



Suggested Citation: Sert, M. (2021), "Sombart in the Turkish Mirror: A Case of Sabri F. Ülgener", *Fiscaoeconomia*, 5(1), 38-55.

Sombart in the Turkish Mirror: A Case of Sabri F. Ülgener¹

Türk Aynasında Sombart: Sabri F. Ülgener Örneği

Mesut SERT²

Abstract

In this article the effect of Sombart in Turkish thought will be discussed in two periods, the late Ottoman and the early republican era in the context of Germans and Germany and then specified in the Sabri F. Ülgener case with his research in economic mentality. It will be proposed that Sombart's effect was limited within the scope of his political writing until Ülgener and his idea on the genesis of capitalism and methodology which was originated from spiritual sciences, are firstly considered with Ülgener.

Article History:

Date submitted:

28.09.2020

Date accepted:

01.12.2020

Jel Codes:

B10, B31, B40

Keywords:

Werner Sombart,
Economic
Mentality, Sabri F.
Ülgener.

¹ This paper is one of the products of my one-year research stay under supervision of Prof. J. Backhaus in University of Erfurt which is supported by the Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TUBITAK) and presented at the EconWorld Congress in Prague on 3-5 September 2014. I especially thank my colleagues Taner Akpınar for his comments and Fuat Özdiç for sharing his library when needed.

² PhD. Hakkari University, Department of Public Finance, mesutsert@hakkari.edu.tr, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2915-4815>

1. Introduction

In the history of economic thought, in a nutshell, Sombart is seen as "one of the most colourful and chameleon like and interesting academic personalities that Germany produced in the decades starting from the 1890's to the 1930's" (Kuczynski, 1968, p. 59). From this statement two important features of Sombart can be extracted. The first is "colourful", and it would seem that it comes from both his personality and his writing or wording style. First of all, it is possible to say that he wrote like a poet. He often used exciting historical examples and metaphors to explain his thoughts which enabled them easy to understand. As Ülgener said "[w]e should not forget that as well as a scientist, he was also a litterateur...and had a strong impact on his first readers which trail themselves to him" (1941b, p. 96). In Kessler's words his wording appears as follows: "...[e]very reader was impressed with his rhetoric on explanation of issue [and] spirited wordings..." (1941, p. 72). His student and also English translator Mortimer Epstein agreed with this by stating that "Sombart was an artist as well as a scholar" (1941, p. 526). His Turkish student *Celal Ömer Sarç* mentioned his excellent lecture performance and said that "he was a teacher who binds his students to himself with his clarity and vibrant style" (Sarç, 1941, p. 62). It should also be added "...his universal knowledge in the social sciences and humanities, his original and manifold hypotheses and his quality as a speaker" (Peukert, 2012, p. 529). With 30.000 volumes including nearly fifty periodicals, his personal library can be seen as proof of his universal knowledge³.

The second important features of Sombart which can be extracted from Kuczynski's statement is "chameleon like". Even though this expression could be seen to be very harsh, it should be seen to be true in a sense. There is a "bad personal and scientific reputation" (Peukert, 2012, p. 528) of Sombart. If we observe it from a scientific manner, we can discern that his basic orientation had changed several times. That is why he is the missing one in Heilbroner's list, and it is not surprising that his oeuvre is often neglected, criticized and rejected (Peukert, 2012). However, it is possible to assume that the Turkish scholars' perception of Sombart seems to be different from that which was pointed out by Ülgener by the following. According to him the "[h]istorian who writes a detailed economic history of our time [1940's] will reserve a preeminent place for Sombart without any hesitation because of his new insight into the composition of the material" (Ülgener, 1941b, p. 95). He also defended his changing opinion by stating "[w]hen we look at the history of thoughts in general, scientists who have important places always rushed forward with a new idea, and they drifted left and right until finding their way. This is also the same for Sombart. ...When considered the adaptation of relatively new Philosophical thought to the specific scientific discipline, expectation of setting a full and complete system would be an excessive assertion" (Ülgener, 1941b, p. 96).

From the personal side it would seem that his disagreeable reputation comes from his relation with National Socialism. Although this argument is also debatable, Peukert's argument seems to be explanatory. He sees this relation as being "temporary supporting" an "irresponsible Bohemian flirtations", and "there are no excuses" (2012, p. 528). In the Turkish case, there is no research focusing directly on Sombart except for the special issue of *İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası (İFM)* (Journal of the Faculty of Economics) in 1941. There are some critical

³ After the completion of *Der Moderne Kapitalismus* in 1928, he sold his library to Japan for 143.000 Marks, which had become an increasing burden on the more modest living condition in Berlin, and now it is a part of the library of the City University of Osaka (Brocke, 1996, p. 46).

assessments, but there is no direct emphasis on his connection with National Socialism with regards this issue.

Despite the negativity of his reputation, Sombart is seen as the most successful German economist, as well as also being considered as one of the founders of economic sociology. Educated in the tradition of the Younger Historical School in Economics and of German Historicism⁴ it can also be said that Sombart was an unfailing teacher and has left a deep and lasting influence on almost two generations of economists, however he never built his own school⁵. He had a large number of students. Among them "emancipated" ones were the majority (Brocke, 1996, p. 82), especially after 1933 when most of the students had to emigrate because of the dangers relating to their Jewish descent.

It is key to emphasize that there were a number of students who came from countries with pre-capitalist economic structures such as Russia, Romania, Bulgaria and Turkey. While his most famous doctoral student and assistant until 1928 was Wassily Leontief⁶ from St. Petersburg, one of his most prominent Turkish students during 1918 and 1925 was *Celal Ömer Sarç*⁷. Sarç explained the reason why most of Sombart's students came from less developed countries and related this in his approach. According to him, as a founder of the Younger Historical School it was not surprising that the students who were interested in what the main driving force of Capitalism instead of those who were interested in what the current problems are, chose Sombart (Sarç, 1941, p. 61).

This could be judged as a starting point to understand Sombart's effect in Turkey. In the following chapters Sombart's effect will be examined in two periods, the late Ottoman and the early republican era, that is the 1930s, in the context of Germans and Germany, and then the discussion will be specified to Ülgener case.

2. Historical Background: Turkey is getting closer to Germany

To understand the effect of Sombart in Turkish thought it is suitable to start with Germany in general and the German Historical School in particular. The expectancy is that the German Historical School provides an alternative path for capitalist development in all underdeveloped countries. There is a general observation in Turkey that Germans or Germany held a strong hold and influence in the country particularly during the periods of the late Ottoman and the early Republican era.

During the period of the late Ottoman Empire the German effect was seen as remarkable in all fields of society especially during the time of war. In the Ottoman era at the end of the 19th century, two trains of thought in the economic sense are observed both contradicting each other. Liberalism being one of them, represented by *Ohannes Pasha* and *Cavit Bey*, and the other being represented by *Ahmet Mithat* and *Akyiğitzade Musa*, which was against the liberal

⁴ Although he was a professionally trained economist, he later turned to sociology as other students of Schmoller who were all originally trained economist: Max and Alfred Weber, Franz Oppenheimer, the historian Kurt Breysig and Otto Hintze (Brocke, 1996, p. 21).

⁵ As Edgar Salin, who often stayed with him and visited in his house during the 1920s stated, he also complained at his 70th birthday that he did not have any followers (Cited in Brocke, 1996, p. 82).

