

Tatars and Arabs in Adam Smith's the Wealth of Nations

Dr. Bilal ELİK¹
Dr. Murat AKYÜZ²
Assoc. Prof. Alpaslan TOKER³

Abstract

In his book, *The Wealth of Nations*, Adam Smith socio-economically made references to social, political, administrative, judicial, cultural, military, religious, and historical activities and situations of some civilizations and nations that existed from the first age until the time he wrote this work. He similarly spoke of Arabs and Tatars as simple, frugal, and warrior nations that remained stranded in the shepherd era, which was one of the sociological stages of society. He discussed Arabs and Tatars, who have played a very important role in history, in several places, mostly and generally in connection with the above issues and in some places independently. Therefore, in this study, we discussed Smith's views on Arabs and Tatars and his thoughts about them together. In this book of his, although he called Arabs and Tatars barbarians, Smith did not fail to provide frequent examples from them on some important issues.

Keywords: Adam Smith, Tatars, Arabs, Arabic Gum.

Section I

1.0. Introduction

Adam Smith (1723-1790) is considered as the father of economics and the pioneer of the political economy. Smith also laid the foundation for Classical Liberalism (Free Market Economy). Of his theories, The Theory of Absolute Advantage, The Division of Labor, The

¹ Department of Economics, Nile University of Nigeria, bilal.celik@nileuniversity.edu.ng

² Department of Business Administration, Nile University of Nigeria, murat.akyuz@nileuniversity.edu.ng

³ Department of English Studies, Nile University of Nigeria, atoker@nileuniversity.edu.ng

Tatars and Arabs in Adam Smith's the Wealth of Nations

Invisible Hand Theory are among Smith's best-known and the most professed theories (Schumpeter, 1954, p. 362). Since he deeply touched on various subjects in his works, due respect and value were paid to him and his works in the fields of economics, politics, history, geography, sociology, philosophy and other sciences.

The most important one of Smith's articles and books and his masterpiece is his book entitled *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. It was identified in a short name, as *the Wealth of Nations*. As is known, *the Wealth of Nations* was written in a period of ten years (1766-1776). During this long period, Smith met with some of the most influential philosophers and scientists of the era, witnessed the declaration of American independence (1776), the French revolution (1789), and its turbulent times of preparation, as well as was deeply affected by them. Therefore, more or less, anyone who happens to read the book will understand that he sometimes experienced fluctuations or shifts in thought during the course in which the book was written. We believe that this should be approached with tolerance.

Robert B. Ekelund and Robert F Hebert (1990) stated the following about Smith's masterpiece:

The new dawn of capitalism that the Physiocrats so eagerly looked forward to had not yet arrived in 1776 – when many Europeans were focused on the New World and the struggles of an emerging nation – but it was certainly on its way. And it was helped along, intellectually, by the publication in that year of a book that is still read and still published (not just by and for graduate students, incidentally): Adam Smith's *Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. The prominence of this book in the development of economics gave its author the consensual title, "father of economics" (p. 107)

Lionel Robbins (2000), in his book entitled *A History of Economic Thought* which was compiled from his lecture notes by his students Steven G. Medema and Waren J. Samuels, made the following important point about Smith's book *The Wealth of Nations*:

The main content of the scientific side of it – and here I am being a spot controversial; not all historians of economic thought would put it this way, but I am saying to you that in my opinion, the main content of the *Wealth of Nations* is a theory of productive organization and a theory of the causes of economic growth. Some people will fasten

attention on the theory of value and distribution. And it is true that the theory of value and distribution in book 1, and some parts of the theory of money and capital in book 2, have attracted the most attention among theoretical economists. But my own belief, which has grown through years of reading and thinking about the *Wealth of Nations*, is that you get the perspective wrong if you focus too much – even I may have done this in earlier lectures or earlier footnotes – on the value and distribution side, although I'm going to give you quite a strong dose of value and distribution in a moment (p. 129).

This point of Robbins, who made the most used and popular definition of the economy and had a vast knowledge and experience, on *Wealth of Nations* is also important because it is the product of a great effort. (Bilal Celik, Murat Akyuz, Medet Onel, 2018)

Adam Smith and his works are quite popular in the world. Especially his book, *Wealth of Nations*, has been accepted among unchanging world classics and considered the most important book of reference. In this important work of Smith, we discussed in our study his reference to the Arabs who have a very deep-rooted and ancient civilization, the Tatars who played a major role in the history and Mongols, Turks, and other Turkic tribes in Central Asia under the title of Tatars. Smith, with the term "Tatar," referred to all nomadic equestrian nations living in Russia, Ukraine, Siberia, and Central Asia, and used this term in a narrower sense for Mongols. It is known that European used the word Tatar for equestrian nomadic tribes until the end of XIX. Century. Mehmet Maksudoğlu (1997), in this regard, the most beautifully explained in which senses the word Tatar was used by the Europeans and stated that

The term "Tatar" causes confusion at first glance because it was used in different meanings at various times. The Russians have used this term all the Muslims with Turkish lineage living in European Russia for centuries. Western writers and researchers used this word for Turks living in Turkestan and north of the Black Sea. The Ottomans used the term Tatar for northern Turks as of sixteenth century (p. 205)

At this point, Ahmet Buran and Ercan Alkaya (2011) explained the etymology, historical development, and meaning of the word Tatar as such:

The name Tatar was first mentioned in Orkhon Inscriptions as Otuz Tatar and Tokuz Tatar. Chinese sources recorded them as "Ta-ta" or "Da-Da" belonging to various

Tatars and Arabs in Adam Smith's the Wealth of Nations

periods. Historian Rashid-al-Din Hamadani recoded these people as a separate tribe and noted down their language as Mongolian. It was also mentioned in the Dede Korkut stories. Apart from these sources, it was seen that the Tatars were shown as one of the nine Turkic tribes in Qabus-Nama, included in the Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk among the Turkic tribes and the name Tatar also found in the list of Turkic tribes in Fakhr al-dīn Mubârekshâh. The name Tatar was described in various sources with meanings such as "mountain man, Tatar, barbarian, savage, archer people, idol (totem), Tepter, Water Mongolian, and foreigner. (p. 55)

The name of Tatar or Tartar has been studied by many historians of different nationalities. Such as; Arabic, Turkish, Persian, Chinese, Russian, and Europeans are discussed in written works.

Europeans, Russians, and some Asian nations called the Golden Herodians until recently and later all the noble Muslims living in European Russia as Tatars. The senior managers in the Golden Horde State and in the khanates established after it called themselves Tatars, which left to the adoption of this name among the people. However, this name, which was opposed by a large part of the people, was accepted and settled in today's sense with Tatar consciousness that began to develop in XIX. Century, and especially with the efforts of Sahabeddin Marcani. (p. 55)

Arabs, Turkish, and some Tatars tribes together, they fought and won victories against the Chinese in Talas (in Kazakhstan) 715 A.C. After this event, Turks and Tatars in Central Asia began to accept Islam religion. Under the influence of this, the Tatars and other Central Asian Turks were thoroughly mixed. That is why historians sometimes confuse Tatars with other Central Asian nations.

Bertold Spuler (1957) stated the following regarding the name Tatar in his book called *The Mongols in Iran*:

East and west, use the word Tatar or "Tartar" (derived from the Greek word "Tartaros") as the name of the tribe instead of the word "Mongol." Mirhvand often uses both names side by side. This means that it is necessary to understand that the Mongol language was referred to when the Tatar language was mentioned as the language used every day in the

palace of the Great Khan at the beginning of the 14th century. However, the word "Tartaric" is recently considered equal to "Turkish" in terms of language. Because both the tribes, the Mongols and the Turks, had fused together. In this sense, the term "Tartaric" is used especially by today's Russian Turks (pp. 494-495).

