Testament, 2 Timothy 4:3-5)

ii. The above example for sewing needles is one of the two examples which strengthen sincerity and true union, stated in Collection of Risale-i Nur⁵. (Nursî, *The Flashes*, 2011: 219).

iii. “Naturalistic mentality for economic and political life” claims (as “invisible hand” suggests) the opposite of Divine Religious economic fundamentals: *Invisible hand* of Smith claims “*preferring his own self-interest over everything* is the motive for the individuals as social interest will reach naturally its maximum level by this way”. However, for divine religious economic fundamentals:

a. From Gospel:

“The Greatest Commandment: One of the teachers of the law came and heard them debating. Noticing that Jesus had given them a good answer, he asked him, “Of all the commandments, which is the most important?” “The most important one,” answered Jesus, “is this: ‘hear, O Israel, the Lord our God, the Lord is one. Love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your mind and with all your

⁵ In Risale-i Nur:

“Craftsmen are obtaining significant wealth through co-operating in order to profit more from the products of their crafts. Formerly ten men who made sewing needles all worked on their own, and the fruit of their individual labour was three needles a day. Then in accordance with the rule of joint enterprise the ten men united. One brought the iron, one lit the furnace, one pierced the needles, one placed them in the furnace, and another sharpened the points, and so on... each was occupied with only part of the process of the craft of needle-making. Since the work in which he was employed was simple, time was not wasted, he gained skill, and performed the work with considerable speed. Then they divided up the work which had been in accordance with the rule of joint enterprise and the division of labour: they saw that instead of three needles a day, it worked out at three hundred for each man. This event was widely published among the craftsmen of 'the worldly' in order to encourage them to pool their labour.

My brothers! Since union and accord in the matters of this world and in dense materials yield such results and huge total benefits, you can compare how vastly profitable it is for each to reflect in his own mirror through Divine grace the light of all, which is luminous and pertains to the Hereafter and does not need to be divided up and fragmented, and to gain the equivalent reward of all of them. This huge profit should not be lost through rivalry and insincerity.” (Nursî, *The Flashes*, 2011: 220)

strength.’ The second is this: ‘love your neighbor as yourself.’ There is no commandment greater than these.” Well said, teacher,” the man replied. “You are right in saying that God is one and there is no other but him.” (New Testament, Mark 12: 28-33)

b. From Gospel:

“Please Others, Not Yourself: “We who are strong ought to bear with the failing of the weak and not to please ourselves. Each of us should please his neighbor for his good, to build him up. For even Christ did not please himself,” (New Testament, Romans 15: 1-4); “The Weak and The Strong: “For none of us lives to himself alone and none of us dies to himself alone. If we live, we live for the Lord; and if we die, we die for the Lord. So, whether we live or die, we belong to the Lord.” (New Testament, Romans 14:7-8); Do Not Make Your Brother Fall: “Let us therefore make every effort to do what leads to peace and to mutual edification.” New Testament, Romans 14:20).

c. “*Indeed the believers are brothers*” (Qur’an, 49:10)

d. “ If you have any interest in your social solidarity, then make of the exalted principle of "The believers are together like a well-founded building, one part of which supports the other"(Bukhari, Salat 88; Adab 36; Mazalim 5; Muslim, Birr 65; Tirmidhi, Birr 18; Nasa'i, Zakat 67; Musnad vi, 104, 405, 409) your guiding principle in life!” (Nursî, *The Letters*, 2014:314-315).

e. ““*But give them preference over themselves*” .(Qur'an, 59:9) Prefer your brothers' souls to your own soul in honour, rank, acclaim, 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*, 2011:216-217) .

iv. As union of opposites is impossible; *rivalry* (is convenient for naturalistic philosophy, it implies “life is conflict”) and *sincerity* (“seek divine pleasure as the sole aim”; “God’s pleasure is won by sincerity alone” (Nursî, *The Flashes*, 2011: 204, 214)) cannot be principles together. Because: “Rivalry towards material advantages slowly destroys sincerity”. (Nursî, *The Flashes*, 2011: 218)

