

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19402506

TRADITION AS A CRITIQUE OF IMPORTED MODERNITY: CULTURAL CONSCIOUSNESS IN ATILA İLHAN'S LITERARY THOUGHT

Esra Polat Onbasi¹ and Alparslan Onbasi²

¹Department of History and Civilization, International Islamic University Malaysia.

Email: onbasipolat@gmail.com

²Department of Islamic Philosophy, Bartın University, Türkiye. Email: onbasialparslan@gmail.com

Received: 20/02/2026

Accepted: 30/03/2026

Corresponding Author: Esra Polat Onbasi
(onbasipolat@gmail.com)

ABSTRACT

This article argues that tradition in Attila İlhan's literary thought functions not as a nostalgic attachment to the past but as a critical epistemological framework through which imported models of modernity are evaluated and resisted. Situating İlhan within debates on alternative modernities and cultural autonomy, the study examines how his essays, novels, and poetic statements construct a theory of tradition grounded in historical consciousness, linguistic authenticity, and civilizational continuity. Drawing on cultural theory and postcolonial approaches to modernity, the article demonstrates that İlhan conceptualizes tradition as an active intellectual resource rather than a static inheritance. Through close textual analysis, it shows how his writings transform tradition into a tool of critique against imitation, dependency, and what he perceives as rootless Westernization. Ultimately, the article proposes that İlhan's formulation represents a distinct model of literary modernity emerging from non-Western intellectual contexts, one that challenges linear modernization paradigms and foregrounds cultural self-definition as the basis of aesthetic production.

KEYWORDS: Tradition, Modernity, Cultural Identity, Literary Theory, Alternative Modernities, Turkish Literature.

1. INTRODUCTION

Debates on modernity and tradition have long occupied a central place in literary and cultural theory, particularly in discussions concerning non-Western intellectual traditions and their responses to global modernity. While classical modernization narratives often posit a linear transition from tradition to modernity, recent scholarship has challenged this dichotomy, arguing instead for plural and contested modernities shaped by local epistemologies, historical experiences, and cultural self-interpretations. Within this broader theoretical context, literary texts become crucial sites for examining how intellectuals negotiate inherited traditions while confronting the pressures of imported models of progress, civilization, and identity. Literature, therefore, does not merely reflect cultural debates but actively produces conceptual frameworks through which societies interpret modernity itself.

One of the most compelling yet underexamined contributors to this discussion is Attila İlhan, whose literary and intellectual corpus offers a sustained critique of imitative modernization and a distinctive revaluation of tradition. Although widely recognized as a poet and novelist, İlhan also developed a coherent body of thought on culture, language, civilization, and national consciousness. In his essays, interviews, and fictional works, tradition appears not as a static heritage opposed to progress, but as a dynamic epistemological resource that enables critical engagement with modernity. His writings repeatedly question whether modernization divorced from cultural memory can produce authentic intellectual or artistic forms, and they foreground the tension between imported institutional models and locally rooted cultural consciousness.

Despite İlhan's prominence in Turkish literary history, existing scholarship has tended to approach his work primarily through biographical, ideological, or historical lenses, often emphasizing his political positions or stylistic features rather than his theoretical contribution to debates on modernity. Consequently, his conceptualization of tradition as a critical instrument remains insufficiently explored within international literary theory. This gap is particularly striking given the growing scholarly interest in alternative modernities and the need to incorporate non-Western intellectual frameworks into global theoretical discourse.

This article argues that İlhan's understanding of tradition constitutes a systematic critique of imported modernity and functions as a theoretical

model of culturally grounded literary consciousness. Drawing on cultural theory and approaches to multiple modernities, the study analyzes selected passages from his essays and literary texts to demonstrate how he reconceptualizes tradition as an active, interpretive force rather than a passive inheritance. By situating his work within contemporary theoretical debates, the article aims to demonstrate that İlhan's literary thought provides not only a national or regional perspective but also a broader conceptual intervention into the relationship between culture, knowledge, and modernity. Ultimately, it proposes that his formulation represents a distinctive paradigm of intellectual self-definition in which tradition operates as a critical methodology for evaluating modern civilization rather than as an obstacle to it.

