



The Concept of Ideology and the Struggle between Capitalism and Communism in Sezai Karakoç's Political Thought

Selin Şahin^{1,a*}, Enes Şahin^{1,b*}

¹Department of Political Science and International Relations, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Dumlupınar University, Kütahya, Türkiye.

*Corresponding author

Research Article

History

Received: 10/09/2022

Accepted: 08/11/2022

ABSTRACT

Considering the political culture of the 20th century, it can be said that one of the essential elements shaping political mentality and activities is the concept of ideology. Especially after the Second World War, the world system was shaped around capitalism and communism, the dominant ideologies of the period. This situation has been determinant in political processes and international relations in this period, known as the Cold War period, and it has also brought intellectuals to produce ideas by being influenced by the concept of ideology. In this direction, it is important to examine the world of thought of Sezai Karakoç -one of the most influential intellectuals of Türkiye and influenced Turkish thought with his literary and intellectual writings- in the context of ideology during the Cold War period. In this context, it is aimed to examine themes such as the concept of ideology, the characteristics of capitalism and communism, and the struggle between them in Sezai Karakoç's works other than poetry. The method of discourse analysis was used in the study, and the result was that Sezai Karakoç's world of thought was significantly influenced by the political and intellectual context of the Cold War period, and the concept of ideology and the idea of a struggle between ideologies had a decisive effect on his mentality. It has become clear that Karakoç's works are one of the most important examples of intellectual pursuits and struggles that directly reflect the context of Islamist thought in Türkiye during the Cold War period.

Keywords: Political Thoughts, Islamism, Sezai Karakoç, Ideology, Capitalism-Communism.

Jel Codes: Z0; Z00

Sezai Karakoç'un Siyasal Düşüncesinde İdeoloji Kavramı ve Kapitalizm-Komünizm Mücadelesi

Süreç

Geliş: 10/09/2022

Kabul: 08/11/2022

Öz

20. yüzyılın siyasal kültürü üzerine düşünüldüğünde siyasal zihniyet ve faaliyetleri şekillendiren en önemli unsurlardan birinin ideoloji kavramı olduğu söylenebilir. Özellikle II. Dünya Savaşı'ndan sonra dünya sistemi devrin hâkim ideolojileri olan kapitalizm ve komünizm etrafında şekillendirilmiştir. Bu durum Soğuk Savaş dönemi olarak anılan bu dönemde siyasal süreçler ve uluslararası ilişkilerde belirleyici olduğu kadar entelektüellerin ideoloji kavramından etkilenecek düşünce üretmesini de beraberinde getirmiştir. Bu doğrultuda Soğuk Savaş devrinde Türkiye'nin en önemli entelektüellerinden biri olan, gerek edebi gerek fikri yazılarıyla Türk düşüncesini etkileyen Sezai Karakoç'un düşünce dünyasını ideoloji bağlamında incelemek önem arz etmektedir. Bu çerçevede çalışmada Sezai Karakoç'un şiir dışındaki eserlerinde ideoloji kavramı, kapitalizm ve komünizmin nitelikleri ve aralarındaki mücadele gibi temaların incelenmesi amaçlanmaktadır. Söylem analizi yönteminin kullanıldığı çalışmada ortaya çıkan sonuç Sezai Karakoç'un düşünce dünyasının Soğuk Savaş döneminin siyasal ve fikri bağlamından önemli ölçüde etkilendiği, ideoloji kavramı ve ideolojiler arası mücadele fikrinin onun zihniyet dünyasında belirleyici bir etkisinin bulunduğu olmuştur. Karakoç'un eserlerinin Soğuk Savaş döneminde Türkiye'de İslamcı düşüncenin kendi bağlamını doğrudan yansıtan entelektüel arayış ve mücadelelerinin en önemli örneklerinden biri olduğu açıkça ortaya çıkmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Siyasal Düşünceler, İslamcılık, Sezai Karakoç, İdeoloji, Kapitalizm-Komünizm.

Jel Kodları: Z0; Z0

License



This work is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License

selin.sahin@dpu.edu.tr

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0071-6554>

enes.sahin@dpu.edu.tr

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5974-240X>

How to Cite: Şahin S., Şahin E. (2023) The Concept of Ideology and the Struggle between Capitalism and Communism in Sezai Karakoç's Political Thought, *Journal of Economics and Administrative Sciences*, 24 (1): 50-59.

Introduction

Ideology is one of modern political thought's most important concepts and elements. In addition, as David McLellan points out, "Ideology is the most elusive concept in the whole of social science." (1995: 1). The reason for this is the different meanings attributed to the concept of ideology in the history of thought (Örs, 2009: 1-2; Keat – Urry, 2001: 279). For example, Terry Eagleton presented sixteen definitions for the concept of ideology in his work (1996: 18). According to Şerif Mardin, in a study conducted among university students, ideology was defined as a "systematic idea structure or narrative" by some students. In contrast, others describe it as "an idea structure that does not reflect the facts as they are" (2003: 13-14). When the history of the concept of ideology is examined, it is seen that these two definitions are used. Everyone knows that the process that created the concept is the modernization experience in Europe. From the Middle Ages to the modern age, the land-based economic system has turned into a money-centered financial system, therefore, new and effective classes have emerged in society (Örs, 2013: 8; Wiesner-Hanks, 2009). This transformation in the social structure also led to political shifts. While the change of political and social actors is important in this process, the transformation in political and social legitimacy is more important. In the pre-modern era, religious narratives and traditional understandings became the measure of legitimacy. With modernization, the source of legitimacy has been determined as a rational reason. Worldviews that define the measures, limits, and rules of order and development in political and social life in the context of reason have also shown themselves as ideology (Larrain, 1995: 21-23; Aytac, 2021: 109-110). Antoine Destutt de Tracy was the first to use the concept, and according to him, science should be done with the senses, not with metaphysical principles (Bendix, 2008: 348; Özbek, 2003: 38). "According to Tracy, the formation and dissemination of knowledge are possible with the help of ideas. Thus, the most fundamental science that forms the basis of all sciences is an ideology (the science of ideas). ...Ideology is the most fundamental teaching of developing and disseminating all the contents of consciousness." (Özbek, 2003: 37-38). Thus, ideology was seen as the basic science on which other sciences were built, the science of correct thinking (Mardin, 2003: 20). The change in meaning toward ideology resulted from the political developments that emerged after the French Revolution. Napoleon, himself one of the first respected members of the ideologues (Vincent, 2006: 4), supported the ideologues after the revolution and gave them the task of preparing a rational education system (Mardin, 2003: 23). Despite this, Napoleon faced ideologues because of his various concessions to religious institutions. This situation gave rise to a new period in the history of the concept of ideology. From this period onwards, Napoleon used ideology in a contemptuous sense (Mardin, 2003: 23; Bora, 2021: 85; Çelik, 2005: 28) and argued that ideologists "...want to destroy the laws of the human heart and the lessons of

history" (Bendix, 2008: 348). Thus, the concept of ideology and political ideologies have come to express the most appropriate version of "...thoughts, meanings and symbolic representations related to social life" (Sancar Üşür, 1997: 8) and the elements that will create false consciousness regarding these issues. Although ideologies emerged due to the shift in political thought, their structure led to ideas about all kinds of issues, such as politics, state, society, economy, and religion (Örs, 2013: 5). In this framework, ideologies do not evaluate politics in a narrow sense by only focusing on issues such as political regimes and administrative systems. In addition to these elements, ideologies are political elements in a broad sense that produce ideas and reveal discourses about almost every aspect of life.