Kalkan (1996) explained distinguishes between Mongols and Tatars as below;

The fact that the scientific world heard the name "Tatar" intensely became apparent with the occupation of Russian lands by the Mongols. In fact, the name Tatar was known in Europe long before Genghis Khan since the period of Lieth Dynasty (907-1119) in China. In 1224, his plundering raids and massacres on Europe caused shock to the public. People, who escaped from violent attacks, identified the Mongols with the name "Tatar" either they failed to distinguish the Mongols and Tatars from one another or the Mongols had sent the Tatars as pioneer units. The move of sending foreign tribes as a pioneer unit in the Mongols was a strategy of Genghis Khan. Even V.V. Barthold also found it interesting that the name Mongol was erased despite Genghis Khan's power and his military achievements and the name Tatar retained its popularity. A potential danger of resistance would be checked by the pioneer units that were sent in advance and the actual attack would be carried out later. (pp. 11-12).

Genghis Khan and Hulagu used the Tatars in the forefront against their enemies during wars in accordance with their strategies and policies. This is one of the important reasons that are Chinese, Russian, Hungarian, Japanese, and many European researchers, who conducted research on Tatar and Mongolian history, made this mistake, and referred Mongols as Tatars.

In the book of *Wealth of Nations*, Adam Smith used the words "Tartar", "Tartars" and "Tartary" as well as "Arab", "Arabs", and "Arabian" (from Arabs or Arabs). Smith, sometimes in the same sentence, on the same page, on the same subject, sometimes on different pages and subjects, made mention of Tatars under the name Tatar 28 times, the historian Tatar Khan twice, the name Genghis Khan once, and the Scythians several times. He sometimes mentioned under the name Tatar from the Mongols, sometimes from Russian, Central Asian and Siberian Turks (Kazan Tatars, Crimean Tatars, Bashkirs, Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, Uzbeks, Uighurs, Azerbaijani Turks, etc.) and sometimes from all six tribes living in Russia, Central Asia, Mongolia, and Siberia. Smith

Tatars and Arabs in Adam Smith's the Wealth of Nations

mentioned the Arabs 14 times in this book. However, 12 mentions, out of 14 mentions with the Arabs, addressed as shared referrals with Tatars. Therefore, we discussed Arabs and Tatars together in this study. Smith was referring to Abbasids, Umayyad, and all Muslims living in the Middle East when he mentioned Arabs.

Smith (2007), in his work, often referred to the eastern nations and Tatars as "Barbarians⁴" (rude, aggressive, uncivilized) (p. 547). He sometimes referred to Spanish and Portuguese as "Barbarians" (p. 313) Smith also spoke of the Ottoman Empire and its subjects when mentioning of "Barbarians" (p. 592).

The topic of "The Turks in *Wealth of Nations*" was previously examined and published by us. Now, we wish to make a contribution, even if small, to economics and the history of nations through this study, perhaps for the first time, by examining the subject of the Arabs, Tatars, Mongols, and Turks in *Wealth of Nations*. Through this study, we believe that many people, especially Arabs, Tatars, Mongols and people living in the Central Asian Turkic Republics, will gather information, through our perspective, on how Smith, in his work, made mention of their ancestors and countries and civilizations of that time and will show interest towards the work.

Method and Sources of the Study

We conducted this study by using methods of text analysis with analytical comparison, thematic analysis, and descriptive analysis methods, from classical and interpretive methods of Qualitative Scientific Research Methods, and making use of three different editions of *Wealth of Nations*. The text, page numbers, and headings in the study were shown on the basis of the 2012 edition of the work by Wordsworth Edition Limited. In addition, the work's 1904 edition by Edwin Cannan was also used. The work consisted of five books, according to *Wealth of Nations* book that we have at our disposal and some other editions. They consisted of the following:

1st book, 11 chapters, and five sections,

2nd book, five chapters,

⁴ Barbarian: Barbaros (Greek), Pl. barbaroi. The name given by the Hellenes to non-Greek speaking communities. The word "barbarian" was originally used in the ancient Greeks, and later in the Old Roman Empire for all tribes and nations outside the Roman Empire, especially for the Germanic tribes. However, as the Romans regarded themselves as the most civilized and developed community in the world, this word began to be used in the sense of rough, aggressive and uncivilized (Ergin, 2013).

3rd book, four chapters,

4th book, nine chapters, and five sections,

5th book, three chapters, six sections, four articles, and two supplements.

In this study, as a method, while explaining the topics, we attempted to ensure the wholeness of the subject, firstly, by providing our own headline for each section and, then, by mentioning the reason for the topic. Then, the English translations of the heading above the sentences which mention the words Tatar or Tatars or the names of people that directly related to Tatars or Arab or Arabs or the names of people that directly related to Arabs will be noted down. Then, the translations of the sentences or paragraphs which mention the subject will be written. If the topics are on the same subject, each topic will be dealt with separately, and, if not, under the same heading. Then, a short description or comment will be written. After doing this for each topic or subject, we will try to raise awareness by providing other opinions on the topic as much as possible. We will conclude our study by providing a brief evaluation in the conclusion section.

Section II

2.0. Tatars and Arabs in Wealth of Nations

Smith mentioned Arabs together with Tatars, except for two places in *Wealth of Nations*. He mentioned solely about Tatars many times. Hereinafter, firstly the sections in which they are mentioned together will be discussed, and then the sections that only mentioned from Tatars.

2.1. Sections in Wealth of Nations which Mention Arabs and Tatars Together

2.1.1. Impact of Sea and River Transportation on Development and Division of Labor

Smith discussed this statement under the main title of "On Division of Labor" chapter of the first book (Smith, *Wealth of Nations*, 2012, p. 10). Smith said that the limited capacity of the market constituted as an obstacle to increased production and industrialization and, hence, constricted the development of the division of labor system. In fact, this situation also led to lagging behind

Tatars and Arabs in Adam Smith's the Wealth of Nations

in civilization. He tried to explain how the domestic and foreign markets grew, industrialization, and agriculture developed in the countries where trade made through sea transportation, especially by inland seas and rivers as well as improved the division of labor by gradually increasing the production in them with examples from the civilizations in history. He made mention of inland seas such as the Mediterranean Sea, the Black Sea and the Caspian Sea, some bays like the Arabian Gulf, major rivers and canals such as the Nile River in Egypt, the Ganges River in India and China as well as other similar places among the good examples he provided during these explanations. He also talked about the North Ice Sea, Tatars, and Siberian people and Africa under the name of the Tatar Sea while is frozen and does not allow sea trade while mentioning negative examples. Under the title of "That the Division of Labor is Limited by the Extent of The Market," Smith (2012) stated the following:

All the inland parts of Africa, and all that part of Asia which lies any considerable way north of the Euxine and Caspian seas, the ancient Scythia, the modern Tartary and Siberia, seem in all ages of the world to have been in the same barbarous and uncivilized state in which we find them at present. The Sea of Tartary is the frozen ocean which admits of no navigation, and though some of the greatest rivers in the world run through that country, they are at too great a distance from one another to carry commerce and communication through the greater part of it. There are in Africa none of those great inlets, such as the Baltic and Adriatic seas in Europe, the Mediterranean and Euxine seas in both Europe and Asia, and the gulfs of Arabia, Persia, India, Bengal, and Siam, in Asia, to carry maritime commerce into the interior parts of that great continent: and the great rivers of Africa are at too great a distance from one another to give occasion to any considerable inland navigation (pp. 25,26)

Sea transportation oversea, rivers, and canals have always preserved its importance in every era and today. Indeed, trade, industry, and civilization developed more rapidly in the nations that became prominent in water transportation than other nationals over time. For this reason, the straits, canals, and gulf located in the seas have virtually always led to battles for dominance due to their military and commercial strategic importance. While Siberian and Kazan Tatars mostly progressed to the city in XVIII. and XIX. Centuries, a significant number of Kazaks and Kyrgyz moved to it in the 1930s (Alkan, 2011, pp. 25,27,207). In Tatarstan, which is autonomous in

present-day Russia, city life generally pervades, whereas nomadic shepherd life partly also continues with the village, plateau, and shepherding life. The Mongols, on the other hand, are both obliged and endeavored to maintain the shepherding culture and settled city life together. However, the village and nomadic shepherding life are still higher in Mongolia than settled city life (Çetinkaya, Demir, Yılmaz, & Atılgan, 2005).