From *The Invisible Hand*: For Smith, the division of labor “is not originally the effect of any human wisdom” foreseeing and intending general opulence. For him, it is the necessary propensity in human nature to barter, exchange things with other things and a necessary result of the faculties of reason and speech being common to all human and not existing in “no other race of animals”. It is the effect of the “accidental concurrence of their passions in the same object at that particular time”. (Smith, *The Invisible Hand*, 2008:14)

Some critiques may be as follows:

i. The coincidence is in contradiction with wisdom, knowledge and will. The contradictory statement of “coincidental chaotic economic order” (of the Secular

economics) assumption may be criticized as follows: “An order is conducted and governed with knowledge, wisdom and will, the order in universe is conducted and governed by perfect knowledge, will and wisdom that encompasses all. Or one should assume an “absolute non-existence”; but absolute non-existence does not exist... So that if Aggregate Supply brings the shocks into equilibrium, it proves the existence of decision makers at least “consciously and orderly computed total supplies”. If one assumes a lack of wisdom, it means absurdity (the opposite of wisdom); then, “*concept of equilibrium*” becomes meaningless.

- ii. It should be both chaotic and coincidence (this is assuming things coming into existence by ‘coincidence or accident’ because of not being able to explain) and this should continue *sans arrêt* and during billions of years and should affect every thing (including mountains and humans etc.) and embrace all but should be aimless and without knowledge and unconscious,... Then why do the economists theorize and try for better economic modelling? If an existing confused chance is assumed, do economic models and projections make sense? Adaptive expectations are made however it is not a repetition of the past and every thing has special features and not outside time. Moreover, there exist many differences between countries, firms, humans, industries and mentalities.
- iii. “Wisdom” means “by a good judgement, knowledge about the truth of existences aiming effectualities, uses, efficacies, affairs; it is connected with reason on the sense why some preference is for the good (in both thisworld and/or hereafter). Hence, is it at all reasonable that claiming that division of labor will make everyone better-off- because there must be reasonable reason for trade- and at the same time it is not the effect of any goal of benefits, uses, effectualities-wisdom?”

4. Conclusion

The consequence of practices based on “invisible hand” and its derivatives in political economics have become “visible oppressor hands” in recent Europe. Unfortunately, such assumption has generated hedonistic enjoyments to satisfy greed in order to give opium as the only solution to corrupted⁶ misguidance of “Naturalistic economic thought”. Moreover, this mentality will bring out such savage governance that the only solution to overcome is to realize and practice the truths of Christianity with the truths of Islamic doctrines for social-economic life. Otherwise, the unjust freedom (based on *self-interest/ego*) harming others’ rights given by Naturalistic and Materialistic view for political and economic lives, will bring terrible consequences so that no policies will be effective to correct chaotic conditions produced by these.

Finally, this “misguidance of Naturalistic economic thought” is not fit to be addressed as incoherence and numerous contradictions are included in its conceptualization and mentality. In Gospel:

“People's desires make them give in to immoral ways, filthy thoughts, and shameful deeds. They worship idols, practice witchcraft, hate others, and are hard to get along with. People become jealous, angry, and selfish. They not only argue and cause trouble, but they are envious. They get drunk, carry on at wild parties, and do other evil things as well. I told you before, and I am telling you again: No one who does these things will share in the blessings of God's kingdom.” (Galatians 5:19-21).

From a true commentary on the Qur'an:

⁶ The comment is made by referring to the following sources: Nursi, *The Flashes*, 2011:161

“Fifth Satanic Stratagem: Profiting from egotism, the supporters of the people of misguidance want to draw my brothers away from me. Truly, egotism man's most dangerous vein. It is his weakest vein, too. They can make people do terrible things by encouraging it. My brothers! Beware, do not let them strike you with egotism, do not let them hunt you with it! You should know that this century the people of misguidance have mounted the ego and are galloping through the valleys of misguidance. The people of truth have to give it up if they are to serve the truth. (Nursi, *The Letters*, 2014:488).