Ideologies have left a significant impact on the political and intellectual life of Europe and then the world. As John Schwarzmantel (1998) pointed out, since the late 18th century, the influence of ideologies on political life and thought has gradually increased, and the age of ideology has manifested itself. The Second World War was, in a sense, a war of ideologies. After the war, a bipolar system emerged; then the Cold War started, its poles were formed around ideologies, and it was a period in which ideologies fought (Mueller, 2004-2005; Ugarriza, 2009). While ideologies affected the world this way, they also showed significant effects in the non-Western world. The impact of ideologies was a very important issue, especially in states and societies that experience modernization and try to convey the ideas and practices that emerged in Europe. The search for modernization coincided with a period when the effectiveness of ideologies began to become more and more evident, Turkish thought was also influenced by the concept of ideology and produced ideas about the concept of ideology (Bora, 2017). In the process of modernization, indigenous ideologies such as Ottomanism, Islamism, and Turkism were built (Somel, 2011; Arai, 2011; Göçek, 2009; Kara, 2011a; Kara, 2011b: 15-61). During the Republican era, the effectiveness of ideology increased even more, and the way to a fast and effective modernization was seen to build a properly shaped ideology (Çelik, 2011).

Islamism, shaped in the process of Ottoman modernization and resurfaced in the world of thought after the 1950s in the Republican period, became both an ideology and revealed ideas about the concept of ideology. As stated earlier, the period from the end of the Second World War to the dissolution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is called the Cold War period (Gaddis, 2008). The Cold War was, first and foremost, a war of ideologies that significantly impacted Islamist thinkers who produced ideas in Türkiye during this period (Akın, 2019: 37-52). During this period, Islamist thinkers put forward discussions on the concept of ideology and especially made evaluations about Capitalism and Socialism, which expressed the conflicting ideologies of the Cold War (Topçu, 1994; Kısakürek, 2014; Özel, 1978). Sezai Karakoç, one of the important Islamist figures of the period in Türkiye, was not left out of this

context. Karakoç was born in 1933, and his world of thought was shaped by the conditions presented to the world by the Cold War, including Türkiye. The period in which the effect of ideologies was seen at the highest level in Türkiye was the Cold War Period. After the Second World War, Türkiye was on the front of the United States in the international system (Karpat, 2012: 257). 1946-1950, the transition period to multi-party life at the beginning of being included in this party, was a period of intense anti-communist discourse (Bora – Ünüvar, 2019: 159). It can be said that Türkiye's foreign policy in the 1950s was built around the development and preservation of relations with the United States (Özcan, 2019: 97, 132). However, the anti-communism discourse was continued by right-wing politics until the end of the Cold War (Koca, 2019: 295). In this context, Liberalism and Capitalism were affirmed by the state, while Socialism and Communism were seen as dangerous others (Varel, 2019: 205; Şenol-Cantek, 2019: 427; Uçar, 2019: 471). This positioning towards ideologies has significantly affected many elements of political and social life, the world of thought, consumption culture, education, and daily life (Alkan, 2019: 591-617; 2017: 933-985; 2020: 825-862). The concepts in which this ideological conflict manifests itself in Türkiye have been right and left. It can be stated that the most fundamental feature of the Turkish right in this period was anti-communism (Koca, 2017: 545-569). Tanil Bora said: "The Turkish right wing was shaped as a reactionary discourse based mainly on the opposition to the left. The essence of leftist opposition was also anti-communism" (2012: 14). In addition, Bora states that the right wing in Türkiye was an umbrella where the Islamist, conservative, liberal and nationalist versions of anti-left discourses meet (2012: 15, 20). The anti-communist associations established in the 1950s prove this situation (Meşe, 2016: 117-204). In this direction, it is also possible to see situations where anti-communism was combined with an expression of sympathy for America. For example, President Celal Bayar said, "We are trying to follow the progress of the Americans in our country. We hope that after thirty years, this blessed country will be a small America with a population of 50 million" (Alkan, 2019: 595) and defined the search for Türkiye as to resemble America. *Fedai*, one of the magazines that revealed the right-wing rhetoric of the period, and statements about the assassination of the President of the United States of America, John F. Kennedy, are examples of this. "With the death of Mr. Kennedy by a communist bullet, humanity has lost its most distinguished son. This mourning is not only for the friendly American nation but also for the great Turkish nation, the free world. Our nation has never felt so deeply sorry for a foreign politician. Fellow America, free world, condolences!" ("Büyük Acı": 2). Türkiye's inclusion in NATO has officially revealed that it is one of the actors of the US side in the world system (Özcan, 2019: 109-110). This development was welcomed by the Democratic Party government and the opposition parties (Zürcher, 2013: 342). The sympathy of the period towards the USA was not only in the political field. The USA has also become the country followed by society on issues such as "...popular

figures representing the American lifestyle, urbanization, architectural and decoration styles, fashion, popular culture products, socializing spaces and forms" (Şenol-Cantek, 2019: 429). After the 1964 Cyprus Crisis and the Johnson Letter, sympathy for the USA gave way to antipathy (Karpat, 2011: 250-251; Ergüç, 2017: 261-270). In addition, after 1960, with the effect of the new Constitution and the political environment, left and Islamist thought in Türkiye expanded by expanding its sphere of influence (Karpat, 2011: 256; Varel, 2019: 399; Algül, 2015: 62; Sunar, 2019: 9; Özcan, 2017: 221). In the 1970s, the struggle of the anti-communist discourse with the rising left mentality turned into a de facto conflict (Zürcher, 2013: 380-381). In this period, the tension between political ideologies brought about social turmoil and violence (Ahmad, 1995: 209-250). It is clear that the search, tension, debate, and political processes that emerged in this summarized process affected Karakoç's mentality. He wrote many books in his extensive corpus during the Cold War years, together with his most important works such as *İslâm Toplumunun Ekonomik Strüktürü* (1967), *İslâm'ın Dirilişi* (1967), *Diriliş Neslinin Âmentüsü* (1976), *Diriliş Muştusu* (1980).

