

DEEP HISTORY OF LIBERALISM: AN APPROACH TO LIBERALISM HISTORY

Firat BARÇADURMUŞ

University of Warsaw

Warsaw/POLAND, e-Mail: fbarcadurmus@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
<p>Article History: Received: 25 April 2018 Accepted: 2 July 2018</p>	<p>The modern liberalism is a political thought movement which develops by the enlightenment of western. Firstly, it used by Adam Smith as a notion. Liberalism comes into prominence with dignity and supporting the true things as freedom of religion and conscience, the leadership of mind, determinate countries, private ownership etc. Sophism was born in V. century. Protagoras is the first agent of sophism. Sophism is a philosophical quadrat that which one criticizes aristocratic and entrenched thoughts, takes people in to the centre and the top of life by idea of metron antropos panton (human is measure of everything), based on humanity while legislation and implement. Sophists suppose the successful person as happy person, gives a pragmatically meaning to life. Generally, the sophists have a democratic approach.</p>
<p>Keywords: Liberalism, Sophism, Philosophical Greek, Socrates</p>	
<p>DOI: 10.26809/joa.2018342288</p>	

1. INTRODUCTION

Liberalism has emerged as a concept AD XVII. century first used by Adam Smith. Philosophical part of liberalism is fed from an intellectual and as a traditional political in historical perspective mainly three resources can be said these are John Locke, notably David Hume Scottish Enlightenment and Immanuel Kant (Erdoğan, 2009). In XX. Century, political has re-shaped in concept of liberalism in Europe and North America and if it is right to express, liberalism continues its way with rearing, nowadays we witness even communist countries like China adopt liberal policies. Liberalism is an economic and political belief that sees the state as a purpose who defends individualism, equality, religion, conscience, belief and expression but use as a means of, it defends the other issues except the security and justice are independent from state and that defends special promotional economic entrepreneurship.

The work Sophist comes from the Greek sophists word. Sophist means someone who loves knowledge, wise, resourceful and clever. Sophism thought that emerged in BC V. century, is a thought of production period that democratic principles gained importance parallel with economic and social development, while the traditional aristocratic rules and intuitions became not able to meet the changing and developing social, political and cultural needs (Göze, 2007). The first representative is Protagoras. Sophism is a thought that criticizes the aristocratic and established thoughts of the period, takes human as a base with human is the measure of all things belief (Metron antropos panton), caring and prefers human, puts human in front of the laws. In the other words, laws cannot be independent from the human. Laws are created by the human, and for the human. Thus, instead of putting laws in front of human, sophists put human in front of the laws. In ancient Greece, successful people are perceived as a happy human, give meaning to life pragmatic and practical. It can be said that generally they develop democratic ideas. Although there has been more than two thousand years between sophism and liberalism, with the aspects of the function of state, taking the individual into centre, caring society show significant similarities.

2. SOPHISM'S BEING AGAINST THE ARISTOCRATIC STRUCTURE

Sophism that is emerged during the corruption period of aristocracy has taken stand against aristocratic values. Rather than the nobles who the distributing the law of justice for personal interests according to Thrasimakhos's "justice is what works for powerful" sentence, sophists who accept human as the measure of all things; says values like state, law, justice are not unchangeable values, and it was a belief against established order (Göze, 1983). Sophists got their first response from aristocratic consensus supporters with their mutual ideas. According to people depending on the layout, sophists assert silly thoughts, people who were themselves outside of society's values and work to show us the behaviour exceeded (Yetkin, 2008). Aristocratic structure admitted to sentence to death like Socrates or exile like Protagoras to get rid of sophists. In aristocratic structure, the management rights belong to aristocrats. They had been claiming that the management right is given themselves by God, as it means the right comes from their blood. Sophist's points that the knowledge and virtues is not coming from blood but it can be won with education, the stand against to aristocratic thought system. For in that period aristocrats are arguing that knowledge and virtue come from the blood and that they are not a property that can be earned later. Here, of course, the sophists are regarded as extremely dangerous for the aristocrats, and in general they have taken an attitude that excluded the sophists, and at first opportunity they were forced to move away from their territories like Protagoras or to be executed as Socrates.