2. MODERNIZATION: A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Modernization is commonly defined as the transformation of societies through processes such as industrialization, urbanization, bureaucratization, and the expansion of rational-legal institutions. Classical modernization theory often described this transformation as a linear transition from traditional to modern social structures (Black 1996; Eisenstadt 1966). Within this framework, traditional values were frequently portrayed as obstacles to development and social progress.

Later scholarship, however, has challenged this interpretation by emphasizing that modernization does not necessarily require the abandonment of cultural traditions. Instead, modernization takes different forms depending on each society's historical experience and cultural structure (Huntington 1996; Inglehart & Welzel 2005). From this perspective, modernization should be understood as a structural and institutional transformation rather than a cultural replacement.

This distinction between modernization and Westernization is particularly important in debates concerning non-Western societies. While modernization refers primarily to economic, technological, and institutional change, Westernization implies the adoption of Western cultural norms and civilizational frameworks (Huntington 1996). It is precisely this conflation that Attila İlhan criticizes in his writings on Turkish modernization.

3. RETHINKING THE DICHOTOMY: TRADITION AND MODERNITY AS COMPLEMENTARY FORCES

Within the discourse of modernization, tradition occupies a critical position, functioning not as an obstacle to be eradicated but as a foundation upon which sustainable development can be built. Contrary to the assumption that modernity necessitates the wholesale rejection of tradition, a more nuanced reading suggests that societies modernize to the extent that their traditional values are integrated and adapted, rather than annihilated. Modernity and tradition need not exist in a state of mutual exclusion; rather, new and authentic values can emerge from their synthesis (Brown 1996: 2-3). Genuinely modern societies are not characterized by the systematic erasure of their past and belief systems—a phenomenon observable in radical movements such as the Russian and Chinese Cultural Revolutions, both of which were, paradoxically, products of Westernizing modernization—but by their capacity to peacefully transform the old into the contemporary (Touraine 1995:354).

This perspective finds robust support in sociological theory. American sociologist Robert Neelly Bellah contends that the complete abolition of traditional cultural elements is unnecessary for successful modernization; indeed, he posits that these very elements can serve as valuable resources in the process (Bellah 1958:1-5). Similarly, Cyril Edwin Black emphasizes the paramount importance of culture in shaping a society's developmental trajectory. He argues that modernization is not a uniform process; rather, it yields distinct outcomes depending on each society's unique cultural and structural configuration. The specific configurations of a society necessarily produce divergent modernization results (Black 1966: 47-48). Samuel Huntington extends this argument by noting that modernization, while enhancing a country's economic wealth and military strength, simultaneously empowers its people to become more—not less—assertive in their adherence to their cultural heritage. The increased capacity brought by modernization can thus reinforce cultural identity rather than dilute it (Huntington 1996a: 219).

The historical experience of Western societies themselves provides the most compelling evidence for this argument. A comparative analysis reveals that there is no singular "Western" model of modernization; instead, each society traversed this path according to its distinct economic and social formations. The participation of these societies in the modernization process, and the specific trajectories they followed, were profoundly shaped by their pre-existing social and political structures. In the United

Kingdom, modernization emerged as a gradual, evolutionary process resulting from a long history of economic, social, and political development. It was shaped as an organic product of British social history, marked by bourgeois entrepreneurship and a strong civic culture. In France, modernization assumed a more revolutionary and public character. While also led by the bourgeoisie, the French Revolution imbued the process with a collective, people-centered ethos that contrasted sharply with the British experience. In Germany, modernization was initially constructed at a theoretical level. However, due to the relative weakness of the bourgeois class as a transformative agent, the state itself assumed the role of primary actor, implementing modernization through direct intervention and a politically-centered approach. To summarize, modernization has manifested in diverse forms: evolutionist and individual-centered in England, revolutionary and people-centered in France, and political and state-centered in Germany. As this brief comparative sketch demonstrates, even within the confines of Western civilization, modernization theories and practices have varied significantly, contingent upon the specific cultural and historical context (Blackbourn 1997: 56-78). This heterogeneity undermines the notion of a monolithic, universally applicable model and opens the conceptual space for non-Western societies to pursue paths to modernity that remain faithful to their own cultural traditions.