The conditions of the period, which made almost everything a matter of ideology, can be seen when Karakoç's works are read carefully. Karakoç made critical evaluations about the concept of ideology in many of his works. In addition, Capitalism and Communism, the dominant ideologies of the period, were subjects that found their place in almost every work of his. In this direction of this study, the ideology of Islamist thought in Türkiye during the Cold War period will be discussed through the works of Sezai Karakoç, one of the people who can represent the period. The discourse analysis method is used in the study. With the discourse analysis method, while a narrative is analyzed with all its elements, the analysis of the context and thinking process that led to the emergence of that narrative can be made. In the first part of the study, Sezai Karakoç's life story was discussed within the framework of the Cold War conditions and the changing ideological structure in Türkiye, while Karakoç's understanding of ideology was evaluated in this section. In the second part, Karakoç's evaluations of Capitalism and Communism, which are the ideologies of the period struggling for world domination, were discussed, and the study was completed with the conclusion part.

Sezai Karakoç's Intellectual Life, Cold War Context and Ideology

Born in 1933, Sezai Karakoç witnessed the Second World War in his childhood, the construction of a new world system after the war in his high school life, and the Cold War during his university years (Karataş, 1998: 19-22; Aydın and Duran, 2016: 273). In this context, it is possible to say that Karakoç shaped his thought during the Cold War years and that he wrote a vast and important part of his works during the Cold War years. It is known that the bipolar system, which emerged as a war of two opposing ideologies, determined international relations during the

Cold War period. In other words, this period was also a period of ideological struggle. As a matter of fact, during these decades, ideologies determined Türkiye's intellectual agenda, and ideological conflicts determined its political agenda. The struggle between capitalism and socialism throughout the world has shown itself among elements such as nationalism, Islamism, socialism, conservatism, and liberalism in Türkiye. This was a period in which anything that does not have an ideological character is not taken seriously. Karakoç reveals that he is aware of this situation with the following statements:

"The twentieth century has been a century of challenge between ideologies. While the First World War was between nationalities, the Second World War looked like a war between doctrines. The first war resulted from opposing those who wanted to realize the same ideology. The second was the challenge between the ideologies of nationalism and socialism. Both ideologies took on their most extreme manifestations." (Karakoç, 2013a: 133-134).

The magazine and entity of *Büyük Doğu* in which he produced ideas after his university years, can also be seen as an ideology (Karataş, 1998: 63-64). Even the name of the book in which Necip Fazıl Kısakürek introduces his ideology is *İdeolocya Örgüsü* (2020). From this point of view, his relationship with ideology can be easily understood. For this reason, Karakoç's relationship with the concept of ideology is in two different ways. Karakoç saw ideologies as a problem for the world of thought. However, he also tried to understand ideologies as the reality of the era and to benefit from the effectiveness of the concept.

Sezai Karakoç understands that ideologies are "new road claims from the West" (Karakoç, 2014a: 144). Karakoç thinks these new roads look like dead ends and are just deception for other societies (2014a: 144). According to him, these ideologies consist of idols and tools of domination, and they enslave the human mind (Karakoç 2015a: 56; 2013a: 135; 2008a: 55). In this sense, it can be said that Karakoç followed the point of view of Cemil Meriç, one of the influential intellectuals of the period, who saw ideologies as straitjackets dressed in human understanding (2016: 92). Karakoç explains the demand of individuals and societies against ideologies that enslave people with the prevailing fear climate of the century (Karakoç, 1998: 7). According to him, ideologies appeal to people's fears, not their hopes, and use their concerns such as poverty and captivity to enslave them (Karakoç: 1998: 8, 9). The ideologies in line with the Hegelian dialectic also produce their antitheses, and these elements, which seem fundamentally hostile to each other, seek the possibility of advancing themselves (2013b: 101-102). Non-Western societies, especially Islamic civilizations, are "...helplessly drifting towards the future, like lambs to the slaughter" under the domination of ideologies (2013c: 153-154). The following statements of Karakoç summarize his view on ideologies:

"...ideologies that come from outside and mean that they want to shape our own culture, ideals, our civilization's spirit, spirituality and sacred system in line with foreign countries and principles are corrupting, deforming and corrupting systems. Capitalism and communism are

examples of this, and nationalism in the sense of racism is also an example." (Karakoç, 2008b: 35).

Therefore, according to Karakoç, ideological pursuits produced in line with the dialectical method to prevent the resurrection of Islamic civilization in Türkiye and the Islamic world are just copies of those in the West (2014a: 144, 145). In this context, criticism of the West also emerges in line with the ideological discourses in the West. According to him, Muslims taking Western-based ideologies into account will only harm them (Karakoç, 2011a: 209; 2008b: 88-89). The only thing Western ideologies will bring for Muslims will be division, fragmentation, and loss of power (Karakoç, 2011a: 209, 212). However, the aim of Muslims should not be to build an ideology that produces discourse against the West but to "resurrect the East and Islam, the real resurrection, to be ourselves" (Karakoç, 2014a: 144). According to Karakoç, with the resurrection of Islam and its opposition to Western ideologies, not different versions of what is ontologically wrong, but right and wrong, good and evil, the Mahdi and the Antichrist will confront each other (Karakoç, 2015b: 21-22). He thinks that all ideologies will disappear in the face of the truth of Islam (Karakoç, 2009: 27). People will destroy ideologies that forget that people invented them because they see people as a field where they will shape them (Karakoç, 2012a: 209-211). However, Karakoç is also aware that the idea to be put forward at that time should also consider the basic concerns and pursuits of a period. He says, "...the age is an age of ideology" (2015b: 34-35). For this reason, although he sees the concept of ideology as problematic, he understands the production of Islam as a third-way ideology after the Second World War. Karakoç explains these searches as "propositions to establish a new Islamic society with the inspiration of Islam" (2015b: 35).

However, it can be said that Karakoç approaches the concept of ideology in an instrumental way. He states, "It is possible to accept the truth system as an ideology in its broadest sense..." (2013a: 130) and that a whole truth system can be seen as an ideology. Although he thinks that ideologies prevent people from reaching the truth, he still uses ideologies, a reality of the age, as a tool to fight against ideologies. Considering that Karakoç refers to the relationship of individuals and societies with ideologies as "one of the greatest features of our age..." (2011b: 264), this situation becomes normal. After all, Karakoç reflects the era in which he lived with all his acceptances, determinations, proposals and objections. For this reason, his ideas are also the result of a certain age. While he sees the truth system as an ideology, he also knows the danger of accepting the opposite of this sentence, namely the idea that ideologies are truth systems. His following statements summarize the issue: "...there is great risk in considering all ideologies as systems of truth. Starting from a little truth or an element of reality does not guarantee to reach the whole truth system." (Karakoç, 2013a: 130). It is possible to understand the reason why Karakoç positions his perception of truth as an ideology even though he is uncomfortable with the concept, within the framework of his sentences: "Opposing doctrine with doctrine is the main

remedy, real action arises from the love and fermentation of a doctrine" (2010a: 23).