According to Socrates with Sophist thoughts, his will for management of society not by the majority of people but by a virtuous minority is alike with the aristocrats, is significantly different from aristocrat's opinions. Although Socrates has a negative attitude towards sophists, but it is not wrong to mention that Socrates have similar thoughts to sophists. According to Yörük, Socrates has impressed in the face of wisdom of Protagoras (Yörük, 1948). Aristophanes In his book "The Clouds," he portrays a different portrait from Socrates that we know today: Socrates is one who is not very different from sophists and deals with physical questions like nature philosophers (William, 2005). Socrates said that "le monde visible" in the world of sight would not reach a single truth. This idea is similar to the idea of sophists, especially Protagoras, who think that "man is the measure of everything." (Dindar, 1986). Socrates believed that it is possible learn to something at all times and at all age that man did not know, so he learned to steal lyre despite his advanced age (Öçal, 2016). Again, in the "Socrates Final Speech", which is written by Plato, Socrates said that Evenos from Paros is providing education for in return money. And Socrates continues as follows:

“...if I had such information (Information that can be given in exchange for money), I would really be proud of myself, but believe me, Athenians, I have no such information...” (Eflatun, 2009).

The separation of Socrates, in general, from the Sophists, comes from thinking that he does not have the knowledge he can afford or can be given in exchange for money. We see Socrates himself arguing that he does not know anything (Eflatun 2009), so he cannot teach for money what he does not know. But, if Evenos from Paros, who teaches knowledge can be given in exchange for money to someone else, has such knowledge and can sell this knowledge, in fact, Evenos is a very happy person (Eflatun, 2009). Against the relative attitude of the sophists to the field of knowledge, Socrates always believed in the existence of universal truths. The sophists did not seek to teach the teacher as much as possible but as a person who did not know anything. The sophists want to gain much evidence from the emergence of truth. Socrates has always been in pursuit of truth throughout his life (Öçal, 2016). Socrates claims that only God is knowledgeable (Eflatun, 2009). Although it is not very accurate to mention that Socrates is a sophist, but it is not wrong to say that there are similar considerations with sophists. These rights to rule the minority community should be taken from their wisdom not from their nobility (Şenel, 2011). Thus, Socrates is not in sharing the same idea that the management of society is not in the hands of nobility that are considered as inherently virtuous and knowledgeable and accepted. Again, Protagoras that we can say he is the father of the Sofism ideas confirmed as follows:

"Virtue is neither the work of nature nor fortune, it is something that can be taught or achieved by labour. To the people who were born with defective work of nature or faith, people don't think to get angry with them, lecture advice or punish them, they only pity them. For example, someone who looks the ugly, petty person with a bad attitude is crazy or what? Everyone knows that things like beauty or ugliness is the bless of nature, bless of fate. But if there are bad attitudes in a person, in that situation, the feelings of both getting angry, punish, lecture rises in people. Nobody can punish a criminal blindly like a monster because he did an evil thing, because the thing is already done, but think of the future, punishes the criminal to give a lesson to other criminal, to prevent criminals doing it again If the purpose of the punishment is to prevent crime, virtue is something can be taught" (Yetkin, 2008).

As we understand from these statements of Protagoras, Protagoras expressed that virtue and knowledge don't come from lineage and he clearly expressed he is against aristocratic structure. Virtue is not a congenital inherited disease, temperament, disability. Virtue is something that can be transmitted / teach to the person afterwards. So virtue is not merely inherited, which is only in the nobility, transmitted to the person through blood. In other words, Protagoras made it clear that virtue and knowledge do not come from the nobility, and made it clear that he is against the aristocratic structure.