⁶ Leontief who was the founder of input-output economics and a Nobel Prize winner in 1973, remarked about his teacher, Sombart "was a very remarkable person, [and] he was an original [scientist] and in a sense not fitting into his environment and possibly even into his time" (Cited in Brocke, 1996, p. 83).

⁷ He was the first dean of the Faculty of Economics from 1936 to 1948 and later president of Istanbul University.

school and was called as protectionist industrialization⁸. Originating from the protectionist doctrine of the German Historical School⁹, the latter saw industrialization as the only way of development (Boratav, 2000, p. 303).

Especially after the event of 1908¹⁰, with the ideology of Turkish nationalism *İttihat ve Terakki Cemiyeti* (Committee of Union and Progress, CUP)¹¹ came into power and dominated the society as a whole. The *Unionist* were "demanding a place for Ottoman Muslims in the social and economic structure, [trying to establish] a constitutional state and [endeavouring to create] a new intellectual and moral order to go with it" (Ahmad, 1993, p. 127). In this context CUP tried firstly to establish Islamism, Turkish Nationalism and National Economy and then to make them stronger. They derived their ideological basis from the German thought¹².

After the restoration of the constitution, the *Unionist* "began to discuss [the necessity] to carry out a social revolution, and they talked about transforming their society to bring it to the level of [the] advanced societies of the West" (Ahmad, 1993, p. 127). In order to serve this goal, some of the influential members of the Committee like *Ziya Gökalp*¹³, *Yusuf Akçura* and *Tekin Alp* began an expansion of nationalist ideology through journals such as *Türk Yurdu* (Turkish Country) published under the motto "For Turkish Benefit", *Yeni Mecmua* (The New Journal) and *İktisadiyat Mecmuası* (The Journal of Economics). While *Ziya Gökalp* wrote articles on Turkish History, Turkish Literature and Turkish Art in *Yeni Mecmua*, *Tekin Alp* began to gain notoriety with his writings in the arena of National Economy published in *İktisadiyat Mecmuası*.¹⁴

It is worth examining *Tekin Alp* and his journal *İktisadiyat Mecmuası* for a general understanding of the German effect on the economy side¹⁵. As an Ottoman Jew, *Tekin Alp* was born in Serez, and his first name was Moiz Cohen. After studying law in Salonika and İstanbul he then worked as a lawyer and a businessman. He was also an assistant of Dr. Fleck, a German economist who came to *Darülfünûn*¹⁶ to support the teaching in economics with reference to

⁸ For a detailed discussion on the history of economic thought in the late Ottoman and in the early republican era see (Sayar, 1986) and (Mardin, 1985), (Toprak, 1985), (Kılınçoğlu, 2015).

⁹ Özveren titled this period as "historical school *alla turca*", and he saw this "alternative perspective [was] independently of, yet parallel with the German scholarship" (2002, p. 139). (Emphases are mine). According to him "German influence penetrated to Turkish economic thought as late as the early twentieth century, and surprisingly, via an indirect route". In this respect "...intermediary atmosphere of Russia [where both Akıgizade Musa Bey and Parvus originally came and educated from] served to uplift in quality the nascent Ottoman Historismus" (2016, p. 150).

¹⁰ This era is called as the second Constitutional Monarchy in Ottoman Turkish politics.

¹¹ This Committee and most of its members, like Mustafa Kemal and other founder elites of Republic, had been effective in the construction of the Turkish Republic.

¹² Germany was the most influential country for Unionist, and the starting point to a close relationship was an alliance agreement signed on August 2, immediately after the constitutional regime was established in July 1908 (Ahmad, 1993, pp. 125-126).

¹³ He was a member of Central Committee of CUP as a delegate of East province.

¹⁴ In this period *Türk Yurdu* was also important to advocate national economic policy with the articles of *Yusuf Akçura* and *Parvus Efendi*. For a detailed discussion on *Türk Yurdu* see (Balkılıç & Dölek, 2013).

¹⁵ In reality the *Unionist* economic policy was an amalgam of two different traditions; the French "solidarism" which was represented by *Ziya Gökalp* and the German "national economy" represented by *Tekin Alp* (Toprak, 1994).

¹⁶ *Darülfünûn* (House of Knowledge) was the first 'University' of Turkey. Although the idea to create a university dates back to 1845 and there were several attempts, the will to create and to develop a modern university system

Ziya Gökalp (Özden, 2005, p. 48). Ziya Gökalp was also a prime mover of the idea to form an association and to publish a journal to support National Economy. *İktisadiyat Cemiyeti* (Association of Economics) and *İktisadiyat Mecmuası* were the products of this idea. The Association saw liberalism as the "ideology of Manchester Manufacturers" (Özden, 2005, p. 49) and followed the way of Friedrich List's protectionist approach.

Published with the motto "Mentioned all of Scientific and Practical Economic Issue", *İktisadiyat Mecmuası* became an institutional organ of the Association and adopted 'national economy' doctrine with the assistance of *İttihat ve Terakki*" (Toprak, 1995, p. 13). In the first issue¹⁷, Tekin Alp registered the aim of the Journal in the article "Our Journal's Occupation: To the National Economy"¹⁸ as follows: "in the pages of the Journal, scientific essence of national economy will be investigated rigorously. The articles written by experts from both Turkey and Europe on Turkey's current economic situation will be published, and by doing so, we will be serving to make different thoughts and theories to be known by the public" (Koraltürk, 2001, p. 296). According to Tekin Alp, it could be useful for Turkey to investigate the experiences of European countries¹⁹, and it is without question that Germany was the most significant example¹⁹. He expressed that "German's economic success is a product of a quarter or a half century of efforts. They owe most of their success especially to the work of individuals [citizens], not to nature. Nationality is the leading factor of their progress. The Germans never imagined their current success when Friedrich List founded National Okonomie. After List founded the principles of National Economy, all nations admitted his principles, and they were successful in a short while by following this" (Koraltürk, 2001, p. 303).

It is possible to label the 1920s as the "interregnum period" in which the German effect seems to weaken. The Signing of the Armistice of Mudros in 1918 also signals the end of the *İttihat ve Terakki* government and their Nationality thesis, consequently Tekin Alp was dismissed from his job (Özden, 2005, p. 49) and the German effect began enter into decline.

During the War of Independence, the Soviet effect was seen as remarkable just before the Republic was proclaimed; the young Turkish Republic constructed their way to a capitalist path in opposition to communism, that is, the Soviet Union²⁰. The founding elite of Turkey adopted Germany or German oriented thesis as a role model once again. By naming it as "Reconstruction under Open Economy Condition", Boratav argues that "while 1923 doubtless represented a disengagement from the past in political sense, the same cannot be said from an economic policy perspective, and it is clear that there is a continuity" (Boratav, 2000, p. 311). The National Economy thesis was generally followed by some small amendments related

re-emerged in the period of the CUP. After large-scale elimination in *Darülfünûn* in 1909, the government invited twenty German scholars to *Darülfünûn* in 1915 and Dr. Anton Fleck was one of them. For detail see (Ege & Hagemann, 2012, pp. 945-948) and (Neumark, 2017, p. 16).

¹⁷ The journal published sixty-nine issues between 1916-1917 in Ottoman Turkish and French.