Karakoç argues that European ideologies first detached Christianity from its political character and turned it into a spiritual education, then eliminated it from the intellectual life (2008a: 27-28). According to him, this is because Christianity has not been able to build a civilization of its own. According to Karakoç, what ideologies wanted to destroy after Christianity was Islamic civilization. Because according to him, Westerners know that if Islamic civilization starts to rise again, their ideology will end (2008a: 28-29). Although the Islamic civilization seems to have weakened, Karakoç states that the Islamic civilization is an "Immortal Civilization" whose secret of immortality is known to God and that modern political ideologies want to destroy Islamic civilization for this reason (2008a: 29). According to him, the superficial qualities of ideologies that do not appeal to the basic identity of the human being (Karakoç, 1998: 117) bring along the fact that people can easily oppose them when the atmosphere of fear is over.

Another criticism of Karakoç against ideologies comes from ignoring the experience before them. While identifying this situation with the following statements, he also reveals his opinion on real innovation: "If a person or some people come out and say something like this, do not believe them: "We have brought a brand new system. There is no precedent. Forget the past. The past is bad. Everything is bad. We have brought something brand new." (Karakoç, 2012b: 35-36). He says, "Innovation is living the time and age with the remembrance of the old." (Karakoç, 2012b: 35-36). It is seen that these criticisms of ideologies reveal a conservative mentality. In this sense, it can be said that Karakoç's Islamism also hosted conservative colors from time to time in line with the context of the period.

Capitalism and Communism in Sezai Karakoç's Thought

Even looking at Sezai Karakoç's works, it can be seen that the main elements of his discussions on ideologies are capitalism and communism. This is quite natural for Karakoç, who shaped his thinking in the context of the Cold War. The world's most basic ideological debate and conflict occur between these two ideologies, and states, societies, and individuals are almost necessarily subject to one of these two ideologies. In this period, ideologies such as anarchism, feminism, environmentalism, and nationalism consisted of versions of capitalism and communism in Karakoç's thought world (1999: 250). In this direction, it is important to deal with Karakoç's evaluations of capitalism and communism, who are looking for the possibilities of using it while critically approaching the concept of ideology.

Karakoç considers it problematic that capitalism makes private property a goal, not the acceptance of the private property. According to him, in capitalist systems, materials cease to be tools and become goals and obsessions, and one side of the human mind and emotions is constantly concerned with goods (Karakoç, 2015c: 87, 88). This situation has included everything about humanity into the spiral of production and consumption (Karakoç, 2013d: 20-

21). This central production and consumption situation has shaped human and social relations on the axis of production and consumption. At this point, his critique of capitalism is that capitalism presents a capital-centered class distinction, making some classes the slaves of other classes in this distinction and normalizing this situation (Karakoç, 2011a: 28). Karakoç summarizes the characteristics of capitalism as follows: "This trend is also the source of corruption that humiliates and degrades people, such as monopoly, exploitation of people, enslaving countries, gnawing on religious devotion, worshipping money and people." (2014b: 146). The capitalists could not distinguish between being the user of the material and being the absolute owner and deifying themselves (Karakoç, 2014c: 56; 2010b: 56). Capitalism, an exploitative system by its nature, even exploits concepts and uses the concepts of right and left to maintain its dominance (Karakoç, 2015a: 63), so capitalists exploit even compassion. Karakoç explains this situation: "Indirect advertising, which capitalists separate from their profits under the name of social service and save them for their expenses, thus reducing their taxes, payout of the state purse, is not compassion, but a counterfeit of compassion." (2012a: 175). The intellectual pursuits that started around trust in the mind revealed a system in which enslavement was structured (Karakoç, 1998: 38). When Karakoç looks at liberalism, he sees theory, and when he looks at capitalism, he sees practice. His following statements reveal the issue:

"One who looks at the principles of liberalism sees positive points of departure such as freedom, work, invention, and the entrepreneur's right. But when you walk from here to capitalism, it is seen that all these roads are blocked. This is the truth: Liberalism is nothing but a set of theoretical principles and slogans. It's easy to be idealistic and humanistic there. But capitalism, as a practice and established economic structure, will show all the features of Western society, faith, and civilization." (Karakoç, 2013d: 18).

Besides all these problems of capitalism, according to Karakoç, capitalist production relations are foreign to the spirit of Turks (2008c: 33). In this direction, Karakoç also states that private property and freedom of work are not far from the mentality of Turkish society (Karakoç, 2014d: 24). In his opinion, what is not suitable for Turkish society is the capital-centered class system and the hierarchical subordination order between these classes.

In Karakoç's narratives about ideologies, communism takes more place than capitalism. The reason for this situation may be that communism was active on the intellectual front while capitalism dominated the actual front of the political field at the time he produced his works. Karakoç's statements on the effectiveness of communism in Türkiye support this idea: "The books of Marx and other communists in recent years have flooded our country with propaganda. For a moment, the works of our own indigenous culture and ideal were buried in ashes." (Karakoç, 2011b: 67). Karakoç sees capitalism as a problem and views communism as a danger. When it is remembered that he referred to communism as a poison, this evaluation

style becomes clear (Karakoç, 2011b: 91; 2011a: 28). According to him, communism operates in places where there is cultural corruption and societies where a tradition and civilization dominate can struggle with the dangers of communism (Karakoç, 2011b: 91-92).

Karakoç adopts Marx's narrative of infrastructure and superstructure relations, but he thinks this formula is constructed incorrectly (2008b: 117). According to him, the infrastructure is not the economy but "...the spiritual structure, the spirit structure, the cultural structure, the structure of the core spirit of a country, a nation." (Karakoç, 2014e: 31). In this framework, his critique of Marx is not system-centered, but mentality-centered. Putting production objects and tools in the center of everything makes them the most basic goal (Karakoç, 2014c: 87-88). Humans have lost their meaning in this system and have no qualifications other than being productive forces (Karakoç, 2015a: 93; 2011c: 145-146). He sees the replacement of the materialist idea of communism with metaphysics as the way to reach the truth (Karakoç, 2012c: 8). For the economy to reach a correct path, but without making the economy an end in line with the understanding of communism, the economy must be understood as the affected object, not the constructive subject. According to him, Marxism and communism, in the most basic sense, consist of "...the denial of God, the spirit, the spiritual, the metaphysical of religion." (Karakoç, 2012c: 8-9; 2015b: 68). In this respect, it is possible to say that Karakoç's most basic criticism of communism emerged in line with the denial of spirituality. He thinks communism can't build a civilization because of this denial (Karakoç, 2015b: 16-17). Just as communism cannot build a civilization, those who already have a tradition, civilization, and religion to become a communist must also give up these (Karakoç, 2015b: 66; 2009: 105; 2012a: 26-27). However, according to Karakoç, although communism cannot build a civilization, it shapes itself as a materialist religion. The following statements reveal this understanding: "Communism is a new religion that knows this world first and foremost, that has lost God, that has made it a principle to worship powerful people, that has removed a single person from being a unit, and that perceives the mass as a flock." (Karakoç, 2015a: 162). According to him, while communism considers religions as illusions, on the other hand, it has become a modern religion adopted by people (Karakoç, 2011d: 73; 2015d: 52; 2011b: 352; 2012d: 44). Another criticism of his toward Marx is about his understanding of the state. Karakoç thinks that the state is not an accidental but a natural institution. Therefore, the idea of a future in which the state will disappear is impossible for him. The name of the institutional mechanism may disappear, but this natural and "holy" (Karakoç, 1998: 139) structure, namely "...the state's strictness, realism and the necessary dose of forgiveness and mercy are inevitable for people and will continue with humanity in one way or another." (Karakoç, 2012e: 92).