3. CRITICAL APPROACH OF SOPHISM TO EMBEDDED THOUGHT

Sophism dealt a severe blow to aristocratic value, the approved without discuss and applied rules and institutions, beliefs until that time. It criticized previous though system and social rules, system with all sides. Because, calling a person as “sophist” requires a common specialty is that this person could make a traditional, social and politic structure's institutions, concept and belief as a discussion subject (Yetkin, 2008). They dwelled on idea that social, political rules and institutions are not unchangeable or unfailing values, these are human nature and because of this they can change(Göze, 1983). They also drew attention on these rules are not the same in everywhere and not unchangeable, they vary from country to country. Social traditions, customs and traditions that regulate the social political life are not unchangeable and sacred values. This shows varies from a country another country within

time periods and in same periods. Because the sophist Herakleitos says, “everything is in one motion, the only thing constant is change’s itself.”. We have mentioned, however, that virtue and knowledge are not inherent characteristics of the person, as we have conveyed in the previous chapter, that they can later be transmitted to the persons, in other words, it is clearly stated by Protagoras that it is not a hereditary condition (Göze, 1983). Socrates, who has sophist opinions, says he listened the voice that god sent him, but this is a great crime regarding aristocratic structure. Because an Athenian citizen who has to depend on society and its laws, traditions, beliefs and thoughts with everything and he can only think in order the state, think and believe, and only can listen the orders given by the state. Apart from that, even it is gods voice, to pay attention, to listen, to believe and obey to another “voice” was a crime against the state, the penalty was death (Göze, 2007). Socrates was executed by making him drink hemlock because of criticizing the aristocratic and settled thoughts, being a threat for the continuation of the order, not believing in gods, abetting young people.

4. SOPHISM’S TAKING HUMAN TO THE CENTRE OF EVERYTHING

One of the main topics of philosophy is human. The human subject has been continuously processed from the past to the present day. Philosophers have had dealing with the philosophy that thought process on issues concerning human and human. To understand humanity and to understand what it is and how it is, how they can live together, is the human an animal or different from other creatures, whether human nature is good or bad, or whether it is actually a human nature or it is changing in individual. That and kind of questions has always been the subject of research. As in liberalism, Sophism has also taken the people in this point.

The philosophical roots of liberalism are shaped by the views of thinkers like Locke, Hume, Smith, Mill, Bentham, Spencer, and Constant (Çetin, 2001). However, there are many writers who are influenced by these liberal thinkers and defend the fundamental values of liberalism. One of the most important liberal philosophers of the XX century is Rorty. Some thinkers, however, do not hesitate to describe Rorty's epistemology as "a new sophism" (Akdemir, 2013). Liberalism in a political and philosophical sense is a movement that is based on people / individuals and develops philosophy around people. There is no doubt that Richard Rorty (1931-2007) is one of the most influential philosopher of the XX century as one of the spokesmen of the pragmatic philosophy in the modern period and one of the elite names of the liberal world (Çetin, 2001). We understand that it has human-centred Rorty's clear from these words;

“According to Rorty, it is a great lie that the human mind / language reflects the truth as it is fact. Because, there is no reality which is independent from human mind. The truth is not something that is outside the human mind and perceived, but rather something that is produced by the human mind. Likewise, "righteousness" is not the "righteous representation" of something that transcends the human sphere, but the "subjective linguistic consensus among people themselves” (Akdemir, 2013).

In Rorty's words above, we see clearly that man is at the centre. According to Rorty, a representative of liberalism, there is no reality independently of the human being, for reality is not something that exists outside of man, independent of man. On the contrary, it is something created by man. Because, just like reality, also truth is not something that happens outside of human. In this case, truth and reality cannot be evaluated independently of human. All these are because the people are. So, things are not independent of the people. In other words, existence of all of this and such things connected with human. Naturally man is in the centre of everything.