2.1.2. Arabs and Tatars a Simple Life

Adam Smith, in the third and fourth chapters of this book, discussed the forms of disposition of property (assets) in both cities and rural areas and the transition to new generations by providing examples from history while mentioning about the benefits of the developing trade in cities to agricultural production and to the landlords and those who lease lands in rural areas. In the meantime, he mentioned the use of wealth in Arabs while stating that he bought a book on Arabian history written by Tatar Khan (although he did not like it). In the last sentence, he wrote his evaluations on the lifestyles and transfer of wealth of old and well-established wealthy families in Arabs and Tatars in order to compare it with other nations. Adam Smith (2012) stated the following under the title of "How the Commerce of Towns Contributed to the Improvement of the Country":

The Arabian histories seem to be all full of genealogies, and there is a history written by a Tartar Khan, which has been translated into several European languages, and which contains scarce anything else; a proof that ancient families are very common among those nations. But where he can spend the greatest revenue upon his own person, he frequently has no bounds to his expense, because he frequently has no bounds to his vanity or to his affection for his own person. In commercial countries, therefore, riches, in spite of the most violent regulations of law to prevent their dissipation, very seldom remain long in the same family. Among simple nations, on the contrary, they frequently do without any regulations of law, for among nations of shepherds, such as the Tartars and Arabs, the consumable nature of their property necessarily renders all such regulations impossible (pp. 408,409).

As suggested by the quotation, Smith stated that the Arab amirs (tribal chieftains) spent on the people who they identified in accordance with their income and the quantities that they can look after as the level of necessity in order to maintain their own existence and power, but spent

Tatars and Arabs in Adam Smith's the Wealth of Nations

generously when their glory and wishes came into question. The situation is generally the same on the whole world for both in those times and today, even though it may not be the same for all beings and people who hold power. Smith, as mentioned elsewhere in the same work, mentioned of Tatars and Arabs leading plain and simple lives at that time, did not experience any issues at the transfer of their wealth to new generations and at the loss of wealth by wealthy families since their wealth consisted of consumable live animals, and, therefore, there was no need or possibility for legal regulation contrary to other societies. This suggests that tradition were very strict, and governance was authoritarian in those societies at that time. Today, wealth can change hands or new ones can join among the wealthy people in parallel with the level of democratization (Çetinkaya, Demir, Yılmaz, & Atılgan, 2005, pp. 33,34).

2.1.3. Arabs and Tatars are Nomadic and Warrior Nations in History

Smith compared the forms of defense and warriors of nations and civilizations from the initial record in history to the time when he wrote *The Wealth of Nations*. Thus, he explained how defense expenditures differed in accordance with lifestyle, level of civilization, and characteristics of the society by providing examples. Since Tatars and Arabs occupied a very important place among the most formidable and successful warring nations in the world, Smith frequently gave examples from their life and warring styles to such a degree. Namely; Smith (2012) stated the following under the title of "Of the Expense of Defense":

Among nations of shepherds, a more advanced state of society, such as we find it among the Tartars and Arabs, every man is, in the same manner, a warrior. Such nations have commonly no fixed habitation, but live either in tents or in a sort of covered wagons which are easily transported from place to place (p. 691).

He spoke of Tatars under the same heading and in the continuation of the same topic;

They all go to war together, therefore, and everyone does as well as he can. Among the Tartars, even the women have been frequently known to engage in battle. If they conquer, whatever belongs to the hostile tribe is the recompense of the victory. But if they are vanquished, all is lost, and not only their herds and flocks, but their women and children, become the booty of the conqueror. Even the greater parts of those who survive

the action are obliged to submit to him for the sake of immediate subsistence. The rest are commonly dissipated and dispersed in the desert (p. 692)

In ancient times, the outcome of the war for the warring nations would result in either all or nothing. Therefore, many civilizations and states went out of existence in history. Some of them maintained their existence by establishing a new state when their fortunes favored them, and they displayed adequate willpower like in Arabs and Turks.

The ordinary life, the ordinary exercises of a Tartar or Arab, prepares him sufficiently for war. Running, wrestling, cudgel-playing, throwing the javelin, drawing the bow, etc., are the common pastimes of those who live in the open air, and are all of them the images of war. When a Tartar or Arab actually goes to war, he is maintained by his own herds and flocks which he carries with him in the same manner as in peace. His chief or sovereign, for those nations have all chiefs or sovereigns, is at no sort of expense in preparing him for the field; and when he is in it the chance of plunder is the only pay which he either expects or requires (p. 692).

Smith compared the war preparations of regular and irregular armies and their expenditure from time to time. In this matter, he spoke of the following about Tatars and Arabs in the continuation of the same topic:

A nation of hunters can never be formidable to the civilized nations in their neighborhood. A nation of shepherds may. Nothing can be more contemptible than an Indian war in North America. Nothing, on the contrary, can be more dreadful than Tartar invasion has frequently been in Asia. The judgment of Thucydides, that both Europe and Asia could not resist the Scythians united, has been verified by the experience of all ages. The inhabitants of the extensive but defenseless plains of Scythia or Tartary have been frequently united under the dominion of the chief of some conquering horde or clan, and the havoc and devastation of Asia have always signalized their union. The inhabitants of the inhospitable deserts of Arabia, the other great nation of shepherds, have never been united but once; under Mahomet and his immediate successors. Their union, which was more the effect of religious enthusiasm than of conquest, was signalized in the same manner. If the hunting nations of America should ever become shepherds, their

Tatars and Arabs in Adam Smith's the Wealth of Nations

neighborhood would be much more dangerous to the European colonies than it is at present (p. 692).

2.1.4. In This Chapter Adam Smith Mentions that Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) and Caliphs Secured the Unity among Arabs for the First Time

Under the title of "Of the Expense of Defense" and in its continuation (Smith, 2012, p. 691), Smith wrote the following about the Scythians, Tatars, and Arabs while comparing the threat levels of hunter nations and shepherd nations, and also their association:

A nation of hunters can never be formidable to the civilized nations in their neighborhood. A nation of shepherds may. Nothing can be more contemptible than an Indian war in North America. Nothing, on the contrary, can be more dreadful than Tartar invasion has frequently been in Asia. The judgment of Thucydides, that both Europe and Asia could not resist the Scythians united, has been verified by the experience of all ages. The inhabitants of the extensive but defenseless plains of Scythia or Tartary have been frequently united under the dominion of the chief of some conquering horde or clan, and the havoc and devastation of Asia have always signalized their union. The inhabitants of the inhospitable deserts of Arabia, the other great nation of shepherds, have never been united but once; under Prophet Muhammad (PBUH)⁵ and his immediate successors. Their union, which was more the effect of religious enthusiasm than of conquest, was signalized in the same manner. If the hunting nations of America should ever become shepherds, their neighborhood would be much more dangerous to the European colonies than it is at present (p. 692).