Karakoç considers the experience of socialism in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) as a practical falsification of many things that seem right in theory.

According to him, Soviet socialism, which is the concealed form of Slavic nationalism and was first accepted and then liquidated for the survival of Russia, deprives people of all their rights and freedoms (Karakoç, 2011d: 76; 1998: 12; 2012c: 31; 2015a: 118). This style of administration theoretically puts the administration under the domination of the working class, but in practice, "...it is a dictatorial system and regime that has the working class as an army in its hands." (Karakoç, 2012c: 32). In this sense, communism consists of an ideology that means "to chain the action" (Karakoç, 2015b: 51), where the rights of the individual and society are determined not by rational criteria, but by the determination of the state, thus oppressing the individual (Karakoç, 2015c: 84; 2014b: 51, 146).

While Karakoç frequently includes his determinations on capitalism and communism in his works, he has not neglected to produce ideas on the struggle between these ideologies. According to him, there is no ontological difference between capitalism and communism. The common origin of these ideologies, which are the results of modern Western thought, is materialism (Karakoç, 2011a: 27; Durmaz, 2022: 50). This makes them different from each other only methodically (Karakoç, 1998: 134-135). According to him, "Capitalism is a system that approaches the devil from the right side and socialism from the left side. The right side of the many-faced devil is capitalism, and the left side is socialism." (Karakoç, 2015a: 63). In other words, it is possible to see these ideologies as two brothers who cannot get along with each other (Karakoç, 2012a: 61, 97; 2015c: 88; 1998: 8; 2014c: 8; 2011c: 127). His words, "In my eyes, Adam Smith and Marx are the same" (Karakoç, 2010c: 14), reveals this situation. For this reason, he showed materialism as a target, not capitalism or communism, in his struggle discourse (Karakoç, 2013b: 90). Since the main element that forms the basis of all these ideologies is materialism, the main enemy to be fought against must be materialism (Karakoç, 2013b: 93).

Conclusion

It is clear that Sezai Karakoç had a significant impact on Turkish thought after 1950 with both his literary and intellectual abilities. While he was affected by the terms and conditions of his era, he influenced the mentality of his era. It can be thought that if Karakoç had written his important works after the collapse of the USSR rather than during the harshest period of the Cold War, the emphasis on ideology and criticism of capitalism-communism in his works would not have been possible to find such a place. He built his mentality in a world where he was forced to choose between capitalism and communism. For this reason, apart from these elements, he presented Islam as the absolute truth and Islamic civilization as the third and true path. Karakoç, on the one hand, was critical of the concept of ideology due to its restrictive nature of the human mind, on the other hand, he realized that he could only address the spirit of his era with the concept of ideology. In this direction, he saw the idea of Islamic civilization as an ideology by emphasizing that other

ideologies do not have a share of the truth. In addition, the ideology-centered searches of the Cold War period, which seemed to be a never-ending era, brought along Karakoç's extensive evaluations of the dominant ideologies of the period. He argued that the conflict between capitalism and communism was not based on existential foundations and said that the difference between them was not qualitative but formal. For this reason, he thinks that materialism, the ontological and epistemological source of these ideologies, should be fought rather than these ideologies. Since Karakoç has placed all his discourses on a metaphysical basis, he sees ideologies as methodologically functional in some cases but inaccurate in terms of source and method.

As a result, it is possible to say that the ideology-centered struggle style of the 20th century has weakened significantly, especially in the post-2000 period. In this respect, Sezai Karakoç's narratives about the concept of ideology, nature, and conflicts between capitalism and communism do not have the function they had the first time they were written. Sezai Karakoç is an intellectual of Cold War Türkiye. Considering that he has not written new works since the 1990s and founded the Diriliş Party in 1990, this situation will be understood more clearly. (Karataş, 1998: 105; Demirel, 2018: 782). He built his idea in an age when ideologies conflicted and completed his mission in this regard with the withdrawal of ideologies from the scene. Today, the works of Karakoç written in the mentioned period have a methodical nature in forming a political mentality. However, these works, which reveal Karakoç's mentality, will always maintain their quality as one of the essential sources to be consulted to show the intellectual pursuits and struggles of the Islamist intellectuals of the Cold War period.

Extended Abstract

Introduction

In the modern era, ideology is one of the most important and influential elements in the thought and activity aspects of the political field. Ideologies reveal grand theories for individuals, societies and states. In this direction, ideologies determine many things, from the daily life of individuals to their education, from how they work to their beliefs. In addition, it provides the shaping of societies and is the most important element in determining both domestic and foreign policy for states. The influence and importance of ideologies as a worldwide field of struggle have become much more significant, especially after the world wars in the 20th century. In this respect, it can be clearly said that the Cold War, which is the process from World War II to the collapse of the USSR, was an ideological war. The struggle between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was entirely ideology-centered, and other states in the world acted in line with these ideologies and joined one of the parties. In this process, Türkiye was also affected by the ideology-based conflicts in the world. Especially since the 1950s, ideologies have been influential in both the operational and the intellectual sides of Turkish politics. This situation has

also affected the intellectuals who produce ideas in Türkiye. Sezai Karakoç is one of the influential persons of Islamism thought, which was founded in the modernization process in the Ottoman period and found a place for itself in the Republican period after 1950. Karakoç was born in 1933, and his world of thought was shaped by the environment of the Cold War and ideological conflict. Karakoç's thought has many unique aspects and a special place in Turkish Islamism. Therefore, examining his world of thought is essential in an ideology-centred way. In this direction, the place of ideology as a concept in Sezai Karakoç's world of thought, capitalism and communism as an issue and the conflict between these ideologies were examined in this study.