Protagoras, who is considered as the founder of sophism made human the focus of philosophy and thought with the sentence “Human is the measure of all things, he laid the foundation of philosophy’s dealing with human. The thing called real, it varies from person to person, if there is something other than and above person an absolute “truth”, “right” and “good” does not exists, regarding that all these values and judgments vary from person to person, in this context, the measure of these values is in the hands of human, that means “human is the measure of all things” (Göze, 2007) says Protagoras. Sophists defended various political ideas but their mutual context is human. This opinion that leaves the problems about universe aside, has addressed human and discussed human in their social, political environment (Göze, 1983).

According to aristocrat Pindoras, “Nomos are generally considered the rules imposed by the gods. Even it is human structure, this is the set of rules to be applied by human who didn’t set them up”, (Şenel, 2011) that means these rules, laws are over everything, but against the rule that they are the king of everything, Protagoras who is considered as the founder of sophism takes human as the measure and puts human in front of laws saying that the laws are not real.

5. REPRESENTATIVE AND MESSENGER OF PRAGMATIC AND PRACTICAL STRUCTURE WITH CONTEMPORARY LIBERALISM IN ANCIENT GREEK

Sophists are the first who addressed for the first time the “moral (happiness) problem” in intellectual history. Moral is an area that is described with “good and bad” concepts and aims best. In this context to “good for people, what is the best?” question, sophists gave the answer “happiness”. However, that answer entails that question should be asked immediately: “How can people be happy?” Here is this happiness recipe of sophists carry the practical and pragmatic meaning. With the most obvious and clear meaning, happy human is successful human (Türe, 2006). In the period that the sophism is emerged, the conceptual knowledge has no meaning. To come to a place in top positions, to gain reputation, to become rich etc. they were required to take core courses such as rhetoric. In right that specific point, sophists were giving these lessons for the consideration of money, because happiness means success. Success could be achieved only with information that will lead to the goal.

The source of the distinction between sophist and philosopher is the notion of philosophy that the sophists treat as an independent theoretical activity independent of the way of life. If we just ignore it then It is not possible to distinguish between a philosopher and a sophist (Oralgül, 2017). If we make a very sharp evaluation between sophist and liberal thinker centuries, then we could mention that the social structure was not so different between both centuries. Both in BC V. century and AD XVII. century religion was so powerful in the social life and people was divided aristocratic and others. There was philosophy and it was so famous but same time social structure could not accept something new and against the social structure or aristocrats. The law was not the law of people which securing the stability and security of people. The law could protect the aristocrats and religion. We will mention about law later again.

The problem basically was the social structure of BC IV. and BC V. century. During the BC IV. and BC V. century there was certainly no disapproval for the sale of goods for money. It was the fact that sophists sold instruction in wisdom and virtue. There were not the kind of things should be sold for money (Kerferd, 1981). With no doubts, Sophist was against social, political and religious structures. An example of the religion, the sophist argues that belief in God and the universe’s origins could be different truths that vary from man to man. As a matter of fact, Protagoras put forward a skeptical attitude in the religious scene, saying

that "I don't know either God exist or not" (Kabakçı, 2010). Indeed, this was a war to religion the structure of ancient Greece. Because the sophists were mentioning could be different understanding of things and it was not a usual idea during that time. Same as liberal thinkers they were mentioning about a different idea which is against the structure.

When it comes to law, they are (sophists) sharply critical of the law and other social institution, and offer scope for widely varying interpretation (Saunders, 1977). According to Protagoras, the law rather than deploy the justice should be useful in securing the stability and security of civilized life. This shows the Protagoras is an open and free-thinker philosopher who is able to evaluate law with a perspective that frees from the state influence (Yörük, 1948). When the law is regarded as an agreement, it is imperative that all human beings are bound to their free will, that is, they are equal to other people. The law should not protect the aristocratic and religious structure but should secure the stability and security of the people within the equal way.