Smith tried to explain that shepherding nations were more often and quickly organized and united and fought well due to their lifestyle, and therefore, they were very dangerous.

Smith tried to explain that shepherd nations are more often and quickly organized and united than hunter nations and that they are very dangerous because of their lives. Although Arabs are shepherd nation, Hz. Muhammad (S.A.V) and immediately after the caliphs say that they cannot establish a relationship between them even once. Smith, in fact, Hz. Muhammad (S.A.V) and

⁵ Naturally only the name Mahomet was mentioned in the original text. In the translation, phrases of Prophet and PBUH were by us.

Rashid surrendered the rights of the Caliphs and stated that the real reason for the unity of the Arabs or their participation in their armies was the Islamic religion, which they believed more than their desire for conquest or war. ((Pirenne, 2006, pp. 173-174).

2.1.5. Arabs and Tartars were Always Soldiers

Smith has comparatively discussed the defense expenditures of various civilizations and empires throughout history. He also described their defense structures, their regular or irregular armies, their achievements, and failures always by comparing costs in this section. Meanwhile, he made the following comparison of the armies of the Tartars and Arabs with the highlander militias and other nations he had mentioned earlier. Under the title of "Of the Expense of Defense," and slightly changing the topic, Smith (2012) stated the following:

Those militias which, like the Tartar or Arab militia, go to war under the same chieftains whom they are accustomed to obey in peace, are by far the best. In respect for their officers, in the habit of ready obedience, they approach nearest to standing armies. The highland militia, when it served under its own chieftains, had some advantage of the same kind. As the highlanders, however, were not wandering, but stationary shepherds, as they had all a fixed habitation, and were not, in peaceable times, accustomed to follow their chieftain from place to place, so in time of war they were less willing to follow him to any considerable distance, or to continue for any long time in the field. When they had acquired any booty they were eager to return home, and his authority was seldom sufficient to detain them. In point of obedience they were always much inferior to what is reported of the Tartars and Arabs. As the highlanders too, from their stationary life, spend less of their time in the open air, they were always less accustomed to military exercises, and were fewer experts in the use of their arms than the Tartars and Arabs are said to be (p. 691).

Prior to the above paragraph, Smith tried to explain that states should now establish a regular army at length. While talking about the advantages and disadvantages of regular and irregular armies, he explained the experiences, preparations, use of weapons, obedience, or disobedience

Tatars and Arabs in Adam Smith's the Wealth of Nations

of soldiers in these armies with good and bad examples from history. In the meantime, he cited Arabs and Tatars as the best examples in comparison with other nations.

2.1.6. According to Adam Smith, the Economic, Military, Judicial and Administrative Forms of Tatars and Arabs and their Expenditures Related to them from Antiquity to their era.

In this section, Smith first mentioned the situation of a Tatar chief in the same paragraph, but in the consecutive two pages, and then he compared the authoritarianism of the Arab sheiks with the despotism of the Tatar khans. Under the title of "Of the Expense of Justice," Smith (2012) observed

A Tartar chief, the increase of whose herds and stocks is sufficient to maintain a thousand men, cannot well employ that increase in any other way than in maintaining a thousand men. The rude state of his society does not afford him any manufactured produce, any trinkets or baubles of any kind, for which he can exchange that part of his rude produce which is over and above his own consumption. The thousand men whom he thus maintains, depending entirely upon him for their subsistence, must both obey his orders in war, and submit to his jurisdiction in peace. He is necessarily both their general and their judge, and his chieftainship is the necessary effect of the superiority of his fortune. In an opulent and civilized society, a man may possess a much greater fortune and yet not be able to command a dozen people (pp. 710,711).

According to Smith, a Tatar chief is almost everything of his tribe. The form of administration is highly authoritarian. According to the perception at that time and the places he lived, his wealth naturally rendered him superior and influential so that those who are his subjects were required to obey his decisions.

We, as the authors of this article, all stayed in Central Asia for at least ten years, and it is clear from the traditions of the nations there, including the Tatars that they come from an authoritarian form of government throughout history. In fact, the works and articles on this subject often mention the same truth (Spuler, 1957, p. 408). However, sultans, khans, khanates, heads, chiefs, chieftains and other rulers, could not decide or make decisions without consulting to their council of elders (White-bearded elders) or even without receiving their approval in some issues

whether in Mongols or in other Turkic tribes, including Tatars, in both Central Asia and elsewhere. The nations of Central Asia still maintain these traditions locally despite nearly 70 years of strict Soviet Socialism. In fact, they formalized the national and local Council of Elders both during Socialism and within the existing state administration system (Aysan & Kemahlı, 2012, s. 194-195).

Smith (2012) stated the following in the continuation of the same paragraph in this section:

The first period of society, that of hunters, admits of no such inequality. Universal poverty establishes their universal equality, and the superiority either of age or of personal qualities is the feeble but the sole foundations of authority and subordination. There is therefore little or no authority or subordination in this period of society. The second period of society, that of shepherds, admits of very great inequalities of fortune, and there is no period in which the superiority of fortune gives so great authority to those who possess it. There is no period accordingly in which authority and subordination are more perfectly established. The authority of an Arabian sheriff is very great; that of a Tartar khan altogether despotic (p. 711).

Indeed, there are enormous imbalances in income distribution in the shepherding periods of societies according to the accents of Smith and historians. There was a disproportionate authority of power that originated from wealth in the societies of that period. Therefore, we witness authoritarian administrations in Mongolian, Tatar, Kazakh, Kyrgyz, Turkmen, Uzbek, Azerbaijan, and other similar nations that lived that period for a long time or still partially live it as well as are identified with it. In many of the states established by the above nations as a result of the disintegration of the Soviet Union, the presidents who attained power somehow do not intend to leave until the end of their lives. It is possible to see similar characteristics in Arab societies for the same reason. This is due to the fact that the issue is not only concerned with oil, but today's forms of government are based on earlier stages of society. Although the authority of the Arab Emirates is still large today as it was in the past, Tatars stand out to be more democratic.

Tatars and Arabs in Adam Smith's the Wealth of Nations

2.1.7. The income of a Tatar Khan or Arab Emir in Earlier Times

After stating that a number of expenses had arisen due to the state's defense, education, and administrative duties in the new state order, Smith discussed the limited resources to cover those expenses. He provided examples of the ways in which the government generates income in different nations and civilizations while explaining these resources. He gave the first examples from the income generation methods of the Arab and Tatar administrations in the following paragraph. Under the title of "Of the Funds, or Sources of Revenue, Which may Peculiarly Belong to the Sovereign or Commonwealth," Smith (2012) stated the following:

The Funds, or Sources of Revenue, which may Peculiarly Belong to the Sovereign or Commonwealth must consist either in stock or in land. The sovereign, like any other owner of stock, may derive revenue from it, either by employing it himself, or by lending it. His revenue is in the one case profit, in the other interest.

The revenue of a Tartar or Arabian chief consists in profit. It arises principally from the milk and increase of his own herds and flocks, of which he himself superintends the management, and is the principal shepherd or herdsman of his own horde or tribe. It is, however, in this earliest and rudest state of civil government only that profit has ever made the principal part of the public revenue of a monarchial state (p. 815).

As is known, Smith matched the production factors with their income. Here, he explained that the income of an Arab Emir and Tatar Khan was entirely composed of livestock and land which he himself ran and that the income comprised of profit after mentioning that the income of the capital, one of the factors of production, was interest and the income of the land was profit in the first sentence.