Method

Although thinking is a personality-centered activity, it is directly affected by the political and cultural environment of the person's thinking. The thought, which is handled independently of its context, cannot find the opportunity to reveal the reasons that led to the emergence of that thought. For this reason, in the studies of the history of thought, it is of particular importance to examine the thought production activities of an individual or group within its own political and social context. In this context, the discourse analysis method, which aims to reveal the political and social context of the discourses, was used in the study. In this direction, Sezai Karakoç's books, other than his literary works, are included in the scope of the study. In the relevant works, Karakoç's evaluations of the concept of ideology, the characteristics of ideologies, the effects of ideologies in the history of Turkish thought and politics, the sources and characteristics of capitalism and communism as an ideology, and the causes and elements of conflicts between these ideologies have been identified. Then these discourses were classified and described, and finally, they were analyzed in line with the conditions that brought them out.

Findings

Sezai Karakoç thinks that ideologies prevent free thought. According to him, ideologies promise to liberate individuals and societies, but they only offer artificial freedom by drawing certain limits to their thoughts and actions. In addition, ideologies identify what is wrong to do and think and construct people and groups who think and act in this way as others. With the spread of ideologies that emerged in Western thought worldwide, these ideologies were also tried to be adopted by non-Western societies. For example, ideologies were tried to be acquired in Türkiye, but this effort was not in line with Türkiye's conditions. For this reason, the ideologies that tried to be copied from the West remained unsuccessful imitations. These copies have also revealed corrupting effects on Turkish thought, society, culture, civilization and sanctities. Although Karakoç approaches ideologies critically, he is aware that the spirit of the period he is in is made meaningful by ideologies. For this reason, he

thought that the search for the civilization of truth he put forward should be presented as an ideology.

According to him, although the truth is an ideology, not every ideology can represent the truth. In Karakoç's discourses, capitalism and communism are ideologies that cannot represent the truth. According to him, the problem with these ideologies is materialism, which is their source. This understanding, which puts the matter in the center, has also removed the matter from being a tool and turned it into a goal. In this direction, individuals and societies have been shaped only by production and consumption. However, according to Karakoç, the matter is only a tool. For this reason, thoughts that do not center on spirituality are doomed to disappear. According to him, both capitalism and communism are systems of exploitation. Capitalism enslaves individuals in the spiral of production and consumption. On communism, Karakoç justifies Marx's statement that the infrastructure shapes the superstructure. But according to him, this correct method was used incorrectly. Marx's materialist idea of determining infrastructure as the relation of production is wrong. According to Karakoç, the infrastructure should be spirituality. In a system where spirituality is the infrastructure, elements such as economy, education, culture, civilization and religion, which are the superstructure, will also be able to move in the right direction. Karakoç thinks that the conflict between capitalism and communism is a method fight. According to him, there is a difference in method, not source, between capitalism and communism. Starting from the same source and mentality, these ideologies have reached different results due to their methods. This situation turns the conflict between them into a methodological conflict rather than an ontological one.

Discussion

As a result, Sezai Karakoç has revealed much discourse about the concept of ideology, the nature of capitalism and communism, and the conflict between them in his works. It can be thought that this situation stems from the way his world of thought was shaped during the Cold War period. In an environment where ideologies, capitalism and communism were constantly discussed in the field of politics and thought under the conditions of the Cold War, Karakoç accepted it as a necessity to produce ideas on these issues. He placed the idea of Islamic civilization beyond these ideologies, and stated that ideologies are temporary, while Islam and Islamic civilization are permanent. Thus, Karakoç justified his search with a discourse that transcends the ideologies highly valued in his time. This situation is understandable considering that he did not produce works after the collapse of the USSR and the end of the Cold War and that he moved to the operational front of politics by founding a party. With the decline of the influence of ideologies, Karakoç sought ways to move the narrative of Islamic civilization from theory to practice.

References

- Ahmad, F. (1995). *Modern Türkiye'nin Dönüşümü*. Çev. Yavuz Alogan. İstanbul: Sarmal Yayınları.
- Akın, H. H. (2019). *Soğuk Savaş Döneminde Türkiye'deki Siyasal İslamcılık Hareketinin Dış Politika Söylemlerinin Hidayet Romanları Üzerinden İncelenmesi*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. TOBB Ekonomi ve Teknoloji Üniversitesi.
- Algül, S. (2015). *Türkiye'de Sendika-Siyaset İlişkisi DİSK (1967-1975)*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Alkan, M. Ö. (2017). "Altmışlı Yıllarda Günlük Hayatın Siyaseti". *Türkiye'nin 1960'lı Yılları*. Haz. Mete Kaan Kaynar. 933-985. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Alkan, M. Ö. (2019). "Soğuk Savaş'ın Toplumsal, Kültürel ve Günlük Hayatı İnşâ Edilirken...". *Türkiye'nin 1950'li Yılları* (3. Baskı). Haz. Mete Kaan Kaynar. 591-617. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Alkan, M. Ö. (2020). "Yetmişli Yıllarda Günlük Hayatın Siyasetine Dair: Zıtlıklar, Kutuplaşma, Siyasallaşma, Radikalleşme". *Türkiye'nin 1970'li Yılları*. Haz. Mete Kaan Kaynar. 825-862. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Arai, M. (2011). "Jön Türk Dönemi Türk Milliyetçiliği". *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasî Düşünce Cilt 1 Cumhuriyet'e Devreden Düşünce Mirası: Tanzimat ve Meşrutiyet'in Birikimi* (9. Baskı). Ed. Mehmet Ö. Alkan. 180-195. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Aydın, C. – Duran, B. (2016). "Soğuk Savaş Dönemi Türkiye'sinde Arnold J. Toynbee ve İslamcılık Sezai Karakoç'un Yazılarında Medeniyetçilik". *Muhafazakâr Düşünce* 13 (49). 271-294.
- Aydın, S. – Yüksel, T. (2014). *1960'tan Günümüze Türkiye Tarihi*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Aytaç, A. M. (2021). "Dünya Görüşü ve İdeoloji." *Siyaset Kavramlar, Kurumlar, Süreçler* (6. Baskı). Ed. Yüksel Taşkın. 105-137. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Bendix, R. (2008). "İdeoloji". *Modern Toplumsal Düşünce Sözlüğü*. Ed. William Outhwaite. 348-349. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Bora, T. – Ünüvar, K. (2019). "Elli Yıllarda Türkiye'de Siyasî Düşünce Hayatı". *Türkiye'nin 1950'li Yılları* (3. Baskı). Haz. Mete Kaan Kaynar. 159-175. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Bora, T. (2012). "Türk Sağı: Siyasal Düşünce Tarihi Açısından Bir Çerçeve Denemesi". *Türk Sağı Mitler, Fetişler, Düşman İmgeleri*. Der. İnci Özkan Kerestecioglu – Güven Gürkan Öztan. 9-28. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Bora, T. (2017). *Cereyanlar Türkiye'de Siyasî İdeolojiler* (4. Baskı). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Bora, T. (2021). "İdeoloji". *Siyaset Kavramlar, Kurumlar, Süreçler* (6. Baskı). Ed. Yüksel Taşkın. 81-104. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Çelik, N. B. (2005). *İdeolojinin Soykütüğü I: Marx ve İdeoloji*. Ankara: Bilim ve Sanat Yayınları.
- Çelik, N. B. (2011). "Kemalizm: Hegemonik Bir Söylem". *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasî Düşünce Cilt 2 Kemalizm* (7. Baskı). Ed. Ahmet İnel. 75-91. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Demirel, İ. (2018). "Sezai Karakoç'un Siyasal Düşüncesinde Türkiye Tasavvurları". *Sosyal Bilimlerde Yeni Yönelimler-V*. Ed. Abidin Temizer – Yaşar Baytal. 769-785.
- Durmaz, İ. (2022). *Sezai Karakoç'un Siyasî Düşüncesi*. Doktora Tezi. Bursa Uludağ Üniversitesi.
- Eagleton, T. (1996). *İdeoloji*. Çev. Muttalıp Özcan. İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları.
- Ergüç, V. (2017). "Johnson Mektubu". *Türkiye'nin 1960'lı Yılları*. Haz. Mete Kaan Kaynar. 257-274. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Gaddis, J. L. (2008). *Soğuk Savaş Pazarlıklar, Casuslar, Yalanlar, Gerçekler*. Çev. Dilek Cenkçiler. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.
- Göçek, F. M. (2009). "Osmanlı Devleti'nde Türk Milliyetçiliğinin Oluşumu: Sosyolojik Bir Yaklaşım". *Modern Türkiye'de Siyasî Düşünce Cilt 4 Milliyetçilik* (4. Baskı). Ed. Tanıl Bora. 63-76. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