What is the state? This was a very important question for the BC IV and BC V. century. When it comes to the question of the existence of states sophists has 2 answers. The first of the answer is the social contract theory. According to Protagoras and Antiphon, humans are among those who are most in need of community life. The second answer is the concept of the power. Which are forms the basis of contemporary state theories (Gagarin, Woodruff, 2003). The "modern" theory and discussion of a social contract and the "natural rights" of man, is based on the works of Grotius, Pufendorf, Hobbes, Montesquieu and especially J.J. Rousseau, who published his *Du Contract Social* in 1762 (Kyriazis, Economou, & Zachilas, 2012). But the social contract theory was discussed first by the sophists. The first explicit formulation of a theory of social contract is to be found in the mid-5th century BC writings of the orator Antiphon, who thus preceded Rousseau by about 2200 years (Kyriazis, Economou, & Zachilas, 2012). Social contract idea was not discussed only by the sophist Antiphon but other sophist was discussing and expressing their idea on social contract as well for example Protagoras in his essay *On Truth*, he also uses the antithesis of law versus nature ("nomos/physics") to claim, in accordance to Antiphon, that (human) laws are superficially imposed on citizens while those arising from nature ("physics") are unavoidable. (Kyriazis, Economou, & Zachilas, 2012). Also Protagoras' view that law and justice find their origin in man's desire to escape from the insecurity of a lawless existence for reasons of individual self-protection is essentially similar to the contract theory of Epicurus (Mulgan, 1979).

In fact, the sophists' discussion of the tension between nomos and physics was part of a larger effort to examine traditional views of morality and justice in a critical but positive way (Gagarin & Woodruff, 2003). The term physics is usually translated by 'nature'. Nomos, traditionally translated either as 'law' or 'convention' or 'custom' according to what seems best to fit the context, is perhaps a rather more subtle term that these translations would suggest (Kerferd, 1981). The sophist has distinguished physics and nomos, putting laws in the latter category.

Despite sophism is emerged in BC V. century, and liberalism is emerged AD XVIII. century, as it is mentioned above, they have so many common directions. Especially, being people-oriented of two thoughts, regarding individual benefits, aristocratic social and political structure emerged as a reaction to the aristocratic religious thinking is noteworthy are in common. In addition to this, in the state is a result of a contract, late sophists the start point of the state even it is not based on power but to equality, seeing the state is not a purpose but as a mean are notable features.

6. CONCLUSION

The reason why sophism is emerged is the corrupted attitude of the period, because the aristocrats were nothing but a group of people who make laws for their own interests, think more their own interests than the society they direct. Liberal ideas began to germinate in such a spot in full because they have scholasticism of the church and it was a current of thought that has rebelled against the corrupt attitude.

One of the important points here is Socrates and the sophists. We know that Socrates generally shows an attitude towards the sophists, but the most important point that difference between Socrates and the sophists is that Socrates think that the sophists change the information to money and that is why they are actually ignorant. According to Socrates, it is only God who has knowledge. Also, if we consider about the social structure in IV. BC and V. BC century, it was not a usual to change such information to the money.

Both sophism and modern liberalism evaluated the reason of existence of state in the concept of "social contract theory". Because human is not a living being who can manage to live alone. That has forced people to go in solidarity. This people of solidarity led to the foundation of the state who has a top authority for the protection of nature and each other. By that, the state is a tool of ensuring happiness, which is created by people based on social contract and equality. With the other words, the existence of states should be based on happiness of people.

The concept of relativity has become the common point of the two ideas. That perception is provided by sense organs of knowledge resources that the people-to-people exchange can be social and political rules in order to have a quality of absolute, universal, and it is not divine, they argued that could be changed in the aristocratic and religious structures.