¹⁸ This article was also published with the title of "Notre programme: Vers l'économie nationale" in French and "Der Zweck unserer Zeitschrift: Unsere Volkswirtschaft" in German at the same issue. Although his articles are familiar with being published in two languages, usually Turkish and French, it is rare that his articles were published in three languages. This also conveys the importance of this article (Landau, 1996, p. 64).

¹⁹ That most of the pages in the Journal were devoted to Germany can be seen as evidence of the German effect. Other countries mentioned in the Journal respectively were Romania, Bulgaria and Hungary.

²⁰ The decisions which were made at the *İzmir İktisat Kongresi* (*İzmir Economy Congress*) on 17 February – 4 March 1923, were important to show the new Republic's way, and most of them were related to the freedom of individual enterprise.

to conjectural constraints²¹ during the early Republican era, and "Protectionist and State-led Industrialization" strategy was adopted without exception during the Great Depression (Boratav, 2000, p. 321).

3. 1930s as a Breaking Point

The 1930s, can be argued as the second era in which the German effect remarkably embarked. Under the single party rule in Turkey, lots of articles were published in the journals such as *Ülkü*²², *Varlık* and *Kadro* all introducing the German economic experiences and advocating that the new government proceed along the German path. Among them *Kadro* and its authors, for example, *Şevket Süreyya*, *Burhan Asaf*, *Ismail Hüsrev* and *Vedat Nedim* were key figures with regards the guidance of the government in terms of its economic policy²³.

Also observable during these years was that Turkish intellectuals met Sombart and referred to him in their writings. His former student *Sarç* seemed to have benefitted pretty much from his teacher while writing his book, *Ziraat ve Sanayi Siyaseti (Politics of Agriculture and Industry)* in 1934 (Türkeş, 1999, p. 117). Nevertheless, it should be noted that whilst demonstrating little impact, a small number of written documents mentioning Sombart were written before this era. By way of illustrations of this are, *Mehmet İzzet*, a notable representative of Turkish sociology who after *Ziya Gökalp*, referred to Sombart in his Sociology High school textbook in 1929, and *Mehmet Servet*, another student of *Ziya Gökalp*, produced an article on "work" which alluded to Sombart's economic philosophy of "Arbeit in the first issue of his journal *Felsefe ve İctimaiyat Mecmuası (Journal of Philosophy and Sociology)* in 1927" (Fındıkoğlu, 1941, p. 66). A translation of Sombart's writing on "Soziologie"²⁴ by *Nüzhet Servet* was also published with the title of "What is Sociology?" in the same issue of this journal (Akyurt, 2014).

On the pages of *Kadro* it is seen that almost all of the writers cite Sombart in their writings except for *Karaosmanoğlu*²⁵ (Türkeş, 1999, p. 118), and it is meaningful that he appeared first with his book, *Die Zukunft des Kapitalismus (The Future of Capitalism)*²⁶. As can be understood from the title of *Vedat Nedim's* article "A Book which confirms *Kadro*", Sombart was one of the 'probable and potential' intellectual sources of *Kadro* (Türkeş, 1999, p. 116). According to Türkeş, Sombart's writings especially the ones in the early period were the best and also a

²¹ One of main constraints to follow protectionist industrialization resulted from the *Lausanne Treaty's* arrangement concerning the custom tariff which prohibited Turkish Republic to make a new tariff.

²² It was an institutional organ of *Halkevi (Peoples House)* which was established to deploy Republic ideology, and was published from 1933 to 1950.

²³ *Kadro* was published monthly between 1932 and 1935, and in total thirty-six issues were published. The aim of the journal was the same as others, embedding revolution and constructing the new ideology.

²⁴ This text was an introduction of Sombart's anthology with the title of "Soziologie" which was prepared by Hanz Lorenz Stoltenberg and published in Berlin in 1924.

²⁵ Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu was one of the greatest novelists in Turkish literature, and as a publisher he had a different role among the other *Kadro* writers. He was coordinating the relationship between Çankaya presidency of the republic and *Kadro* (Bostancı, 1990, p. 9), (Ertan, 1994, p. 39).

²⁶ This book was published in 1932 as a booklet after his lecture in Association of Study for Money and Credit Economy on 29 February 1932, and it is important with regards to show Sombart's relation with National Socialism. For detail see (Sert, 2018).

suitable source for *Kadro* writers to avoid themselves from an accusation of communist propaganda and to be identified with Marxism (Türkeş, 1999, p. 119)²⁷.

Vedat Nedim who met Sombart during his studentship years in Berlin²⁸ spoke in high praise of him and introduced him as a famous German Professor whose book had a major impact among economists. After presenting the book in detail, *Vedat Nedim* inferred that "firstly all nations have an economic policy and economic order which suited their conditions, and there is nothing to learn from foreigners. Secondly, the transformation of the world economy is a result of the wars of national independence. Thirdly, the future's economic order will be the 'planned economy', and the planned economic order will be 'state'" (Tör, 1932, p. 38). The last inference was directly related to Sombart's book, which is why he considered this book as "a confirmation of *Kadro*'s national independence movement thesis and ideology partly" (Tör, 1932, p. 38). *Vedat Nedim* also referred to an interview with Sombart which carried out in Berlin, at that meeting Sombart confirmed and emboldened this ideology more deeply. Although he stated that "There will be a published letter in which Sombart wrote on this subject for *Kadro*" (Tör, 1932, p. 38), it was not published in the issues followed even if such a letter existed.

In 1934 Sombart acquired additional fame amongst Turkish intellectuals as a result of the publication of his book *Deutscher Sozialismus*²⁹. After Sombart's book was published, two book reviews were immediately published in *Ülkü* and *Adliye Ceridesi*. The one published in *Ülkü*³⁰ by *Ziyaeddin Fahri* gained more influence than the other, in main, because of the writer, and additionally the conclusions he had formed for Turkey and the Turkish readership.

Ziyaeddin Fahri as a sociologist was the key person to introduce the German thought especially Weber and Sombart to Turkey. He was the translator of Kessler's book "Introduction to Sociology" into Turkish. The importance of this book results from that it is the first book which deals with the problems from a new perspective differing from the dominance of Durkheim sociology³¹, and that "although it contains limited information as a textbook, the Turkish reader firstly met Tönnies, Simmel and Weber who had been seen in smoke screen up till now" (Ülgener, 1940, p. 278) .

As a visitor of Sombart in Berlin, *Ziyaeddin Fahri* had also chance to talk to Sombart regarding his new book, and after his return to Turkey, he wrote a review. Their conversation was mostly centred on his new book, the book being published shortly before their meeting. He pointed out that "Sombart was both pleased and sad for the critics from both inside and outside of

²⁷ It is true that his book *Zukunft* is known with his proposal towards planned economy which is directed attention to *Kadro* writers. But contrary to Türkeş, this book is also known for "the conclusion which meant to be a call for resolute leadership" (Sert, 2018, p. 13) which had been already realised and emphasized by Şevket Süreyya (1932).

²⁸ *Vedat Nedim* did his PhD in economics at Berlin University in 1921, and according to his expression Sombart's History of Capitalism had a major impact on him (Tunçay, 1991, pp. 203-204).