24. Kara, İ. (2011a). "İslâmcı Söylemin Kaynakları ve Gerçeklik Değeri". Modern Türkiye'de Siyasî Düşünce Cilt 6 İslâmcılık (3. Baskı). Ed. Yasin Aktay. 34-47. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
25. Kara, İ. (2011b). "Giriş: Türkiye'de İslâmcılık Düşüncesi İçin Bir Çerçeve Denemesi". Türkiye'de İslâmcılık Düşüncesi 1 Metinler Kişiler. 15-61. İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları.
26. Karakoç, S. (1980). Diriliş Muştusu. İstanbul: Diriliş Yayınları.
27. Karakoç, S. (1989). Tarihin Yol Ağzında (4. Baskı). İstanbul: Diriliş Yayınları.
28. Karakoç, S. (1998). Çağ ve İlham III Yazgı Seçiş (3. Baskı). İstanbul: Diriliş Yayınları.
29. Karakoç, S. (1999). Gün Saati Günlük Yazılar IV (2. Baskı). İstanbul: Diriliş Yayınları.
30. Karakoç, S. (2008a). Çağ ve İlham IV Kuruluş (3. Baskı). İstanbul: Diriliş Yayınları.
31. Karakoç, S. (2008b). Fizikötesi Açısından Ufuklar ve Daha Ötesi I Perde Devrildiği An (3. Baskı). İstanbul: Diriliş Yayınları.
32. Karakoç, S. (2008c). Unutuş ve Hatırlayış (3. Baskı). İstanbul: Diriliş Yayınları.
33. Karakoç, S. (2009). Çağ ve İlham I Metafizik Gerilim Şartı (7. Baskı). İstanbul: Diriliş Yayınları.
34. Karakoç, S. (2010a). Varolma Savaşı I (3. Baskı). İstanbul: Diriliş Yayınları.
35. Karakoç, S. (2010b). Gündönümü (7. Baskı). İstanbul: Diriliş Yayınları.
36. Karakoç, S. (2010c). Diriliş Neslinin Âmentüsü (13. Baskı). İstanbul: Diriliş Yayınları.
37. Karakoç, S. (2011a). Yapı Taşları ve Kaderimizin Çağrısı II (3. Baskı). İstanbul: Diriliş Yayınları.
38. Karakoç, S. (2011b). Sütun Günlük Yazılar II (6. Baskı). İstanbul: Diriliş Yayınları.
39. Karakoç, S. (2011c). Farklar Günlük Yazılar I (6. Baskı). İstanbul: Diriliş Yayınları.
40. Karakoç, S. (2011d). İnsanlığın Dirilişi (8. Baskı). İstanbul: Diriliş Yayınları.
41. Karakoç, S. (2012a). Çağ ve İlham II Sevgi Devrimi (7. Baskı). İstanbul: Diriliş Yayınları.
42. Karakoç, S. (2012b). Çıkış Yolu II Medeniyetimizin Dirilişi (4. Baskı). İstanbul: Diriliş Yayınları.
43. Karakoç, S. (2012c). Düşünceler I Kavramlar (4. Baskı). İstanbul: Diriliş Yayınları.
44. Karakoç, S. (2012d). Kıyamet Aşısı (10. Baskı). İstanbul: Diriliş Yayınları.
45. Karakoç, S. (2012e). Yitik Cennet (13. Baskı). İstanbul: Diriliş Yayınları.
46. Karakoç, S. (2013a). Fizikötesi Açısından Ufuklar ve Daha Ötesi II Diriliş Şoku (4. Baskı). İstanbul: Diriliş Yayınları.
47. Karakoç, S. (2013b). Fizikötesi Açısından Ufuklar ve Daha Ötesi III Doğum Işığı (4. Baskı). İstanbul: Diriliş Yayınları.
48. Karakoç, S. (2013c). Çıkış Yolu III Kutlu Millet Gerçeği (4. Baskı). İstanbul: Diriliş Yayınları.
49. Karakoç, S. (2013d). İslâm Toplumunun Ekonomik Strüktürü (13. Baskı). İstanbul: Diriliş Yayınları.
50. Karakoç, S. (2014a). Sûr Günlük Yazılar III (6. Baskı). İstanbul: Diriliş Yayınları.
51. Karakoç, S. (2014b). Yapı Taşları ve Kaderimizin Çağrısı I (4. Baskı). İstanbul: Diriliş Yayınları.
52. Karakoç, S. (2014c). Edebiyat Yazıları I Medeniyetin Rüyası Rüyanın Medeniyeti Şiir (6. Baskı). İstanbul: Diriliş Yayınları.
53. Karakoç, S. (2014d). Düşünceler II Kurumlar (4. Baskı). İstanbul: Diriliş Yayınları.
54. Karakoç, S. (2014e). Çıkış Yolu I Ülkemizin Geleceği (5. Baskı). İstanbul: Diriliş Yayınları.
55. Karakoç, S. (2015a). Ruhun Dirilişi (12. Baskı). İstanbul: Diriliş Yayınları.
56. Karakoç, S. (2015b). İslâmın Dirilişi (15. Baskı). İstanbul: Diriliş Yayınları.
57. Karakoç, S. (2015c). İslâm (14. Baskı). İstanbul: Diriliş Yayınları.
58. Karakoç, S. (2015d). Samanyolunda Ziyafet (8. Baskı). İstanbul: Diriliş Yayınları.
59. Karataş, T. (1998). Doğu'nun Yedinci Oğlu Sezai Karakoç. İstanbul: Kaknüs Yayınları.
60. Karpat, K. H. (2009). Osmanlı'dan Günümüze Kimlik ve İdeoloji. Çev. Güneş Ayas. İstanbul: Timaş Yayınları.
61. Karpat, K. H. (2011). Türk Siyasî Tarihi Siyasal Sistemin Evrimi (2. Baskı). Çev. Ceren Elitez. İstanbul: Timaş Yayınları.
62. Karpat, K. H. (2012). Türk Dış Politikası Tarihi. Çev. Güneş Ayas. İstanbul: Timaş Yayınları.
63. Keat, R. - Urry, J. (2001). Bilim Olarak Sosyal Teori (2. Baskı). Çev. Nilgün Çelebi. İstanbul: İmge Kitabevi.
64. Kısakürek, N. F. (2014). Moskof. İstanbul: Büyük Doğu Yayınları.
65. Kısakürek, N. F. (2020). İdeolojya Örgüsü. İstanbul: Büyük Doğu Yayınları.
66. Koca, B. (2017). "Altmışlı Yıllarda Türkiye'de Anti-komünizm: Truman Doktrini'nden Komünizmle Mücadele Dernekleri'ne". Türkiye'nin 1960'lı Yılları. Haz. Mete Kaan Kaynar. 545-569. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
67. Koca, B. (2019). "Ellili Yıllarda Merkez Sağ: Demokrat Parti'nin Özgürlük ile İstismar Arasındaki Dinî Politikaları". Türkiye'nin 1950'li Yılları (3. Baskı). Haz. Mete Kaan Kaynar. 293-319. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
68. Larrain, J. (1995). İdeoloji ve Kültürel Kimlik Üçüncü Dünya Gerçeği. Çev. Neşe Nur Domanıç. İstanbul: Sarmal Yayınevi.
69. Mardin, Ş. (2003). İdeoloji (9. Baskı). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
70. McLellan, D. (1995). Ideology. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
71. Meriç, C. (2016). Bu Ülke. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
72. Meşe, E. (2016). Komünizmle Mücadele Dernekleri. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
73. Mueller, J. (2004-2005). "What Was The Cold War About? Evidence From Its Ending?". Political Science Quarterly 119 (4). 609-631.
74. Örs, H. B. (2009). "Postmodern Dünyada İdeolojinin Dönüşümü". İ. Ü. Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi 40. 1-12.
75. Örs, B. (Ed.) (2013). "İdeoloji: Karmaşık Dünyayı Anlaşılır Kılmak". 19. Yüzyıldan 20. Yüzyıla Modern Siyasal İdeolojiler (6. Baskı). 3-45. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
76. Özbek, S. (2003). İdeoloji Kuramları (2. Baskı). İstanbul: Bulut Yayınları.
77. Özcan, G. (2017). "Altmışlı Yıllarda "Dış" Politika". Türkiye'nin 1960'lı Yılları. Haz. Mete Kaan Kaynar. 217-256. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
78. Özcan, G. (2019). "Ellili Yıllarda "Dış" Politika". Türkiye'nin 1950'li Yılları (3. Baskı). Haz. Mete Kaan Kaynar. 97-133. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
79. Özel, İ. (1978). Üç Mesele Teknik Medeniyet Yabancılaşma. İstanbul: Düşünce Yayınları.
80. Sancar Üşür, S. (1997). İdeolojinin Serüveni Yanlış Bilinç ve Hegemonyadan Söyleme. Ankara: İmge Kitabevi.
81. Schwarzmantel, J. (1998). The Age of Ideology Political Ideologies from the American Revolution to Postmodern Times. Hampshire: Macmillan Press.
82. Somel, S. A. (2011). "Osmanlı Reform Çağında Osmanlılık Düşüncesi (1839-1913)". Modern Türkiye'de Siyasî Düşünce Cilt 1 Cumhuriyet'e Devreden Düşünce Mirası: Tanzimat ve Meşrutiyet'in Birikimi (9. Baskı). Ed. Mehmet Ö. Alkan. 88-116. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
83. Sunar, L. (Ed.). (2019). "İslamcılığı Konumlandırmak: Genel Bir Giriş". "Bir Başka Hayata Karşı" 1980 Sonrası İslamcı Dergilerde