With taking people to the centres and individual interests, is also one other common point in liberalism. With the understanding of "Man is the measure of all things" not the universe has dealt with people, but emphasized the importance of human happiness. With the practical and pragmatic quality, also it is emphasized that the happy people are the successful people. In short words, although there is the two-thousand-year time interval between two thoughts, sophists can be seen as the precursor of liberalism in ancient Greek. Because the aim of the state with sophism, emerging with the term of core values and features, at the end of the AD XVII. century and in the beginning of XVIII. Century, taking people to the centre, being opposed to the established opinion, it is expected to explain with the practical and pragmatic structures are alike in which degree to each other.

REFERENCES

- AKDEMİR, F. (2013). Richard Rorty'nin Pragmatik Liberal Ütopyasında Dinin İşlevi ve Geleceği Sorunu. *İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi III*. 31-60.
- BRITANNICA, T. E. (n.d.). Encyclopaedia Britannica. Retrieved, (22.07.2018) from Nomos: <https://www.britannica.com/topic/nomos-Greek-philosophy>
- ÇETİN, H. (2001) "Liberalizmin Temel İlkeleri", C.Ü. İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi, Retrieved (19.08.2017), from: <http://eskidergi.cumhuriyet.edu.tr/makale/101.pdf> . 219-237
- DINDAR, B. Sokrates ve J. P. Sartre Felsefesinde İnsan. *On dokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 1986, s.77-86
- EFLATUN. (2009), Sokrates'in Savunması, Alkım Yayınları, İstanbul,
- ENCYCLOPEDIA. RETRIEVED (22.07.2018) from Nomos And Phusis: <https://www.encyclopedia.com/humanities/encyclopedias-almanacs-transcripts-and-maps/nomos-and-phusis>
- ERDOĞAN, M. (2009). Liberalizme Yeniden Bakış: Tarihi ve Felsefi Temelleri. *Liberal Düşünce*. 7-31
- GAGARIN, M. & WOODRUFF, P. (2003). Early greek political thought from Homer to the Sophists. Cambridge: University Press of Cambridge.
- GÖZE, A. (1983), Siyasal Düşünce Tarihi, Fakülteler Matbaası, İstanbul
- GÖZE, A. (2007) , Siyasal Düşünceler Ve Yönetimler, Beta Yayınları, İstanbul
- KABAKÇI, E. (2010). Siyasal Düşünceler Tarihi. İstanbul: İÜ AUZEF.
- KERFERD, G. B. (1981). The Sophistic Movement. New York: Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge.
- KYRIAZIS, N., ECONOMOU, E. M., & ZACHILAS, L. (2012). Direct Democracy and Social Contract in Ancient Athens . *International Journal of Social, Behavioral, Educational, Economic, Business and Industrial Engineering*, 3086-3091.
- MULGAN , R. G. (1979). Lycophron and Greek Theories of Social Contract . *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 121-128.
- ÖÇAL, Ş. Sofistler ve Sokrates. Retrieved (08.01.2017) from Akademia.edu: <https://scholar.google.com.tr/scholar?hl=tr&q=++SOFİSTLER+VE+SOKRATES+++Şamil+Öçal&btnG=&lr=> adresinden alındı
- ORALGÜL, E. D. (2017). Sofist ve Filozof Ayrımı Işığında Antik Felsefe. *Flsf*. 259-275.
- SAUNDERS, T. J. (1977). Antiphon the Sophist on Natural Laws. *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, 215-236
- ŞENEL, A. (2011), Siyasal Düşünceler Tarihi, Bilim ve Sanat Yayınları, Ankara
- TÜRE, F. (2006), "Antik Liberalizm mi Yoksa Modern Sofizm mi", *SÜ İİBF Sosyal ve Ekonomik Araştırmalar Dergisi*. 23-49
- WILLIAM, J. (2005) , Ancient Concept of Philosophy, Taylor & Francis e-Library, London.
- YETKİN, Ç., (2008), Siyasal Düşünceler Tarihi 1, Salyangoz Yayınları, İstanbul

YÖRÜK, A. K. (1948). Sofistler ve hukuk görüşleri. *İstanbul Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Mecmuası* , 850-870.