²⁹ The adventure of this book from *Sozialismus und soziale Bewegung im 19th Jahrhundert* in 1896 to *Der Proletarische Sozialismus* in 1924 and lastly to *Deutscher Sozialismus* in 1934 is also interesting to show how Sombart's thought changed from Marxism to National Socialism. For detailed information see (Sert, 2018).

³⁰ This review was firstly published in *Hakimiyet-i Milliye (National Sovereignty)*, the newspaper had been published since the War of Independence days until 1934, and then its name was changed as *Ulus (Nation)*.

³¹ The difference between Weberian and Durkheimian sociology is also seen in the difference between verstehen/understanding and the explanation/erklarung in the methodological sense (Ayan, 2000, p. 170).

Germany. The reason for him being pleased was that there was an article almost daily in the newspapers which mentioned his new book and that it was welcomed in National Socialist centres. At the same time, he was sad because he had received some letters which accused him for being unfaithful to science" (Fındıkoğlu, 1941, p. 64). In response to these critics he lamented about incomprehensibility and stressed on numerous occasions that this book should be seen as a result of his intellectual progress.

The main moments of this intellectual progress can be traced in both of the book reviews especially from *Hüseyin Avni's*³² (1935) detailed review. For instance, in the first chapter Sombart's "economic age" argument can be seen as a result of his history or the emergence of capitalism analysis, mainly introduced in *Der Moderne Kapitalismus* and the other supplementary works, *Luxus und Kapitalismus*, *Der Bourgeois* and *Krieg und Kapitalismus*; and in the fifth chapter his emphasis on state and planned economy can be related to the analysis which had already been asserted in *Die Zukunft des Kapitalismus*.

Despite the fact that there was no inference to Turkey and the Turkish readership in *Hüseyin Avni's* review, *Ziyaeddin Fahri* argued that "the impact of the book on Turkish people was very deep...*Deutscher Sozialismus* has instructive pages for the East, especially for Turkey. Sombart complains about the cliff which is caused by big industry and the dominance of 'economics' in all social values. Although this dominance has not arisen yet in East, the course of these countries is going to this direction" (Fındıkoğlu, 1935, p. 400). He asked, "Can new social policy lead to People Socialism in Turkey?" and stressed that "this book is stimulating the Turkish intellectuals who have to think about this topic" (Fındıkoğlu, 1935, p. 400).

The other key figure of the 1930s, writing on the topic of the Turkish economy in *Kadro*, was *İsmail Hüsrev*. He successfully implemented Sombart's thought on the emergence and the diseases of capitalism to explain Turkey's economic progress. Although *Ziyaeddin Fahri* viewed him "as a faithful student of the writer of *Der Moderne Kapitalismus*" (1941, p. 66), he clarified his relationship with Sombart in the serial article with the title of "National Economy Survey" in *Kadro*. Contrary to *Ziyaeddin Fahri's* assessment he differentiated between his approach and Sombart's way of thinking on the grounds of idealism vs. materialism. He expressed that "Although Sombart's methodological essences and the terms which mainly resist on the idea that socio-economic order is conceived by economic mentality are similar to ours. We move to the idea from materialist sense, and from our point of view specific economic mentality is born and live(s) only in specific social order" (Tökin, 1932, p. 25).

In his book *Türkiye Köy İktisadiyatı* (1990)³³, *İsmail Hüsrev* once again clarified his relationship with Sombart on the same grounds. *Şevket Süreyya* also remarked regarding his methodological differences and qualified them as dialectic-materialist (Aydemir, 1934, p. 35), however "not exactly and purely Marxist" one. According to *Şevket Süreyya* "there is a significant influence of Sombart's method on his Marxist perspective, [and] he especially took the economic sentiment concept and its effect on production technique and system which has relatively dominant role in Sombart comparing to Marx" (Aydemir, 1934, p. 37).

³²*Hüseyin Avni* was a professor at *Mülkiye* which is an important school, founded in 1839 during the Ottoman modernization process to educate civil servants for the state.

³³ This book was firstly published in *Kadro* publication in 1934.



Sert, M. (2021), "Sombart in the Turkish Mirror: A Case of Sabri F. Ülgener", *Fiscaoeconomia*, 5(1), 38-55.

Looking from another perspective, *İsmail Hüsrev's* book also held importance. It is possible to state that he was the first writer who deeply knew and understood Sombart using his method astutely before the German refugee professor had in İstanbul University. In this book he also criticized Sombart's periodization of capitalism analysis which was asserted in *Der Moderne Kapitalismus* as early capitalism (Frühkapitalismus), high capitalism (Hochkapitalismus) and late capitalism (Spätkapitalismus). The point which does not satisfy him in regard of this periodization was that social classes were not taken into consideration. According to him although "Sombart made a good systematization of historical fact, he had not found and shown the class motive of this, and he reduced the reasons behind the facts to spiritual origin" (Tökin, 1990, p. 85).

The special issue of *İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası (İFM)* in 1941 was the most important and the only publication directly highlighting Sombart. In the introductory chapter, after announcing the death of Sombart and declaring their duty to devote this issue to his memory, the Editorial Board of *İFM* pointed out that he had gained true international fame and was accepted, even by his prominent critics, as a great economist and sociologist. They also added that "everybody who had met him knew that it is very hard to comprehend his immense, attractive and shining different colour intelligence with all aspect and dynamism. In this respect the following articles can be seen as a present to him from our Faculty members".

In the first article *Celal Ömer Sarç* spoke in praise of his teacher and stressed his importance in the history of economics, as follows: "Nobody can interpret the relation between capitalism and technique, law and economic mentality better than Sombart, [and] one of the most interesting innovations of him is a product of this universal-sociological view" (Sarç, 1941, p. 61). In his assessment "Contrary to List, Schmoller and Bücher's explanation to the economic stages (Wirtschaftsstufen) with respect to economic criteria, Sombart – inspired from Marx – defined it in relation with three noneconomic elements; technique, law and economic mentality, and he also asserted that all economic system (Wirtschaftssystem) has a unique economic mentality, technique and law order" (Sarç, 1941, pp. 61-62).

In spite of these laudatory lines, he also complained about the rapid changes in his thoughts same as all the others. *Sarç* denoted his relationship with Marx as an example of this change, also stressing that Sombart had not clung on to his early methodological consideration relating to "value judgments"³⁴ by the end of his life. *Sarç* pointed out that "he gave more place to value judgments in his last books than the writers who had been criticized by him" (Sarç, 1941, p. 63).

The emphasis on his association with Marx and the value judgement problem is also seen in *Rüstow's* article in the same issue. Here he articulates on Sombart's conception of Capitalism in relation with the scientific intention of the historical school, *Rüstow* described that the target of the historical school is to explain the specific moment of economic history by synthesizing economic theory, sociology and history. Although none of them were a member of the historical school, he referred to three people, Smith, List and Marx who had achieved a

³⁴ According to *Sarç's* assessment, Sombart started an 'objectivity campaign' in economy science with Max Weber in the first decade of the 20th century which asserted that economic matter should be analyzed from the perspective of 'what?' rather than 'what should it be?' (1941, p. 63)

synthesis between economic theory and history³⁵, giving a special position to Marx. He believes that Marx's work could be seen as a more developed example than List's National System (Rüstow, 1941, p. 86).