2.2. Sections that Independently Mentioned Tatars in Wealth Of Nations

The places that separately made mention of Tatars and Arabs will be examined in this section.

2.2.1. Ukrainian Tatars

Smith talked about the development of art in general, especially in silver, of various nations and civilizations from the early ages through silver mines and art. While mentioning the art and

civilization levels of Peru, Mexico, Granada, Yucatan, Paraguay and Brazilian nations from civilizations in South America, he compared them with Ukrainian Tatars in his own time. Under the title of "Digression Concerning the Variations in the Value of Silver during the Course of the Four Last Centuries," Smith (2012) observed that:

After all the wonderful tales which have been published concerning the splendid state of those countries in ancient times, whoever reads, with any degree of sober judgment, the history of their first discovery and conquest, will evidently discern that, in arts, agriculture, and commerce, their inhabitants were much more ignorant than the Tartars of the Ukraine are at present. (p. 208)

In this narration, Smith showed that the Ukrainian Tatars were far behind compared to his time. So much so that he almost reduced them to the situation of the civilizations in South America in the early age.

2.2.2. Europeans Traded with China over Tatarstan and Siberia in XVI. Century

Under the same title above and in the consecutive page in which the topic continued, Smith (2012) made mention of the name Tatar while explaining the expansion of the East India Company's⁶ trade;

The English and French carried on some trade with India in the last century, but it has been greatly augmented in the course of the present. The East India trade of the Swedes and Danes began in the course of the present century. Even the Muscovites now trade regularly with China by a sort of caravans which go overland through Siberia and Tartary to Peking (p. 210).

Smith, in his book *The Wealth of Nations*, frequently referred to East India Company, sometimes criticized the company's form of management, sometimes advised it to earn more and operate better, sometimes compared it to West India company, established by Portugal and Spain and operated with the same logic, and finally, stated that this and similar companies had to be operated according to free-market rules without state's support; otherwise, they would be better

⁶ East India Company: a company that was established by the British through which they conducted the trade and exploitations of the European states.

Tatars and Arabs in Adam Smith's the Wealth of Nations

off to be closed down ((Smith, 1937, pp. 139, 283, 285, 690, 837, 847, 849, 996, 997, 998, 1007, 1093, 1124, 1246, 1279).

Smith frequently referred to East India in his book *The Wealth of Nations*, sometimes criticizing the company's management, sometimes advising him to win and run better, and sometimes compared it to West India, which Portugal and Spain established and operated with the same logic, and, finally, he said that these and similar companies should be operated according to free-market rules without state support; otherwise they would be better off.

2.2.3. Types of Taxation in Tatar Governments Set an Example for Europe

Smith (2012), under the title "Of the Rise and Progress of Cities and Towns after the Fall of the Roman Empire," stated the following in brief. He explained that the living standards and rights of those living in towns and cities in Europe were not very different from those living in rural areas in the periods after the collapse of the Roman Empire. Traders, workers, and slaves generally lived under the rule of a master in the cities. They could perform any acts of business with his permission and paid taxes to him. It was such that a tradesman in the city could not marry his daughter to someone outside the city or town without the permission of his master. The masters were the lords who owned the land and everything in it in the countryside. State administrators, city and town masters, and lords would receive various taxes, including the head tax, from the people subject to them, but they sometimes forgave them ((p. 390). In summary, Smith (2012) stated the following in the subsequent paragraph:

In all the different countries of Europe then, in the same manner as in several of the Tartar governments of Asia at present, taxes used to be levied upon the persons and goods of travellers when they passed through certain manors, when they went over certain bridges, when they carried about their goods from place to place in a fair, when they erected in it a booth or stall to sell them in. These different taxes were known in England by the names of passage, postage, lastage, and stallage (p. 390).

Here, while Smith asserted that these types of tax implemented in many different countries in Europe had been in practice in Tatar governments in Asia for quite a while, in fact, he indicated that some of these tax types were taken as examples from Tatars.

2.2.4. Measures of Wealth in Tatars and Genghis Khan

Prior to explaining commercial principles in accordance with his own era and perception, Smith firstly defined the concept of money and explained its functions and features almost in line with the present. Then, he talked about the attitudes and approaches of some nations and Europeans about money. He also referred to John Locke's definition of money and his views in which he compared goods and money. He then explained that some societies and individuals believed that the accumulation of gold and silver, originated from the mercantilist approach, was a measure of wealth. Stating that the measure of wealth differed in reference to civilizations right before the paragraph under examination, Smith (2012) stated the following under the title of "Of the Principle of the Commercial or Mercantile System":

A rich country, in the same manner as a rich man, is supposed to be a country abounding in money; and to heap up gold and silver in any country is supposed to be the readiest way to enrich it. For some time after the discovery of America, the first inquiry of the Spaniards, when they arrived upon an unknown coast, used to be, if there was any gold or silver to be found in the neighborhood. By the information which they received, they judged whether it was worthwhile to make a settlement there, or if the country was worth the conquering. Plano Carpino, a monk, sent ambassador from the King of France to one of the sons of the famous Genghis Khan, says that the Tartars used frequently to ask him if there was plenty of sheep and oxen in the kingdom of France. Their inquiry had the same object with that of the Spaniards. They wanted to know if the country was rich enough to be worth the conquering. Among the Tartars, as among all other nations of shepherds, who are generally ignorant of the use of money, cattle are the instruments of commerce and the measures of value. Wealth, therefore, according to them, consisted in cattle, as according to the Spaniards it consisted in gold and silver. Of the two, the Tartar notion, perhaps, was the nearest to the truth (pp. 419-420).

Above, Smith mentioned the different wealth measures of the Spanish and the Tatars between two different and distinct civilizations. He spoke of the son of Genghis Khan, who was, in fact, a Mongol, and thus Genghis Khan himself as Tatars like all of his European contemporaries while presenting a historical even as evidence (Kalkan, 1996, p. 11).

Tatars and Arabs in Adam Smith's the Wealth of Nations

Today, the extent of wealth and prosperity varies according to societies and states. Therefore, each state or society applies different economic, administrative, social systems and policies suited to its own perception.

2.2.5. Every Tatar Chief Had a Treasure with Respect to Himself

Smith paid much attention to money when explaining the rules of trade and shopping. While comparing money with gold and silver currency systems, he discussed the difficulties of protecting precious metal coins as a treasure as follows. Smith (2012) stated the following under the title of "Of the Principle of the Commercial or Mercantile System".

In that simple state, the expense even of a sovereign is not directed by the vanity which delights in the gaudy finery of a court, but is employed in bounty to his tenants, and hospitality to his retainers. But bounty and hospitality very seldom lead to extravagance; though vanity almost always does. Every Tartar chief, accordingly, has a treasure. The treasures of Mazepa, chief of the Cossacs in the Ukraine, the famous ally of Charles the XIIth, are said to have been very great. The French kings of the Merovingian race all had treasures. When they divided their kingdom among their different children, they divided their treasure too (p. 436).

Smith stressed that it would not be possible for the states to maintain their existence if they were managed by extravagance before and after the paragraph above. In this regard, he provided evidence by giving examples from the expenditures of ordinary state structures established by ancient civilizations to the forms of expenditures in modern and more equipped state structures of his own time. In fact, we find the mercantilist approach in this work of Smith. For instance, Smith observed that "the treasury should be filled with gold and silver at the time of peace as much as possible so that there would be no hardship at the time of war" ((Smith, 2012, pp. 418-419). Related to the accumulation of precious metals in the treasury of the United Kingdom, he suggested that, in case of need, melting of pots, pans, ornaments, and other wares, made of these precious metals, should not be avoided. In addition, he made recommendations on the prevention of smuggling these metals abroad. In work, he mentioned this subject in many places in the manner above ((Smith, 2012, pp. 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422). Thus, Smith clearly expressed his thoughts with a mercantilist approach particularly when the interests and benefits

of England came into question. For this reason, some scientists in the later period classified Smith, the founder of the classical liberal economic approach, as a Mercantilist. However, in some places, just as in the previous issue, although Smith (2012) stated that "a rich person, as well as a rich country, is full of money and accumulating gold and silver is the easiest way to enrich a country," (Smith, 2012, p. 419), he noted that this was not sound or sufficient in some other parts of the work.