- Meseleler, Kavramlar ve İsimler. 1-14. İstanbul: Konya Büyükşehir Belediyesi Kültür Yayınları.
84. Şenol-Cantek, F. (2019). "Ellili Yıllar Türkiye'sinde Basın". Türkiye'nin 1950'li Yılları (3. Baskı). Haz. Mete Kaan Kaynar. 423-450. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
85. Topçu, N. (1994). "Sosyalizme Karşı Koyan Kuvvetler". Türkiye'de İslamcılık Düşüncesi Metinler/Kişiler III. Haz. İsmail Kara. 213-217. İstanbul: Pınar Yayınları.
86. Uçar, A. (2019). "Ellili Yıllarda Edebiyat Ortamı: Toplumculuğun Modernizmle Dansı". Türkiye'nin 1950'li Yılları (3. Baskı). Haz. Mete Kaan Kaynar. 471-484. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
87. Ugarriza, J. E.. (2009). "Ideologies and Conflict in the Post-Cold War". International Journal of Conflict Management 20 (1). 82-104.
88. Varel, A. (2019). "Ellili Yıllarda Muhalefet: Hükümete Yönelik Temel Eleştiriler ve DP Karşısında CHP'nin İdeolojik Konumlanması". Türkiye'nin 1950'li Yılları (3. Baskı). Haz. Mete Kaan Kaynar. 203-234. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
89. Vincent, A. (2006). Modern Politik İdeolojiler. Çev. Arzu Tüfekçi. İstanbul: Paradigma Yayıncılık.
90. Wiesner-Hanks, M. E.. (2009). Erken Modern Dönemde Avrupa 1450-1789. Çev. Hamit Çalışkan. İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.
91. Zürcher, E. J. (2013). Modernleşen Türkiye'nin Tarihi (28. Baskı). Çev. Yasemin Saner. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
92. "Büyük Acı". (1963). Fedai 5, 2.