At the same time, he also criticized Marx's approach as politically spitefulness, and his assessment regarding Sombart seemed to rely on this. In his assessment the importance of Sombart and Weber as a third generation of the historical school in the history of economic thought materialized from their ability to transfer the conclusion that Marx reached about the history of economy and the world by removing them from his political revenge and desire for vengeance. He stated that "Sombart and Weber generated a synthesis between the historical school and Marx's works, and in achieving this mission, their thesis about not giving a place to the value judgements in scientific activity (although these thesis actually was abandoned later by Sombart) acted as facilitative" (Rüstow, 1941, p. 87).

The most important aspect of Rüstow's article is that it is one of the articles that considered Sombart's methodological concern. It can be said that both Sombart's magnum opus *Der Moderne Kapitalismus* and his methodological concern were the first to be deeply considered in Rüstow's article. In regard to *Der Moderne Kapitalismus* Rüstow claim that Sombart always and exactly considered being tied to Marx (1941, p. 87). As a proof of this belief he cited the famous lines in the preface of the third volume of *Der Moderne Kapitalismus* in 1928, which had always been quoted as; "...This work is intended to be nothing but the continuation and, in a sense, the completion of the work of Marx... Anything that is good in my work, I owe to the mind of Marx. Marx spoke the first proud words about capitalism. In this work, the last modest words about this economic system are said" (Brocke, 1996, p. 61). While even these lines are open to argument and debate, it is accurate that "the concept of capitalism which is used today by everybody from both inside and outside of scientific field was introduced by Sombart's work" as Rüstow also befittingly indicated (1941, p. 88).

From the methodological point of view Rüstow took his *Die Drei Nationalökonomien* into consideration. He saw this book as the clearest and most comprehensive one amongst the other writings on methodology. In this book Sombart differentiated between the three economic sciences; *richtende* (directing), *ordnende* (classifying) and *verstehende* (understanding), and in each of them related to the three kinds of political economy, respectively; scholastic, classical school and historical school. According to Rüstow "...understanding economics is nothing than combination of economic sociology, economic history and idea and economic sentiments history of economic life" (1941, p. 90).

The other important German refugee professor at Istanbul University was Kessler, and his assessment of Sombart was also the same, underlining the importance of Sombart in the history of economic thought and of his book *Der Moderne Kapitalismus*. According to him "Sombart did really want to create neither a pure theoretical economy in a classical school sense nor an economic history which only investigates the origin, rather he wanted to make 'economic sociology' as he advert or 'philosophy of economic history' as being expressed better" (Kessler, 1941, p. 75).

³⁵ He pointed out that "their analyses rely on systematically and historical critics of the economic system which dominated in their time – mercantilism, free trade and capitalism – and proclaimed a more perfect system – competitive, protectionist and collectivism – instead (Rüstow, 1941, p. 83).

Sombart's economic sociology would appear to owe much to the German Historical School. As Kessler incisively pointed out that "Sombart does not approve the possibility of the creation of the economic theory which suits all periods of economic activities and synchronizes all events in economic life....he wants to understand deeply the economic sentiment which is dominant in special periods, namely the capitalist spirit, and to compare this to the economic sentiments which were old and totally different ones" (Kessler, 1941, p. 75).

He also regarded four of his books which were written between the two editions of *Der Moderne Kapitalismus* (1902-1916); *Die Juden und das Wirtschaftsleben* (1911), *Krieg und Kapitalismus* (1913), *Luxus und Kapitalismus* (1913) and *Der Bourgeois* (1913) as significant in understanding Sombart's thought. According to Kessler, "his books especially the one on the Jews and Bourgeois were rather important with regards to Sombart" (Kessler, 1941, p. 75).

Der Bourgeois also holds importance in understanding Ülgener's analysis, and an analogy is possible between it and Ülgener's books, with regards to consideration in the 'living man'. Before analyzing the effect of Sombart on Ülgener, two points have to be made. The first, Sombart's effect on Turkish literature suggest it to have a close relationship with conjuncture in the 1930s. As a consequence of this, amongst his writings only *Die Zukunft des Kapitalismus* and *Deutscher Sozialismus* which are thought to suit Turkey's political and intellectual climate during that period, are concerned. The second, it is seen that Sombart's negative reputation in relation to National Socialism is failed to be taken into consideration even by German immigrant professors at Istanbul University. However, Rüstow's argument illustrates another side of Sombart's disagreeable personal reputation. He pointed out that amongst the major historical personalities nobody can suit Hobbes's thesis which is "people can only build a relationship with others only when it is appropriate in their self-interest" better than Sombart (Rüstow, 1941, p. 93).

4. Sabri F. Ülgener as one Applying Sombart's Thought and Methodology

"If we excide the man and their interventions from our science, what will be left is nothing" (Ülgener, 1941a, p. 352)

In Turkey, it is true that the name of Ülgener always comes with the name of Weber, and he is often regarded as the "Turkish Weber". In reality, not solely to Weber but also German tradition totally hint to play an important role in his intellectual formation. In this regard mention should be given to the path from *firstly* Sombart and then Weber to Ülgener, being constructed via German Professors in Istanbul University.

This emphasis which relates to being the first is important to observe Sombart's effect on Ülgener. Realistically it could be mentioned that there are two sides to being the first. While Sombart was the first scholar who affected Ülgener, Ülgener was the first scholar who applied Sombart's thought and especially methodology in Turkey. With his own words; "[i]t was Werner Sombart whom I had firstly met...His agile pen and clear, attractive wording was really enough for affecting his reader. I regard serendipity to start with him. Starting with Sombart's clear and a little shallow wording and setting to work could be right to warm the topic" (Ülgener, 2006 [1983], pp. 3-4). His professorship committee's assessment also verified this point. According to the committee, under the presidency of Neumark, "Sabri Ülgener improved his scientific formation under the influence of especially Werner Sombart and Max Weber School and....he produce most of his works in this area" (Sayar, 1998, p. 110).

The topic mentioned by Ülgener and the area which his professorship committee stressed is the economic mentality. In Turkey, his works rightly identify with the economic mentality, and the source of this thought is indisputably based on the German tradition in terms of both philosophical and economical³⁶. German refugee professors would appear to be effective not only in introducing Sombart and Weber to him but also in "the adoption of methodology which is originated from Dilthey" (Uğur, 1983, p. 129). As he identified "...economic mentality research is closely related to the 'philosophy of life' and 'Phenomenology'" (Ülgener, 1941a, p. 354), and when this perception is taken into consideration, Ülgener was also seen "the precursor of applying the phenomenology and hermeneutic in social sciences" (Uğur, 1983, p. 130) in Turkey.

Like his contemporaries³⁷, his inception was the question of the backwardness of Turkey. However contrary to those who were mostly affected by Marxism, Ülgener followed a different path. He questioned the thought that the religion, in this context Islam, was the only reason for economic backwardness, which had been dominant since the *Unionist* with an influence of Positivism (Sayar, 1998, p. 66). Both in this questioning and all of his analyses, he seems to have benefitted from two of his advantages. One of them being his religious nurture³⁸ which became the main underlying reason behind his deep knowledge in classical Ottoman culture and the religious issue, his proficiency in the German language being the second.