5. Addendum-A Brief Answer to Naturalistic Philosophy on Cause-Effect Connection

As stated in The Gifford Lectures, a doctrine separating *nature* from God; making subservient *spirit* to *matter*- is based on three fundamental theories as follows:

The first one is stated as “nature is ultimately resolvable into a single vast mechanism”,

The second as “the theory of evolution as the working of this mechanism”,

The third one is stated as “the theory of psychophysical parallelism or conscious automatism, according to which theory mental phenomena occasionally accompany but never determine movements and interactions of the material world.”

Another statement from Gifford Lectures is the following: “Evolution, briefly, is regarded as implying “ideal ends that control physical means”. In one sense it forms a contradiction: mechanical evolution or development. “Nevertheless, we shall find that the category of End, equally with the categories of Substance and Cause, is nowadays outside the pale of natural science”. Evolution refers to a process by which the energy and the mass of the universe have transformed from some supposed primitive condition to “that distribution to which they have at present”. The process will continue until some ultimate distribution is achieved, after which a counter process of dissolution will start.” (giffordlectures.org/books/naturalism-and-agnosticism-vol-1/lecture-7-mechanical-evolution)

One answer to those theories may be as follows:

Each vital existence in universe is measured and determined wisely: with a composition of matter having a precise measure from many numerous and various substances. Therefore, if one declares that they come into existence by coincidence, then it becomes necessary to accept that “only that precise and quite different amounts for the formation of a living are arranged themselves and come together by an accident”. Also it becomes necessary for Naturalistic philosophers to reject the appropriate measures and precise equilibria which imply balance and infinite justice; “the complex intermingling of all of those forms” with innumerable differentiations and distinguishing qualities which imply all-encompassing knowledge with perfectly broad applications including every thing and every human, the universe as a whole; “the utmost regularity in all matters which imply infinite wisdom; the will that encompasses the entire universe not only “at present and till an ultimate distribution” but in all periods of time, at the past and the present and the future; as for all being, those determined measures are like a plan or model. Furthermore, Naturalistic atheism must reject the determined measure for each thing (which is ultimately definitely obviously seen by their eyes) since Divine Determining is an aspect of Divine knowledge and the creation by Divine Power with pre-eternal, infinite and all-embracing knowledge, is in accordance with that measure. Therefore it can be said for Naturalistic philosophy, by accepting many numerous impossibilities and endless and senseless absurdities and difficulties such as “creation by

causes, nature, strange coincidence or a working of a mechanism”, it claims that “numerous material forms, shapes and patterns with external existences have been inclosed in the body of even a miniature living”.⁷

Very simple example by Sets for “connection of cause and effect”: Suppose E, universe, and $A \cap B$: the connection between the cause and effect, by Divine Determining, the event realized. The set A represents “an individual’s defective behavior A” and the set B represents “an unfortunate situation for second individual”. Then, realized event $A \cap B$ means “the unfortunate situation (*effect*) for second individual through first individual’s defective behavior (*cause*)”; $A \cap B$, determined event, A and B occur at the same time. Neither A nor B is an obligation or a coincidence. i.e. an explanation such as “if A had not occurred (if first individual had not defectively behaved), B would not have occurred (second individual would not have that unfortunate condition”. In the area except $A \cap B$, i.e. for $E \setminus (A \cap B)$ no one knows what would happen, because of possibilities $A \setminus B$ or $B \setminus A$ or $E \setminus (A \cup B)$ or $E \setminus A$ or $E \setminus B$ or another events (since E-universe-does not include only A and B supposed for this explanation). (Madi, 2014:81)⁸

Naturalistic mentality does not comprehend the connection with cause and effect; i.e. in reality, any effect would occur through a cause. If one supposes that cause did not occur, then he is rejecting the connection of the cause and effect. Then, there is no decision for the effect is occurring. Or for some philosophers cause and effect are supposed to be separate; which implies “an obligation”. The truth is considering “*if this cause had not occurred, no one knows if that effect would have occurred*”. Otherwise, a meaning implying obligation: “if this cause had not occurred, the consequence still would have appear” or a meaning rejecting the connection (made by Divine Determining): “if this cause had not occurred, the consequence would not have appear”. For both of them one cannot know whether the effect would have occurred.⁹