2.2.6. Regular Armies and Militia

Smith compared the expenditure of regular and irregular armies by taking their success into account. Smith (2012), under the title of "Of the Expense of Defense," stated the following while comparing the armies of many civilizations and states, especially the Ancient Romans:

From the end of the second Carthaginian war till the fall of the Roman republic, the armies of Rome were in every respect standing armies. The standing army of Macedon made some resistance to their arms. In the height of their grandeur it cost them two great wars, and three great battles, to subdue that little kingdom, of which the conquest would probably have been still more difficult had it not been for the cowardice of its last king. The militias of all the civilized nations of the ancient world, of Greece, of Syria, and of Egypt, made but a feeble resistance to the standing armies of Rome. The militias of some barbarous nations defended themselves much better. The Scythian or Tartar militia, which Mithridates drew from the countries north of the Euxine and Caspian seas, was the most formidable enemies whom the Romans had to encounter after the second Carthaginian war. The Parthian and German militias, too, were always respectable, and upon several occasions gained very considerable advantages over the Roman armies. In general, however, and when the Roman armies were well commanded, they appear to have been very much superior; and if the Romans did not pursue the final conquest either of Parthia or Germany, it was probably because they judged that it was not worthwhile to add those two barbarous countries to an empire which was already too large. The ancient Parthians appear to have been a nation of Scythian or Tartar extraction, and to have always retained a good deal of the manners of their ancestors. The ancient Germans were, like the Scythians or Tartars, a nation of wandering shepherds, who went to war under the same chiefs whom they were accustomed to follow in peace. Their militia was

Tatars and Arabs in Adam Smith's the Wealth of Nations

exactly of the same kind with that of the Scythians or Tartars, from who, too, they were probably descended (p. 691).

Smith, based on the Romans above, compared it with the Macedonian, Greek, Syrian, Egyptian, Persian, Germanic, Scythian, and Tartar armies and militia in the same paragraph. Although Smith called the Tatars barbarians, he cited examples of their success and superiority when it comes to their armies. As the continuation of the subject Adam Smith (2012) stated the following under the same title:

When a civilized nation depends for its defense upon a militia, it is at all times exposed to be conquered by any barbarous nation which happens to be in its neighborhood. The frequent conquests of all the civilized countries in Asia by the Tartars sufficiently demonstrate the natural superiority which the militia of a barbarous has over that of a civilized nation. A well regulated standing army is superior to every militia. Such an army, as it can best be maintained by an opulent and civilized nation, so it can alone defend such a nation against the invasion of a poor and barbarous neighbor. It is only by means of a standing army, therefore, that the civilization of any country can be perpetuated, or even preserved for any considerable time (p. 706).

Herein, Smith mentioned that the civilized and wealthy countries, with the barbarian, evil, and poor neighbors, were always in danger of invasion. However, the same situation exists among all the strongest and weaker countries in the world, whether it was neighboring or not, civilized or not.

2.2.7. Justice Management in Tatar Governments in Asia and European Governments

Smith described many different systems and practices by providing many examples from the history related to securing justice and the provision of its expenditure. Hence, he provided historically tested recommendations on the ideal justice system in his own time and what its expenses should be. When talking about the methods or systems of maintaining justice by some civilizations in the history and its expenditure, Smith (2012) stated the following under the title of "Of the Expense of Justice":

In the Tartar governments of Asia, in the governments of Europe which were founded by the German and Scythian nations who overturned the Roman empire, the administration of justice was a considerable source of revenue, both to the sovereign and to all the lesser chiefs or lords who exercised under him any particular jurisdiction, either over some particular tribe or clan, or over some particular territory or district (p. 714).

Is it possible to speak of justice if distributing justice has become a source of income for both those in power and the civil servants? Or is it possible for those who are responsible for justice living on with the presents from the plaintiffs and defendants to be fair?

According to Smith's (2012) narration; "In some European and Asian societies in the past, first the kings and khans themselves and their deputies as well as their officials responsible for maintaining justice that they had appointed generated income by accepting the precious items that plaintiffs and defendants had to bring as gifts" (Smith, 2012, p. 714). In today's modern state structures, if some judges, prosecutors, and even police officers responsible for enforcing justice abused their positions, it is possibly very difficult to speak of justice in those old times. As Smith stated, those responsible for justice probably made their decisions based on which gift was more valuable. Consequently, some advanced societies of today must have taken lessons from the past very well that they arranged their justice systems and implement them exceptionally well. In under-developed societies, the justice system is either poorly established, badly implemented, or both are in a terrible state.

The survival of a state depends on a good justice system; "Justice is the basis of the state." For this, it is very important that the share of justice in the state budget should be sufficient and be spent on time.

2.2.8. Tatars of the North were very active, resilient and needy

Smith stated that the education of people of all ages was generally undertaken by religious institutions taking his own era and prior to it into account. In the relevant section of the book, he wrote about the sects, churches, clergy, their income and expenditures, and members in Christianity at length. In the meantime, he likened the situation of some clergy, who lack the knowledge, but address to some kind and gentle circles being exposed to the bullying and bickering of another clergy who become knowledgeable and brave, although unprepared, and

Tatars and Arabs in Adam Smith's the Wealth of Nations

address to commons of the general public, to the case of some of the naïve societies in the south of Asia being exposed to the attacks of harsh, forbearing, but needy Tatars. Smith (2012) stated the following under the title of "Of the Expense of the Institutions for the Instruction of People of All Ages":

Such a clergy, when attacked by a set of popular and bold, though perhaps stupid and ignorant enthusiasts, feel themselves as perfectly defenseless as the indolent, effeminate, and full-fed nations of the southern parts of Asia when they were invaded by the active, hardy, and hungry Tartars of the North (p. 785).

In our opinion, Smith made this analogy a little mercilessly and out of place for both the Tatars and the related people in the south of Asia as well as those religious clergy. But it can be seen from the analogy above that the Tatars or the nations in Asia that Smith called Tatars generally occupied an important, even though negative, place in his mind.

2.2.9. About the Treasures of the Monarchs

Smith, in this section of his book, expressed his views on state debts, and, therefore, dwelled extensively on expenditures that could also cause governments to seek debt. He properly explained what the expenses of the rulers or kings spent for the decoration of the palaces and similar buildings representing the state by being influenced by the noble rich circles and, also, the extravagant expenses that they made in the name of vanity. Smith (2012) asserted the following in under the title of "Of Public Debts":

In that situation the expense even of a sovereign cannot be directed by that vanity which delights in the gaudy finery of a court. The ignorance of the times affords but few of the trinkets in which that finery consists. Standing armies are not then necessary, so that the expense even of a sovereign, like that of any other great lord, can be employed in scarce anything but bounty to his tenants and hospitality to his retainers. But bounty and hospitality very seldom lead to extravagance; though vanity almost always does. All the ancient sovereigns of Europe accordingly, it has already been observed, had treasures. Every Tartar chief in the present times is said to have one (pp. 912,913).