The first conclusion which he reached, by virtue of both the discussions with the German professors and his reading of Sombart and Weber, was that "religion was not only a super-structural phenomenon as Marx had asserted but also an effectual fact" (Sayar, 1998, p. 63)³⁹. Such an approach to the role of religion in economic life was an underlying reason behind his orientation to economic mentality research. "With mentality research, the 'living man' starts to come into prominence" (Yılmaz, 2011, p. 88), and that was the signifying factor which makes Sombart important in the eyes of Ülgener. As is seen from the sentence quoted above, for most of his lifetime, Ülgener pursues identifying and recognizing this man by focusing the

³⁶ However as pointed out by Ayan "... it is a deficient argument that the only people who study economic mentality is Ülgener and that the only way to study this topic is German tradition. For example, Şerif Mardin also stressed this topic in his *'Ideology'* and *'Ideology and Religion'* (2000, p. 173).

³⁷ According to Sunar one of the main frames that shaped the thought of Ülgener was his generation, that is the circa 1910 generation. They "entered into Turkish thought mainly in 1940's and they had a critical approach against the current socio-political system in different terms and styles. Some important people of this generation like Niyazi Berkes, Mümtaz Turhan, Nurettin Topçu, Behice Boran and Kemal Tahir produced different perspectives on the current discussions that were shaped by the rapid political and social changes" (Sunar, 2015, p. 187).

³⁸ His religious nurture it would seem to have been from his family background. His grandfather İsmail Necati Efendi who was also the sheik of the Gümüşhanevi Sect and his father Mehmet Fehmi Efendi was "one of the important members of *ulema*...[he] also delivered fiqh and Mecelle (law) lectures in the Faculty of Politics (*Mekteb-i Mülkiye*), Faculty of Divinity (*İlahiyat*) and the Law Faculty in İstanbul Darülfünûn (University). He was appointed to İstanbul Müfti Office after the declaration of the Republic and served in this post till the end of his life" (Sunar, 2015, p. 187).

³⁹ However, it does not mean that religion is the only factor which determines the economy. In this respect, it should also be added that Ülgener did not entirely participate such an anti-Marxist debate, rather he thinks that "as well as a religion, periodical or partially political condition and other cultural developments" (Ayan, 2000, p. 173) also shaped the economic structure.

wrinkle on his face which was neglected⁴⁰. The subtitle of his magnum opus⁴¹, "the essay of a portrait with reflection in the history of thought and art history", also demonstrates the summit of his mentality research.

Considering in the living man ineluctably has a requirement of being in opposition to and criticizing the neo-classical abstraction as he essentially tried to do in both of his early articles. In his article on the Otto Stein's book review which was also his first academic article, Ülgener (1937) gave importance to the discrepancy and specificity of the German thought system against Anglo-Saxon tradition⁴². According to him, the direction of Germany is "to 'life' [and] its irrational diversity contrary to quantitative, static, mechanical [and] atomistic [approach], in short, 'pure' theory consideration since especially the Romantic and neo-romantic [movement]" (Ülgener, 1937, pp. 270-271). Linking with economic mentality, he again submitted the same argument with his own words in the first article which was the methodological foundation of his later analysis based on economic mentality⁴³. He underlined that "[Romantic Movement] was substantially close to the source of economic mentality by believing the fact that it could be learned much from living art and cultural production, even from ordinary folk songs instead of the abstraction of classical economics to understand people's real economic life" (Ülgener, 1941a, p. 353).

According to him, "by the omission of the [living] man, classical economists want to examine the flow of material sources like commodity, capital and money from one side to another, and by doing so they try to uplift economy science at the level of positive sciences (Ülgener, 1941a, pp. 351-352). However, "as a final stage of an evolutionary process which walks together with the *history of philosophy and culture*⁴⁴ in the recent past, economic mentality was also considered as well as the other material and exogenous factor in economic history survey" (Ülgener, 1941a, p. 353).

For Ülgener, Sombart's importance comes into sight at this point. According to him, what Sombart accurately and successfully achieved was the combination of the three traditions; namely, German Historical School, philosophy of life and, spiritual science. "Getting closer Schmoller School to Dilthey methodology was very efficient in regard to bringing opportunity of a wide vitality in economic history survey" (Ülgener, 1941b, p. 99). Once again, he had underlined that "the way which is followed and represented by Sombart was an important

⁴⁰ In this respect he said that "[t]he most prominence thing to identify and recognize the man who represents any circle and time is wrinkle on their face which is neglected" (Ülgener, 1941a, p. 352)

⁴¹ It was firstly published in 1951 (Ülgener, 1951) and secondly in 1981 with small changes under the different title (Ülgener, 1981).

⁴² According to Sayar, in Istanbul University "[a]lthough there was a neoclassical line which started with Röpke and accelerated with Dobretsberger and finally peaked with Ricci...Ülgener extremely had remained distant with the neoclassical abstraction and had been critical with his approach of human-material relation from the beginning (1998, p. 93).

⁴³ In the very beginning of his writing he summarized the importance of this article as follows; "The role of economic mentality in our science is one of the issues discussed recently. As an introduction to my large study on medieval economic mentality which I plan to publish in the future, I am just going to reveal the main point of this subject now" (Ülgener, 1941a, p. 351).

⁴⁴ Italics are in original.

turning point in respect to bringing living *man*⁴⁵ to the forefront, instead of exogenous data"⁴⁶ (Ülgener, 1941a, p. 354). According to Ülgener, "putting the living and hearing man in the centre of investigation also means the expansion of border to cultural science" (Ülgener, 1941a, p. 355), additionally "it was Sombart who masterly carried out this new survey *first*⁴⁷" (Ülgener, 1941b, p. 99). In a way to have the same meaning he also asserted that "the most important innovation of Sombart's system [was] to transfer the methodology of spiritual sciences to his discipline" (Ülgener, 1941b, pp. 100-101).

As seen from all, Ülgener's concern with regards to Sombart was considerably related to his methodology that had not been undertaken in Turkey previously. It could be said that he adopted the methodology from Sombart and walked along the path which is described by him. Although he also fostered support from Weber during this walking. Substantially benefitting from Weber's ideal types, especially to determine the appearance of mentality that was the most difficult part of mentality research.

He indicated that one of the possible ways to determine the appearance of mentality was to use the Dilthey's method which relies on comparing mediocre types with each other to compare different periods in history. Being aware of the difficulty in determining how successfully the types, Ülgener also stressed this method is not as simple as was supposed. At this point he refers to Weber and indicates that "admitted types in culture and mentality comparison should not be 'mediocre types' as Dilthey asserted, it should be mostly 'ideal types'" (Ülgener, 1941a, p. 355) which became a main information instrument for historians and sociologists especially after Weber. According to Ülgener, Weber's ideal types "provide stronger clarity by deepening some more particular lineament in physiognomy of [living man] than actually they are" (Ülgener, 1941a, p. 355).

Although Weber's ideal types are more convenient in comparison to Dilthey's mediocre types to determine and to compare different mentality, the problem with Weber in mentality research is that "he was only content with an appearance of specific mentality which closely concerns himself" (Ülgener, 1941a, p. 359). In fact, "economic mentality could be different in respect to *locality and occupation*, [and] it also differentiated by *time*⁴⁸" (Ülgener, 1941a, p. 359). Ülgener stressed that to examine the different appearances of mentality it would be helpful to remember Sombart's well-known classification which he made in *Der Moderne Kapitalismus*.