“The Possessor and Master of the universe surely does everything with knowledge, disposes every affair with wisdom, directs everything all-seeingly, treats everything all-knowingly, and arranges everything willing the instances of wisdom, purposes, benefits that are apparent in them. Since, then, the One who creates knows, surely the One who knows will speak. Since He will speak, surely He will speak to those who possess consciousness and thought, and those who will understand His speech.” (Nursî, *The Letters*, 2014:114)

References

- Erkekoğlu, L.C. (2015). *Seküler İktisadi Doktrinin Eleştirisi Çerçevesinde Ortadoğu-İslam Toplumunda Ekonomik Entegrasyonun Esasları*. Doktora Tezi, Marmara Üniversitesi, Ortadoğu ve İslam Ülkeleri Araştırmaları Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Erkekoğlu, L.C., Madi, İ. (2016). The Influence of the Ancient Roman Philosophy on the “Secular Economic Mentality”. *The International Academic Forum, The European Conference on Ethics, Religion & Philosophy 2016 Official Conference Proceedings*, Brighton, United Kingdom, Official Conference Proceedings, ISSN: 2188-966X.57-68. file:///C:/Users/Akademi/Downloads/ECERP2016_32334%20(1).pdf

⁷ The comment is made by referring to the following sources: Nursî, *The Flashes*, 2011:234,235, 237 ; *The Words*, 2013:77, 92,481.

⁸ The comment is made by referring to the following sources: Nursî, *The Words*, 2013:481,482.

⁹ The comment is made by referring to the following sources: Nursî, *The Words*, 2013: 481,482.

- Gökberk, M. (1974). *Felsefe Tarihi* (Üçüncü Basım). Bilgi Yayınevi: İstanbul.
- Hunt, E.K., Lautzenheiser, M., (2016). *İktisadi Düşünce Tarihi Eleştirel Bir Perspektif*. (Çev. Vedat Ulvi Aslan), Phoenix Yayınevi: Ankara.
- Kazgan, G. (2004). *İktisadi Düşünce veya Politik İktisadın Evrimi* (11. Basım) Remzi Kitabevi: İstanbul.
- Madi, İ. (2014). *Ortadoğu Dinleri Açısından Homo Economicus'un Analizi*. Doktora Tezi, Marmara Üniversitesi, Ortadoğu Araştırmaları Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Mankiw, N.G. (2004). *Principles of Economics* (Third Edition). Thomson South-Western: USA.
- Nursî, S. (2011). *The Flashes*. (Çev. Şükran Vahide), Sözlere Neşriyat: İstanbul.
- Nursî, S. (2014). *The Letters*. (Çev. Şükran Vahide and others), Sözlere Neşriyat: İstanbul.
- Nursî, S. (2013). *The Words*. (Çev. Şükran Vahide), Sözlere Neşriyat: İstanbul.
- Smith, A. (2018). *Ahlaki Duygular Kuramı*. (Çev. Derman Kızılay), Pinhan Yayıncılık: İstanbul.
- Smith, A. (2018). *Hukuk Üzerine*. (Çev. Ahmet Celiloğlu), Pinhan Yayıncılık: İstanbul.
- Smith, A. (2016). *Milletlerin Zenginliği* (11. Basım). (Çev. Haldun Derin). Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları: İstanbul.
- Smith, A. (2008). *The Invisible Hand*. Penguin Books-Great Ideas: England.
- Stokes, P. (2018). *Dünyanın En Büyük 100 Düşünürü*. (Çev. Ecem Çayırermez), Yakamoz Kitap: İstanbul
- Turkish / English New Testament* (New International Version). (1999 by International Bible Society). Kitabı Mukaddes Şirketi: İstanbul.
- Heilbroner, R. L., Adam Smith Scottish Philosopher, <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Adam-Smith>
- The Gifford Lectures, Part 2. Theory of Evolution, Lecture 7: Mechanical Evolution; giffordlectures.org/books/naturalism-and-agnosticism-vol-1/lecture-7-mechanical-evolution
- <https://www.bible.com/bible/>
- <https://www.biblegateway.com/>
- <https://www.clearquran.com/>
- https://www.philosophybasics.com/philosophers_smith.html