4. ATTILA İLHAN AND HIS VIEW ON MODERNIZATION

Attila İlhan (1925-2005), who grew up in a modern and secular family, described himself as a "leftist", and he consistently propagated a socialist political ideology throughout his career (İlhan 2006:58). Because of his admiration for Paris, İlhan traveled there in his youth and had the opportunity to observe French modernization firsthand. His curiosity about modernization and culture deepened during his time in Paris, where he conducted extensive observations and intellectual inquiries (İlhan 2006:55).

During the Paris trip, he benefited from Jean Marie Albertini's (1929-2014) *Mécanisme du sous-développement et développement* (The Mechanism of Underdevelopment) in his investigation of the impacts of colonial powers on the development process of indigenous people and the cultural problems they created. In this work, Albertini argues that the colonial power de-cultures the indigenous people, which refers to the alienation or even complete disappearance of a group from its own culture as a result of its relationship with another

culture (İlhan 2005:72-73). Another important person that İlhan takes as a reference on this subject is Nikolai Trubetzkoy (1890-1938). He argues that the secret desire of the Europeans is to make the peoples of the world forget their own culture by being de-identified. In this way, European culture will easily voice its claim to universality and regard other cultures as second-class (İlhan 2005a:112). While the authors who influenced him provided an intellectual framework for questioning Western-centered models of culture and modernity, it was his lived observations in Paris that transformed these abstract reflections into concrete conviction. During this period, two striking encounters deeply reinforced his developing perspective. Firstly, İlhan recounts an interview broadcast on French television with a prosecutor living in Pondicherry, a former French colony that later became part of India. Although this individual spoke fluent French and possessed extensive knowledge of French classical literature, he expressed contempt for his own people and identified himself as culturally closer to the West. Yet he also acknowledged that, because of his race, he could never truly be considered French, despite emotionally adopting French identity and culture; indeed, he stated that although he was of Hindu origin, he did not feel Hindu at all. Secondly, İlhan refers to the case of a Black writer from the Antilles who experienced a similar dilemma. This writer likewise felt culturally French but recognized that he would never be accepted as French due to racial hierarchies implicitly upheld by native French society. Consequently, he admitted that he lived in a state of profound identity crisis. These examples, for İlhan, illustrated the psychological and cultural consequences of imitation-based modernization, demonstrating how uncritical identification with an external civilization can generate alienation from one's own historical and social roots (İlhan 2002:24-25). Drawing on these experiences, he developed a sustained critique of the notion that the West represents a unified and superior civilization. He forcefully challenged the tendency among Eastern societies to treat Europe as the final stage of civilizational progress, insisting that Europe cannot serve as an absolute standard of modernity and that such an assumption constitutes a deeply problematic and misleading prejudice (İlhan 2005b: 127). From this perspective, he considered the trajectory of Turkish modernization fundamentally problematic, especially due to what he described as "comprador intellectuals" aligned with Western paradigms who displayed a dismissive attitude toward Turkish culture. In his view, this mindset required critical

transformation, which is why these questions became central themes throughout his writings (İlhan 2005b:46).