According to Sombart, the distinction between pre-capitalism and capitalism was firstly the difference between the principle to meet the needs (Bedarfsdeckungsprinzip) and the principle to make profit (Erwebsprinzip) in terms of economic activity. Secondly the difference between the traditional and the rational in terms of production and thirdly the difference between altruist and selfish in terms of human relation. Ülgener submitted that this classification was not assumed to be satisfactory in every respect and that why it had been open to criticism⁴⁹,

⁴⁵ Italic is in original

⁴⁶ This way was also "against the superficial science which has the habit of 'writing history without a man' as pointed out in Ranke's criticism (Ülgener, 1941a, p. 354).

⁴⁷ Emphasis is mine.

⁴⁸ Italics are in original.

⁴⁹ Ülgener also criticized this classification. His Sombart critique was largely relying on Rüstow's article which criticized Sombart's approach on the grounds of Eucken's writings. For detail see (Rüstow, 1940, p. 200).

nonetheless; it could be helpful in respect to didactical, lucid and easy to understand features (Ülgener, 1941a, pp. 359-360).

It should be noted once again that Ülgener's relationship with Sombart is in methodological base. It also has to be added that he also criticized him and gained support from others, especially from Weber, when appropriate. His writings in the very beginning of his magnum opus are seen as the summation of his thought; "It could possibly be an interesting study to expand the content of the working plan which had been tried by western scientist i.e. Weber and Sombart in their society to an original and a never studied area" (Ülgener, 1981, p. 15).

5. Conclusion

When it comes to the name of Sombart nowadays, two different approaches attract the attention. Either his name is completely overlooked or he is remembered with his negative reputation. The reason why most of today's economists and economy students do not recognize Sombart would seem to be mostly related to the modern-day economy perceptive. As a natural result of this perception, as long as the economy draws closer to quantitative methods, it equally diverts away from history and when taking this point of view into consideration, it is possible to say that not only Sombart but also almost all economic historians are cast away from history. Remembering him with his unfavorable scientific and personal reputation seems to be hold justification in some ways. His association and sympathy with National Socialism has still been discussed as it is accurate that his thoughts changed rapidly.

In the Turkish case, the factual situation appears to differentiate slightly. The 1930s was the first time when Sombart had started to gain notoriety amongst Turkish intellectuals and scholars. It is meaningful that he appeared with his two books; *Deutscher Sozialismus* and *Die Zukunft des Kapitalismus*. Although both of them can be evaluated as the indication of, to say the least, his sympathy towards National Socialism. In Turkey there was no direct emphasis or assessment regarding this issue. *Ziyaeddin Fahri's* book review in *Ülkü* seems to be the exception, nevertheless, it is possible to say that Sombart's only political writings rather than scholarly ones are concerned in this period.

It is without doubt that *Kadro* was one of the best representatives of the mentality world in 1930s Turkey, and the references given to Sombart by its writers, confirm this notion. The deduction of why the political writings of Sombart are only concerned with is probably the accordance of the German experience with the political condition of Turkey that is under single party rule. However, this does not mean that *Kadro* writers were unaware of any other writings of Sombart. As seen from *İsmail Hüsrev's* writings his *Der Moderne Kapitalismus* was also familiar, although it has had a little impact amongst Turkish intellectuals.

It is necessary to wait on Ülgener, for the examination, understanding and the application of the entire thought of Sombart. Having met Sombart by virtue of German immigrant professors at Istanbul University, Ülgener formed his analysis regarding economic mentality on the grounds of Sombart's thought and method. Although he is mostly named as the Turkish Weber, his premier inspiration indisputably is Sombart. It could be said that this is also consistent with the priority of Sombart in the face of Weber in the history of economic thought.

References

- Ahmad, F. (1993). War and Society under the Young Turks 1908-18. In A. Hourani, & et.al, *The Modern Middle East: A Reader* (pp. 125-143). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Akyurt, M. A. (2014). Çevrimyazı: Sombart W. İctimaiyat Nedir? Çev Nüzhət Servet. *Sosyoloji Dergisi*, 3. Dizi(2014/1), 383-389.
- Ayan, D. (2000). Sabri Ülgener'in Türk Düşünce Kültüründeki Yeri, [Sabri Ülgener's Place in Turkish Culture of Thought]. *Doğu Batı*(12), 157-191.
- Aydemir, Ş. S. (1932). Plan Mefhumu Hakkında [On Conception of Plan]. *Kadro*(5), 5-12.
- Aydemir, Ş. S. (1934). Bir İlk Eser: Türkiye Köy İktisadiyatı. *Kadro*(34), 34-39.
- Balkılıç, Ö., & Dölek, D. (2013). Turkish Nationalism at its Beginning: Analysis of Türk Yurdu 1913-1918. *Nationalist Papers: The Journal of Nationalism and Ethnicity*, 41(2), 316-333.
- Boratav, K. (2000). İktisat Tarihi (1908-1980). In S. Akşin, *Türkiye Tarihi, Cilt: 4 Çağdaş Türkiye 1908-1980* (pp. 297-380). İstanbul: Cem Yayınları.
- Bostancı, N. (1990). *Kadrocular ve Sosyo-Ekonomik Görüşleri, [Members of Kadro and His Socio-Economic Views]*. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları.
- Brocke, B. v. (1996). Werner Sombart 1863-1941 Capitalism-Socialism His Life, Works and Influence. In J. Backhaus, *Werner Sombart (1863-1941) Social Scientist Vol.1: His Life and Work* (pp. 19-102). Marburg: Metropolis.
- Ege, R., & Hagemann, H. (2012). The modernisation of the Turkish University after 1933: The contributions of refugees from Nazism. *The European Journal of the History of Economic Thought*, 19(6), 944-975.
- Epstein, M. (1941). Obituary Werner Sombart. *The Economic Journal*, 51, 523-526.
- Ertan, T. F. (1994). *Kadrocular ve Kadro Hareketi [Members of Kadro and Kadro Movement]*. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları.
- Fındıkoğlu, Z. F. (1935). Alman Sosyalizmi, [German Socialism]. *Ülkü*, 5(29), 397-400.
- Fındıkoğlu, Z. F. (1941). Sombart'a Dair [On Sombart]. *İÜİFM*, 3(1-2), 64-70.
- Hüseyin Avni, .. (1935). Bir Şerh Tercemesi Münasebetiyle, [In Connection with a Translation]. *Adliye Ceridesi*(7), 425-444.
- Kessler, G. (1941). Werner Sombart ve İktisat Tarihi [Werner Sombart and Economic History]. *İÜİFM*, 3(1-2), 71-78.
- Kılınçoğlu, D. T. (2015). *Economics and Capitalism in Ottoman Empire*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Koraltürk, M. (2001). İktisadiyat Mecmuası ve Dizini, [Journal of Economics and its Index]. *Kebikeç*(11), 295-331.
- Kuczynski, J. (1968). Werner Sombart. In D. L. Sills, *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences Vol.15* (pp. 57-59). USA: The Macmillian Company& The Free Press.



Sert, M. (2021), "Sombart in the Turkish Mirror: A Case of Sabri F. Ülgener", *Fiscaoeconomia*, 5(1), 38-55.