Prior to the paragraph above, Smith stated that the rulers and kings possessed treasure for the maintenance of their dignity and power as well as for the preservation of tax and precious gifts from the surrounding areas. He wrote about the speculation of the presence of the treasures of the Tatar khans in his own period in order to reinforce this knowledge.

Similar to the perception of the ruler of old and underdeveloped societies, perhaps even more exaggerated than them, the rulers of some countries today waste the state's budget for their own reputation, luxury, and vanity rather than spend it for the basic needs of their citizens. Generally, these also occur underdeveloped or developing states. The problem that Smith seriously dwelt on still persists in the third world countries except for developed countries.

2.3. Sections that Independently Mention Arabs in Wealth Of Nations

Adam Smith, in his book *The Wealth of Nations*, spoke of the Arabs independently only in two places referring to the subject as "Arabian" and "Arabian Gum." These sections will be discussed below.

2.3.1. Adam Smith and the Generosity of the Arabs

Smith explained how trade in cities and towns gradually affected landlords, their tenants and workers involved previously only on agriculture and animal husbandry in the countryside, and that they consumed their products and animals that they obtained during the shepherding phase by throwing banquets and entertaining their guests. Accordingly, he wrote about legendary hospitality in Europe that continued until recently but did not persevere. Smith assumed that the shepherding phase of the Arabs still continued to a large extent compared to his own period, and explained as such that the attitude of hosting guests and treating everyone still persist in them. Adam Smith (2012) stated the following under the title of "How the Commerce of Towns Contributed to the Improvement of the Country":

Hospitality nearly of the same kind was exercised not many years ago in many different parts of the highlands of Scotland. It seems to be common in all nations to whom commerce and manufactures are little known. 'I have seen,' says Doctor Pocock, 'an Arabian chief dine in the streets of a town where he had come to sell his cattle, and invite

Tatars and Arabs in Adam Smith's the Wealth of Nations

all passengers, even common beggars, to sit down with him and partake of his banquet' (p. 403).

Although not extensive as in the past, the tradition of hospitality and feasting still maintained in the Arabs. The practice of throwing banquets and entertaining guests that emerged as a result of the shepherding period of the society in the past has gradually become a means of tradition, luxury, and making friends in the Arabs. This tradition has solidified and also become a form of worship with the adoption of Islam. However, in Islam, glamor apart from the intention of worship and generosity made with similar reasons is not as accepted as acts of worship.

2.3.1. Arabian Gum

In this section, Smith referred to the application of the Mercantilist System in the U.K and other European countries and showed many import and export products as examples together with implemented bans, freedom, quotas, and tariffs. While mentioning the reasons for the laws and regulations about these goods in detail, he stated that many introduced harsh, compelling, and restrictive laws were caused by the greed of traders. According to the narration of Smith (2012), the trade of Senegalese Gum or Arabian Gum was in the hands of France before the British-French colonial war, but he wrote that it passed into the hands of the British merchants when Senegal passed into the hands of the British after the war. Arabian Gum (Senegalese Gum), in this case, could be imported without tax at first, but, then, a small tax was imposed on its import from colonies since it was contrary to England's principle of not supporting trade directly by the state. However, as a result of the discovery that British traders turned greedy and sold the Arabian gum illegally in order not to pay a very small tax imposed on it by the royalty, the king of England increased both taxes and penalties with the law passed by parliament. Therefore, the trade of Arabian Gum became far from profitable for the British Mercantilists (pp. 654-655).

In sum, Smith (2012), under the title of "Conclusion of the Mercantile System," stated the following while explaining this phase with the sentences above;

The home market was at all times likely to be more scantily supplied; the commodities were at all times likely to be somewhat dearer there than they would have been had the exportation been rendered as free as the importation. By the above-mentioned statute,

gum senega⁷, or gum Arabic, being among the enumerated dyeing drugs, might be imported duty free (pp. 654-655).

As explained above, when starting the discussion on this issue, Mercantilist British businessmen lost their advantage in the trade of Arabian Gum and thus made this contribution to the end of the Mercantilist Trade System.

Conclusion

Smith deserves the title of being the "Father of Economics" and the *Wealth of Nations*, as a masterpiece, is worthy of the title of the "Essential Work" of the Science of Economics written at the academic level. The work is already among "the greatest hundred classical works of all times." Today, Adam Smith Institute, established and operated in the name of Adam Smith and is based in England, introduces itself briefly as follows:

The Adam Smith Institute is one of the world's leading think tanks. Independent, non-profit, and non-partisan, we work to promote free market, neoliberal ideas through research, publishing, media outreach, and education. The Institute is today at the forefront of making a case for free markets and free society in the United Kingdom (<https://www.adamsmith.org/>, n.d.)

The Institute speaks of the influence of *Wealth of Nations* today as follows:

Smith's world was very different from ours, of course, before the Industrial Revolution changed everything. At yet, by showing how the freedom and security to work, trade, save and invest promotes our prosperity, without the need for a directing authority, The *Wealth of Nations* still leaves us with a powerful set of solutions to the worst economic problems that the world can throw at us. The free economy is an adaptable and flexible system, which can withstand the shock of the new, and cope with whatever the future brings. (Butler, n.d.)

In his book *Wealth of Nations*, Smith discussed many historical events from a socio-economic perspective in order to prove or strengthen his own views and theories, and to support the legitimacy of his proposals. In some cases, he compared the Arabs and Tatars, two of the most

⁷ Arabian gum was obtained from a tree called "Senega."

Tatars and Arabs in Adam Smith's the Wealth of Nations

established and important nations in history, with other civilizations or cited their practices as examples. Smith directly or indirectly compared the Arabs and Tatars sometimes from negative or positive aspects or gave them as examples in subjects such as trade, income, factors of production, state revenues (taxes) and expenditures (budget or G.D.P.), governance, justice, defense, military, social life (in city or rural area), capital accumulation and wealth or poverty, development and belief.

The living styles of the Arabs and Tatars settled as nomads in large areas and lived on with animal husbandry in the past, are quite similar to a great extent. The people of Central Asia embraced Islam through the Arabs, especially after the Battle of Talas in 751 and, later on, their behavior and lives became more similar to each other because of belonging to the same religion and their necessities. For this reason, Smith often considered them together in his work. Adam Smith referred to all nomadic equestrian nations living in Russia, Ukraine, Siberia, and Central Asia with the concept of Tatar like other European contemporary writers and sometimes used this expression for the Mongols in a more narrow sense.

According to Emeritus Professor Anthony Brewer (1942-2018) and our own opinion, Smith divided history until his own time into four phases in his book *Wealth of Nations*. These are: hunting, shepherding, agriculture, and trade phases. (<https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/a317/9eac8db97b67c88800aa792a5881c96f03f6.pdf>)

Smith evaluated the Arab and Tatar civilizations according to his own age and argued that they generally remained in the shepherding period and had not yet entered into the agricultural and commercial phases as a society. To Adam Smith, by force and result of this situation, their state structures were simple and quite economical, and their communities consisted of the warrior, plundering, and even barbaric people. For this reason, Smith considered Arabs and Tatars to be the best prototypes of shepherding nations and often compared them with the same or different stages of other nations on the issues mentioned above. Indeed, he often spoke of them as negative, but sometimes gave them credit by expressing the positive characteristics of these people. Adam Smith sometimes depicted these nations with sarcastic accounts. It is a fact that some scientists and writers who narrated history in the past and even a little in the new periods lose their objectivity. Smith acted biased and even hurtful about Tatars and Arabs in his work *the Wealth of Nations*. Because both the Arabs and the Tatars (the term "Tatars" included many

nations at that time as explained above) made considerable progress both in their commercial activities and in the field of science, and made inventions and established universities until the period in which the *Wealth of Nations* was written. These nations were far ahead of Europeans throughout the Middle Ages (Bayraktar, 2013, p. 101). When Europe entered the Age of Enlightenment and carried out the Industrial Revolution, Europeans got ahead of the Eastern nations, namely the Ottomans, Arabs and Tatars.

Smith, on the other hand, described Europe as if it was ahead of these nations in every period. However, as discussed in some parts of our article, Smith also mentioned the commercial activities of Arabs and Tatars as positive examples.

Smith compared Tatars and Arabs as successful examples in the field of military service and explained the reasons for their success in wars in detail. He called the Tatars "Barbarians," and, perhaps the reason for this might be that Mongol Khan, Genghis Khan and his grandson, Hulagu Khan, and Amir Timur, who would establish a great empire in Central Asia in the consequent centuries, invaded many countries with their armies, burnt and destroyed cities, hurt many people and destroyed families (Kalkan, 1996, p. 11). Nevertheless, he regarded them as the most successful examples in the irregular army category.

Smith based the reason for the Arabs' desire for conquest and their success in wars not on their sentiments of acquiring new places and getting rich but on their enthusiasm to spread the religion of Islam after mentioning that the Arabs could not unite until the time of Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) and his Caliphs (R.A).

Smith, based on his own period, emphasized the importance of the transition to regular and systematic state structure and to the regular army in relation to it. In this respect, he laid the foundations of the science of "Modern Management" (Hirschman, 2008, pp. 100-113). He provided examples from the simple and plain state structures of Tatars and Arabs while explaining issues such as the duties and powers, income and expenditures of the new state, but he stated that Europe would not be like in the shepherding period due to the necessities arising from its entry into the advanced agriculture, trade and even partly into industrialization.

Although the simple life in the Arabs and Tatars originated from the requirements of the shepherding state prior to Islam, at the same time, it also originated from the requirements of

Tatars and Arabs in Adam Smith's the Wealth of Nations

their religion for those who embraced Islam ((Küçükaşçı, 2011, pp. 93-94). But, nowadays, since the sensitivity in the Islamic faith is generally lost, the Muslim rulers do not refrain from any luxury or extravagance for reputation and splendor in palaces, offices, and protocols.

Smith also spoke of the generosity and sharing of the Arabs. Some nations on earth, whether governed by Socialism or Capitalism, are still hospitable and generous. Although not as much as the previous periods and decreasing in number day by day, these nations continue to throw feasts and entertain guests.

We believe that the narratives about the Arabs and Tatars and the nations which were mentioned under their names or in addition to them (for example, the Russians, Scythians, Muscovites, etc.) in Smith's book, *the Wealth of Nations* render the book an important source for both the histories of those nations and for the world history and this article has the characteristics of a note recorded in history.

Finally, Smith's mention of the Arabs and the Tatars in many aspects in his work, one way or another, reveals the historical importance of these two civilizations and the nations that he referred to when talking about them in almost every subject.

References

- Alkan, H. (2011). *Orta Asya Türk Cumhuriyetlerinde Siyasal Hayat ve Kurumlar*. Ankara: Usak Yayınları.
- Aysan, A., & Kemahlı, F. (2012). Orta Asya'da Demokrasi Sorunu: Kırgızistan Örneği. *Turgut Özal Uluslararası Ekonomi ve Siyaset Kongresi- II*, (s. 194-195). Malatya.
- Bayraktar, M. (2013). *İslam Tarihi ve Medeniyeti II*. Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi yayınları.
- Bilal Celik, Murat Akyuz, Medet Onel. (2018). Adam Smith'in Ulusların Zenginliği Kitabında Türkler'le İlgili Bölümler. *International Journal of Social Sciences*, 2(13), 110-133.
<https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/injoss> adresinden alındı
- Buran , A., & Alkaya, E. (2011). *Çağdaş Türk Yazı Dilleri-II*. (A. Buran, & M. M. Tulum, Eds.) Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi.

- Butler, E. (n.d.). *ADAM SMITH INSTITUTE*. (A. S. INSTITUTE, Editor, & ADAM SMITH INSTITUTE, 23 GREAT SMITH STREET, LONDON SW1P 3DJ, UNITED KINGDOM02072224995INFO@ADAMSMITH.ORG) Retrieved 12 11, 2019, from ADAM SMITH INSTITUTE Web site.: <https://www.adamsmith.org/the-wealth-of-nations>
- Çetinkaya, A. R., Demir, Y., Yılmaz, F., & Atılgan, N. (2005). *Moğolistan Ülke Raporu*. Ankara: TİKA.
- Ergin, G. (2013). *Anadolu'da Roma Hakimiyeti Direniş ve Düzen (2 b.)*. Istanbul, Turkey/Istanbul: TÜRKİYE İŞ BANKASI KÜLTÜR YAYINLARI.
- Hirschman, A. (2008). *Tutkular ve Çıkarlar: Kapitalizm Zaferini İlân Etmeden Önce Nasıl Savunuluyordu ?* İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.
- <https://www.adamsmith.org/>. (tarih yok). <https://www.adamsmith.org/>. (A. S. INSTITUTE, Editör, & ADAM SMITH INSTITUTE, 23 GREAT SMITH STREET, LONDON SW1P 3DJ, UNITED KINGDOM02072224995INFO@ADAMSMITH.ORG) 12 11, 2019 tarihinde ADAM SMITH INSTITUTE: <https://www.adamsmith.org/> adresinden alındı
- Kalkan, M. (1996, Ocak). Türk-Moğol Kavimleri Arasında Tatarlar ve Menşei Meselesi. *Türk Kültürü Dergisi*(XXXIV), 11-18.
- Küçükaşçı, S. M. (2011). *İslam Tarihi ve Medeniyeti I*. Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Lionel Robbins, Steven G. Medema, Waren J. Samuels. (2000). *A History of Economic Thoughts* (éd. 5). (W. J. Steven G. Medema, Éd.) New Jersey, New Jersey, United States: Princeton University.
- Maksudoğlu, M. (1997). Tatarlar: Moğol mu, Türk mü? *Marmara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*(11-12), 204-210.
- Neal, L. J. (2006). *The Rise of Muscovy*. Oregon: Western Oregon University.
- Pirenne, H. (2006). *Hız Muhammed ve Charlemagne*. (M. A. Kılıçbay, Trans.) Ankara: İmge Kitabevi.
- Robert, B. J., & Robert, F. H. (1990). *A History of Economics Theory and Method*. New York: McGraw-Hill Publishing Company.
- Samuels., L. R. (2000). *A History of Economic Thoughts* . (G. M. W. J. Steven, Ed.) New Jersey, United States, New Jersey.: Princeton University.
- Schumpeter, J. A. (1954). *History of Economic Analysis*. Great Britain: Routledge Ltd.

Tatars and Arabs in Adam Smith's the Wealth of Nations

Smith, A. (1937). An Inquiry Into the Nature of Causes of the Wealth of Nations. A. Smith, & C. E. Edwin Cannan (Dü.) içinde, *An Inquiry Into the Nature of Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. New York, New York, USA: Modern Library (1937).

Smith, A. (2007, May 29). <http://metalibri.incubadora.fapesp.br>. MetaLibri Digital Edition. adresinden alındı

Smith, A. (2012). *Wealth of Nations*. Herthfordshire: Wordworth Edition Limited.

Smith, A. (2012). *Wealth of Nations*. Herthfordshire: Wordworth Edition Limited.

Spuler, B. (1957). *İran Moğolları -Siyaset, İdare Ve Kültür İlhanlılar Devri , 1220-1350-Leipzig 1939*. (C. Köprülü, Trans.) Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basınevi.