5. HISTORICAL MEMORY AND TURKISH CULTURAL CONTINUITY IN THE NOVELS OF ATILAN İLHAN

In the fictional universe of Attila İlhan, tradition is not merely a thematic reference but a structural principle shaping narrative logic, character consciousness, and symbolic space. His novels repeatedly foreground the tension between historically rooted cultural forms and the dislocating effects of externally imposed models of modernization. Rather than portraying tradition as folklore or decorative heritage, İlhan integrates elements of Turkish historical memory, linguistic sensibility, and civilizational continuity into the very architecture of his narratives. This narrative strategy transforms tradition into an interpretive framework through which both characters and readers evaluate social change.

In *Kurtlar Sofrası* (Table of Wolves) (İlhan 2012: passim), the social environment reflects a fractured cultural landscape where inherited ethical codes coexist uneasily with newly adopted social norms. The novel's urban setting does not symbolize progress in a straightforward sense; instead, it appears as a liminal space suspended between cultural memory and imported institutional forms. Characters who lack connection to historical consciousness are portrayed as intellectually unstable or morally directionless, suggesting that tradition functions as a stabilizing epistemic axis. Here, İlhan implicitly frames Turkish cultural inheritance as a reservoir of interpretive authority capable of grounding individual and collective identity amid rapid transformation.

This pattern becomes even more pronounced in *Sokaktaki Adam* (The Man on the Street) (İlhan 2003: passim), where alienation is depicted as a consequence of severed continuity with the cultural past rather than as an inevitable condition of modern life. The protagonist's psychological fragmentation parallels the erosion of meaningful ties to language, memory, and shared symbolic references. In this narrative, tradition is not presented directly; it is evoked through its absence. The character's disorientation thus functions as a negative image of cultural rootedness, implying that a viable modern subjectivity requires an active relationship with inherited forms. Through this technique, İlhan converts personal crisis into civilizational commentary.

A defining feature of İlhan's narrative method is his use of linguistic texture as a marker of cultural continuity. His prose frequently incorporates tonal registers, idiomatic expressions, and rhetorical rhythms characteristic of the Turkish literary tradition. This stylistic choice is not ornamental but conceptual: language itself becomes evidence of historical depth. By preserving linguistic memory within modern narrative form, İlhan demonstrates that innovation and inheritance are not mutually exclusive. Instead, he proposes that literary originality emerges from a conscious dialogue with tradition rather than from its rejection.

Taken together, these novels suggest that İlhan envisions Turkish tradition as a dynamic cultural matrix that enables critical engagement with modernity. His fiction does not idealize the past, nor does it advocate regression. Rather, it constructs a model of literary modernity grounded in historical awareness and cultural self-interpretation. In doing so, İlhan positions tradition as a methodological resource that allows both individuals and societies to negotiate change without relinquishing interpretive autonomy. This narrative vision ultimately affirms that the question is not whether tradition should survive modernity, but how it can be transformed into an active principle shaping modern cultural consciousness.

The thematic and structural role of tradition becomes even more pronounced when İlhan's broader novelistic corpus is considered. Across different historical settings and narrative perspectives, his fiction repeatedly returns to the question of how Turkish cultural memory can function as a stabilizing interpretive framework within periods of social transformation. Rather than presenting history as a static backdrop, İlhan activates it as a living epistemic force that shapes character perception and narrative meaning.

In *Sırtlan Payı* (Share of the Hyena) (İlhan 2016: passim), historical consciousness operates as a moral axis structuring both plot and characterization. The novel situates its narrative within a politically charged atmosphere in which questions of national direction, intellectual dependency, and cultural authenticity come to the foreground. Characters who possess a strong awareness of historical continuity display interpretive clarity, whereas those detached from collective memory appear ideologically unstable. Here, İlhan constructs history not as nostalgia but as a cognitive instrument that allows individuals to situate themselves within a larger civilizational trajectory. The narrative thereby affirms the idea that tradition is inseparable from

intellectual agency.

A related dynamic emerges in *Dersaadet'te Sabah Ezanları* (The Morning Prayers in *Dersaadet*), (İlhan 2015: passim) where the late Ottoman setting functions as a symbolic laboratory for examining cultural transition. By reconstructing a historical moment marked by institutional transformation and civilizational uncertainty, İlhan explores how societies negotiate continuity under pressure. The novel's attention to linguistic texture, social rituals, and symbolic spaces reflects a deliberate effort to recover the experiential density of tradition. Rather than idealizing the past, the narrative emphasizes its interpretive richness, suggesting that historical depth expands rather than limits cultural imagination. In this sense, the Ottoman milieu becomes less a historical reconstruction than a conceptual model for understanding modern identity formation.

The same structural logic can be observed in *Bıçağın Ucu* (The Tip of the Knife) (İlhan 2014: passim), where the metaphor of the "knife's edge" encapsulates the precarious balance between continuity and rupture. The narrative situates its characters within a social environment shaped by rapid transformation, yet it consistently frames meaningful action as dependent on historical awareness. Cultural disorientation appears not as an unavoidable condition of modernity but as the result of severed ties with inherited interpretive frameworks. Through this narrative strategy, İlhan redefines tradition as a form of orientation—a conceptual compass that enables individuals to navigate periods of accelerated change.

Across these works, a consistent pattern emerges: Turkish tradition functions as a narrative infrastructure rather than a thematic ornament. It determines how time is organized, how characters interpret experience, and how meaning is produced within the text. İlhan's fiction, therefore, challenges the assumption that modern narrative must break from inherited forms to achieve originality. Instead, it proposes that literary innovation arises from a conscious engagement with cultural memory. This positions his novels within a broader theoretical understanding of modernity as a negotiated process shaped by historically grounded modes of self-interpretation rather than by linear imitation of external models.

6. INTELLECTUAL ARCHITECTURE OF MODERNITY AND TRADITION IN THE ESSAYS OF ATTILA İLHAN

The intellectual dimension of Attila İlhan's literary project emerges most systematically in his

essay books, where he develops a sustained critique of imitation-based modernization and proposes instead a historically grounded synthesis between tradition and change. These works should not be approached as isolated political commentaries; rather, they form a coherent theoretical corpus in which each text advances, refines, and expands the arguments of the previous one. Read sequentially, they reveal a cumulative conceptual trajectory moving from civilizational analysis to ideological critique and finally to a global theory of cultural autonomy.

This trajectory begins with *Hangi Batı* (Which West) (İlhan 2002: passim), where İlhan formulates the epistemological foundation of his thought. In this work, he challenges the widespread assumption that “the West” constitutes a unified civilizational model. Instead, he argues that Western history contains multiple and internally contradictory traditions, including rational humanism, scientific inquiry, imperial expansion, and cultural domination. Treating these heterogeneous elements as a single entity, he contends, produces intellectual confusion in societies attempting to modernize. For this reason, the decisive question is not whether a society should engage with the West, but which aspects of Western experience can be productively adapted. Through this distinction, İlhan establishes a key methodological principle: modernization must be selective rather than imitative. Tradition, therefore, acquires a functional role as a historical filter that enables societies to distinguish between transferable knowledge and incompatible structures.

Having established this conceptual framework, İlhan proceeds to test it within ideological contexts. His next step is *Hangi Sağ* (Which Right) (İlhan 2005c: passim), in which he analyzes the structural weaknesses of right-wing thought in Turkey. Building directly upon the criteria developed in *Hangi Batı* (Which West) (İlhan 2002: passim), he argues that conservative discourse fails not because it values tradition, but because it fails to interpret tradition analytically. Instead of functioning as a living intellectual resource, tradition is often reduced to symbolic rhetoric. This rhetorical traditionalism, İlhan suggests, conceals a deeper contradiction: despite claiming authenticity, right-wing frameworks frequently rely on conceptual categories imported from external intellectual traditions. Such epistemological dependency prevents them from generating internally coherent theories. Consequently, genuine conservatism must move beyond nostalgic repetition and engage in historical interpretation, transforming inherited memory into

an active principle of thought.

This critique naturally leads to the parallel question of whether similar limitations exist within opposing ideological camps. İlhan addresses this issue in *Hangi Sol*, where he applies the same analytical lens to leftist movements. Here, he argues that Turkish leftist thought often privileges theoretical abstraction over social reality. Concepts formulated within specific European historical conditions were transferred into a different sociocultural environment without adequate contextual adaptation. İlhan describes this phenomenon as “translated ideology,” meaning a system of ideas detached from the lived historical experience of the society to which it is applied. Such frameworks, he contends, cannot produce genuine social transformation because they lack resonance with collective memory. By demonstrating that both right and left suffer from forms of historical disconnection, İlhan reinforces his broader thesis: intellectual authenticity depends not on ideological labels but on the depth of a theory’s relationship to its own historical environment.

While these earlier works analyze ideological distortions, İlhan’s argument reaches a more metaphorical and diagnostic intensity in *Batının Deli Gömleği* (Straitjacket of the West) (İlhan 1981: passim). The central metaphor of the “straitjacket” encapsulates his critique of externally imposed modernization models. Just as a straitjacket restricts physical movement, imported civilizational templates constrain a society’s organic historical development. Importantly, the metaphor functions on two levels: it signifies both external pressure and internalized dependency. İlhan emphasizes that domination becomes most effective when it is accepted as natural. In this sense, the danger of imitation lies not merely in institutional mismatch but in the gradual reshaping of intellectual horizons. Political sovereignty, he argues, cannot ensure genuine independence if cultural imagination remains subordinated to external paradigms. Thus, modernization becomes emancipatory only when societies transform borrowed forms into locally grounded syntheses.

From this point, İlhan’s analysis expands beyond the national framework to a global scale. This expansion is articulated in *Hangi Küreselleşme* (Which Globalization) (İlhan 2003: passim), which extends his earlier critique of Westernization into a broader examination of international power structures. Here, globalization is not treated as an inevitable or neutral process but as a historically situated configuration shaped by asymmetrical power relations.

Accordingly, the crucial issue is not whether globalization exists but which version of globalization is being advanced and whose interests it serves. İlhan underscores that globalization entails not only economic integration but also the circulation of cultural norms and symbolic authority. Societies that lose control over their cultural production risk becoming intellectually dependent even if they retain formal sovereignty. In this framework, tradition re-emerges as a strategic resource, enabling societies to participate in global systems without dissolving their historical identity.

Seen together, these works form a continuous argumentative arc. *Hangi Batı* (Which West) establishes the methodological distinction between imitation and synthesis; *Hangi Sağ* (Which Right) and *Hangi Sol* demonstrate how the absence of this distinction produces ideological distortions; *Batının Deli Gömleği* (Straitjacket of the West) dramatizes the civilizational consequences of uncritical Westernization; and *Hangi Küreselleşme* (Which Globalization) situates the entire problem within global power dynamics. Across this progression, İlhan advances a consistent theoretical proposition: modernity is not a single universal path but a plurality of historically conditioned possibilities, and the success of any modernization project depends on its capacity to reconcile structural transformation with cultural continuity.

7. CONCLUSION

This study has argued that the literary thought and fiction of Attila İlhan offer a distinctive conceptual framework for understanding the relationship between tradition and modernity beyond binary oppositions. Through theoretical contextualization and close textual analysis of multiple novels, it has demonstrated that tradition in İlhan's work is neither a nostalgic return to the past nor a conservative rejection of change. Rather, it functions as a methodological principle—a mode of interpretation that enables both individuals and societies to evaluate transformation critically. In this sense, tradition operates not as the opposite of modernity but as one of its necessary conditions.

The analysis has shown that İlhan embeds

cultural memory within narrative structure itself. His novels consistently depict characters who experience alienation when severed from historical consciousness, while those capable of interpreting the present through inherited cultural frameworks exhibit greater intellectual clarity. This recurring narrative pattern indicates that tradition, in İlhan's literary universe, serves as an epistemic orientation rather than a thematic reference. Language, historical setting, symbolic space, and character psychology all work together to construct a model of literary modernity grounded in continuity. Such a model challenges linear modernization theories that equate progress with rupture and instead suggests that meaningful innovation emerges through conscious dialogue with inherited forms.

On a broader theoretical level, İlhan's work contributes to global debates on alternative modernities by articulating a culturally rooted understanding of transformation. His literary project implies that modernization detached from historical self-knowledge risks producing derivative intellectual forms, whereas modernization informed by cultural continuity can generate originality and autonomy. This perspective invites a reconsideration of how literary modernity is defined within comparative scholarship. Rather than measuring non-Western literatures against externally derived standards, İlhan's example demonstrates the analytical value of examining how writers themselves theorize modernity from within their own cultural horizons.

In light of these findings, this article proposes the concept of rooted modernity as a term describing İlhan's distinctive synthesis of tradition and transformation. Rooted modernity refers to a mode of cultural and literary production in which innovation arises from historical consciousness rather than from its negation. The concept highlights a form of modern subjectivity grounded in interpretive continuity, where tradition functions as a critical instrument for negotiating change rather than as an obstacle to it. By introducing this conceptual framework, the article seeks to position İlhan not only within Turkish literary history but also within wider theoretical discussions on modernity, culture, and intellectual autonomy.

REFERENCES

- Black, Cyril Edwin. *Dynamics of Modernization*, New York: Harper, 1996.
- Blackbourn, David. *The Long Nineteenth Century: A History of Germany, 1780-1918*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Brown Daniel, *Rethinking Tradition in Modern Islamic Thought*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Eisenstadt, Samuel N. *Modernization: protest and change*, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1966.

- Huntington, Samuel P. "The West Unique, Not Universal", Council on Foreign Relations, 75 (1996a): 28-46.
- Huntington, Samuel P. *Political Order in Changing Societies*, London: Yale University Press, 1968.
- Huntington, Samuel P. *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*, New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996.
- İlhan, Attila. *Aydınlar Savaşı* (War of Intellectuals). İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2005a.
- İlhan, Attila. *Batının Deli Gömleği* (The Straitjacket of the West). İstanbul: Bilgi Yayınevi, 1981.
- İlhan, Attila. *Bıçağın Ucu* (The Tip of the Knife). İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2014.
- İlhan, Attila. *Dersaadet'te Sabah Ezanları* (Morning Calls to Prayer in Dersaadet). İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2015.
- İlhan, Attila. *Hangi Batı* (Which West). İstanbul: İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2002.
- İlhan, Attila. *Hangi Küreselleşme* (Which Globalization). İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2003.
- İlhan, Attila. *Hangi Sağ* (Which Right). İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2005b.
- İlhan, Attila. *Kurtlar Sofrası* (Table of Wolves). İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2012.
- İlhan, Attila. *Sırtlan Payı* (Share of the Hyena). İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2016.
- İlhan, Attila. *Sokaktaki Adam* (The Man on the Street). İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2003.
- İlhan, Attila. *Ulusal Kültür Savaşı* (National Cultural War). İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2006.
- İlhan, Attila. *Yıldız, Hilal ve Kalpak* (Star, Crescent and Calpac). İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2005c.
- Inglehart Ronald and Christian Welzel, *Modernization, Cultural Change, and Democracy: The Human Development Sequence*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Lerner, Daniel. "Modernization", in *The International Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*, New York: Macmillan, 1968.
- Lerner, Daniel. *The Passing of Traditional Society*, New York: Free Press, 1958.
- Robert N. Bellah, "Religious Aspects of Modernization in Turkey and Japan", *American Journal of Sociology*, 64: 1 (1958):1-5.
- Touraine, Alain. *Critique of Modernity*, New York: Wiley-Blackwell, 1995.
- Weiner, Myron. *Modernization: The Dynamics of Growth*, London: Basic Books, 1966.