- Landau, J. M. (1996). *Tekinalp Bir Türk Yurtseveri (1883-1961)* [Tekinalp, Turkish Patriot (1883-1961)]. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Mardin, Ş. (1985). Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e İktisadi Düşüncenin Gelişmesi (1838-1918) [Development of Economic Thought from Tanzimat to Republic (1838-1918)]. In *Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyete Türkiye Ansiklopedisi, Vol. III* [Encyclopedia of Turkey from Tanzimat to Republic] (pp. 618-634). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Neumark, F. (2017). *Boğaziçine Sığınanlar: Türkiye'ye İltica Eden Alman İlim Siyaset ve Sanat Adamları 1933-1953* [Refuge at the Bosphorus. German scholars, politicians and artists in emigration 1933-1953]. (Ş. A. Bahadır, Trans.) İstanbul: Kopernik Yayınları.
- Özden, M. (2005). Atatürk Döneminde Kemalist Metinler: A'râfda Bir Kemalizm: Tekin Alp ve Kemalizm (1936), [Kemalist Texts in Atatürk's Era: A Kemalism in Purgatory: Tekin Alp and Kemalism]. *Bilig*(34), 45-81.
- Özveren, E. (2002). Ottoman economic thought and economic policy in transition. Rethinking the nineteenth century. In M. Psalidopoulos, & M. E. Mata, *Economic Thought and Policy in Less Developed Europe* (pp. 129-144). London: Routledge.
- Özveren, E. (2016). A Hundred years of German Connection in Turkish economic thought: Historicism and otherwise. In J. L. Cardoso, & M. Psalidopoulos, *The German Historical School and European Economic Thought* (pp. 149-166). NewYork: Routledge.
- Peukert, H. (2012). Werner Sombart. In J. Backhaus, *Handbook of the History of Economic Thought: Insight on the Founders of Modern Economics* (pp. 527-564). New York: Springer.
- Rüstow, A. (1940). İktisat İlminin Esasları [Principles of Economy Science]. *İÜİFM*, 2, 155-201.
- Rüstow, A. (1941). 'Sombart'ın Kapitalizm Telakkisi ve Tarihçi Mektebin İlmi Hedefleri, [Sombart's Capitalism Conception and Scientific Intention of Historical School]. *İÜİFM*, 3(1-2), 79-94.
- Sarç, C. (1941). Werner Sombart. *İÜİFM*, 3(1-2), 60-63.
- Sayar, A. G. (1986). *Osmanlı İktisat Düşüncesinin Çağdaşlaşması* [Modernization of Ottoman Economic Thought]. İstanbul: Der Yayınları.
- Sayar, A. G. (1998). *Bir İktisatçının Entellektüel Portresi: Sabri F. Ülgener* [An Intellectual Portrait of an Economist: Sabri F. Ülgener]. İstanbul: Eren Yayınları.
- Sert, M. (2018). Werner Sombart and His Analysis of "The Future of Capitalism". In E. Wirth, O. Şimşek, & Ş. Apaydın, *Economic and Management Issues in Retrospect and Prospect* (pp. 9-22). London: IJOPEC Publication.
- Sunar, L. (2015). A Weberian Critique of Weber: Re-Evaluation of Sabri F. Ülgener's Studies on Socio-Economic Structure of Turkey. *Journal of Economics and Political Economy*, 2(1), 186-196.
- Toprak, Z. (1985). İkinci Meşrutiyet Döneminde İktisadi Düşünce [Economic Thought in the period of Second Constitution]. In *Tanzimat'tan Cumhuriyet'e Türkiye Ansiklopedisi, Vol III* [Encyclopedia of Turkey from Tanzimat to Republic] (pp. 635-640). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

- Toprak, Z. (1994). Nationalism and Economics in the Young Turk Era. In J. Thobie, & S. Kançal, *Industrialisation, Communication et Rapports Sociaux: en Turquie et en Mediterranee orientale* (pp. 259-). Paris: Varia Turcica XX, Harmattan.
- Toprak, Z. (1995). *Milli İktisat-Milli Burjuvazi [National Economy and National Bourgeoisie]*. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları.
- Tökin, İ. H. (1932). Şark Vilayetlerinde Derebeylik I, [Seignior in East Province I]. *Kadro*(11), 22-29.
- Tökin, İ. H. (1990). *Türkiye Köy İktisadı 2. Baskı*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Tör, V. N. (1932). Kadro'yu Teyit Eden Bir Eser: Die Zukunft des Kapitalismus [A Book which confirms Kadro: Die Zukunft des Kapitalismus]. *Kadro*(5), 37-38.
- Tunçay, M. (1991). *Türkiye'de Sol Akımlar I (1908-1925) [The Left Movements in Turkey (1908-1925)]*. İstanbul: BDS Yayınları.
- Türkeş, M. (1999). *Kadro Hareketi Ulusçu Sol Bir Akım [Kadro Movement: A National Leftist Movement]*. Ankara: İmge Yayınları.
- Uğur, A. (1983). XIX. Yüzyıl Alman Tarih Felsefesi Geleneği ve Bir Türk Bilim Adamı: Prof. Sabri F. Ülgener [XIX. Century German Philosophy of History Tradition and A Turkish Scientist: Sabri F. Ülgener]. *Toplum ve Bilim*(23), 127-132.
- Ülgener, S. F. (1937). O. Stein "Menge und Grösse in der Wirtschaft: Grundlagen Zur Kritik An der Mathematisierenden Wirtschaftstheorie" (Volkswirtschaftliche Forschungen, No 4 Berlin 1936). *İstanbul Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Mecmuası, III*, 270-273.
- Ülgener, S. F. (1940). Kessler "İçtimaiyata Başlangıç" Türkçeye çeviren Z. F. Fındıkoğlu, İstanbul, 1938, [Kessler's "Introduction to Sociology" Translated in Turkish by Z.F. Fındıkoğlu]. *İÜİFM, 1*(2), 277-283.
- Ülgener, S. F. (1941a). İktisadi Hayatta Zihniyetin Rolü ve Tezahürleri [Mentality and its Appearance in Economic Life]. *İÜİFM, II*(3-4), 351-380.
- Ülgener, S. F. (1941b). 'İktisat Felsefesi' Tarihinde Werner Sombart'ın Yeri ve Şahsiyeti [Werner Sombart's Place of History of 'Economic Philosophy' and His Personality]. *İFM, III*(1-2), 95-115.
- Ülgener, S. F. (1951). *İktisadi İnhinat Tarihimizin Ahlak ve Zihniyet Meseleleri [Moral and Mentality Matters of Economic Decline]*. İstanbul: İ.Ü. İktisat Fakültesi Yayınları No:55.
- Ülgener, S. F. (1981). *İktisadi Çözülmenin Ahlak ve Zihniyet Dünyası [Moral and Mental World of Economic Dissolution]*. İstanbul: Der Yayınları.
- Ülgener, S. F. (2006 [1983]). *Zihniyet, Aydınlar ve İzm'ler [Mentality, Intellectuals and ...ism's]*. İstanbul: Derin Yayınları.
- Yılmaz, F. (2011). Sabri Ülgener ve Liberalizm [Sabri Ülgener and Liberalism]. In M. Yılmaz, *Sabri Fehmi Ülgener: Küreselleşme ve Zihniyet Dünyamız [Sabri Fehmi Ülgener: Globalization and Our Mentality World]* (pp. 85-102). Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları.