

**IDEOLOGY AND CONFLICT IN JOHN LE CARRÉ'S NOVELS:
THE SPY WHO CAME IN FROM THE COLD AND A MOST
WANTED MAN**

**Pamukkale University
The Institute of Social Studies
Master of Arts Thesis
Department of English Language and Literature**

Mustafa BÜYÜKGEBİZ


Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mehmet Ali ÇELİKEL

June 2014

DENİZLİ

YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ ONAY FORMU

Batı Dilleri ve Edebiyatları Anabilim Dalı, İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Bilim Dalı öğrencisi Mustafa BÜYÜKGEBİZ tarafından Doç. Dr. Mehmet Ali ÇELİKEL yönetiminde hazırlanan "Ideology and Conflict in John Le Carré's Novels: The Spy Who Came In From The Cold and A Most Wanted Man (John Le Carré'nin Romanlarında Ideoloji ve Çatışma: Soğuktan Gelen Casus ve Aranılan Adam)" başlıklı tez aşağıdaki jüri üyeleri tarafından 10.06.2014 tarihinde yapılan tez savunma sınavında başarılı bulunmuş ve Yüksek Lisans Tezi olarak kabul edilmiştir.



Doç. Dr. Meryem Ayan

Jüri Başkanı



Jüri-Danışman

Doç. Dr. Mehmet Ali ÇELİKEL



Jüri Üyesi

Doç. Dr. Turan PAKER

Pamukkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Yönetim Kurulu'nun 20./06./2014 Tarih ve ..13/22.. sayılı kararı ile onaylanmıştır.



Prof. Dr. Turhan KAÇAR

Enstitü Müdürü

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that as required by the rules and conduct I have fully cited and referenced all materials and that are not original to this work.

Signature:

A handwritten signature in blue ink, consisting of stylized, cursive letters that appear to be 'M. B. G.'.

Name, Last Name: Mustafa BÜYÜKGEBİZ

INTRODUCTION

David John Moore Cornwell, aka John le Carré, is a renowned British author of espionage novels. During the 1950s and 60s, Cornwell worked for the British intelligence service, MI6, and began writing novels under the pseudonym, John le Carré. He began to be popular with his third best-seller novel, The Spy Who Came in from the Cold while he is mostly known for the film adaptations of the most of his novels.

John le Carré was born in Poole, England, on October 19, 1931. He spent several years in Vienna with the Army Intelligence Corps. After the national service, he enrolled at Lincoln College, Oxford. When he graduated from this school, he worked in various odd jobs. He even worked as a teacher for one year in Eton (Aronoff, 2001: 1).

Le Carré turned to his intelligence career in 1960 and he started to work in Foreign Service. During this time, he started to write. He wrote his first novel, Call for the Dead (1961) as an intelligence worker. After A Murder of Quality, his second novel that appeared in 1962, he resigned from MI6 and devoted himself completely to writing.

Le Carré wrote an essay entitled “The United States Has Gone Mad” to protest the war on Iraq and it was published in The Times in 2003. He is also well known with his attitude of declining honours and awards. His novel, The Spy Who Came in from the Cold, was awarded by Britain Crime Writers’ Club as Dagger of Daggers in 2005 and he also received Goethe Medal in 2011. He also claims that he has never read any piece of writing about him. This attitude made John le Carré even more interesting and distinguished writer and renders it more difficult to find inspirational sources for his novels in his present life. Yet, his past experiences during the Second World War as a British intelligent officer obviously constitute the largest source of inspiration of both his themes and characters.

It is not that easy to define the genre and style of le Carré since he is told to be different from much of the espionage authors. According to Myron Aronoff:

John le Carré is one of our most preeminent contemporary political novelists. He deals with very serious ideas—including the consequences of the dominant international political myth of our era, the Cold War, and more recently with the sense of disorientation in the aftermath of its demise (Aronoff, 2001: 2).

Aronoff refuses to define le Carré as an espionage novelist. He claims that he is an author of political novels since he asserts that “a political novel is characterized by internal tensions between the immediacy of human experience and the general inclusiveness of the underlying political ideology” (Aronoff, 2001: 2). According to him, it is not enough to define le Carré’s fiction. There is something else what makes le Carré different from other espionage and political novelists. He suggests that le Carré writes political novels without proclaiming his political side. Myron Aronoff and Tony Barley agree that his novels are far from political novelists such as Orwell, Malraux and Koestler. Tony Barley suggests that

Most of le Carré’s political novels depart from this convention by refusing to make ultimate evaluations on their readership’s behalf. The political in le Carré’s fiction inheres not in ‘message’, nor even in the presence of political statements, but in the enactment of political encounter, and enactment which involves readers as much as characters (Barley, 1995: 22-23).

However, most of le Carré’s novels are spy stories set in the Cold War period; except The Little Drummer Girl that uses the Israel-Palestinian conflict and A Most Wanted Man which reflects the islamophobic atmosphere of Post 9/11 world. Although these two differences seem to be not connected to his Cold War spy novels, they have a significant characteristic in common. All of John le Carré’s novels reflect the need of enemy in western culture and le Carré uses this concept successfully in his novels. Therefore, the main aim of this thesis is to analyse this need for an enemy in the west by putting emphasis on the lives of the agents of intelligence services and their personal clashes inside the society.

The concept of ideology felt deeply in the works of English literature in the Cold War Period brings lots of clashes when taken into consideration with the concept of social classes. While the higher classes of the society feel a fear of conspiracy during their dense ideological war, middle and lower class members live their monotonous lives unaware of this ideological struggle. This social reality of the modern age can be observed clearly in the literary works of the period. The problems of the individual who gets stuck between his

social and individual lives are also the first step of the clashes of both individual and institutions.

Hence, in this study, the fear of conspiracy and terror will be studied and the change of the enemy of the west will be emphasized by focusing on the novels of John le Carré; The Spy Who Came in from the Cold (1963) and A Most Wanted Man (2008). John le Carré's Cold War and Post Cold War attitudes and the differences between these attitudes are also a matter of subject in this study. The stylistic and thematic progress of the author during and after the Cold War and what kinds of fears and conflicts have been replaced by which ones during the Post Cold War will be analysed by giving specific examples from the novels.

This study will analyse, in its conclusion, how western intelligence services affect the social and individual conflicts during the Cold War period and how the higher class members of the society, who try to take these services under control, become gradually the victims of them. One of the key points of this study is to analyse the rotten dynamics of modern society and exemplify these from the novels to discuss the effects of Cold War and Post Cold War dimensions to the novels written during the periods in question. This study also focuses on how these periods gave birth to new novel genres in stylistic and thematic ways.

In the 'Historical Introduction' of the thesis, World War II and the Cold War period will be explained by focusing on the causes and effects of the war on the society. The results of the World War II will be discussed and revealed by some specific details. Then, the effects of the feeling of insecurity after the World War II both in the USA and the USSR and how this feeling of insecurity changed the major strategies will be defined. The use of ideology during the Cold War will also be a main interest in this chapter.

The fall of the Berlin Wall will be accepted as the beginning of the Post Cold War period and western euphoria and the spread of globalization will be examined in the next part of 'Historical Introduction' (10-13). The shift from militarism to market democracy will also be discussed. Gulf Crisis and the ultimate dominance of the USA will be accepted as the end of the Post Cold War Period.

September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks in the USA and Islamophobia in the west as a result of these attacks will be the main focus of the last part of 'Historical Introduction'. Islamophobia and its causes will be analysed in a detailed way by giving some specific examples from various sources. First, Islamophobia will be viewed as a racist attitude which is a result of collective unconscious and then, its historical roots will be revealed by referring to some sources. The fear of Islam due to the growing population of Muslims in the West will be used to define the racist tendency in Western culture. The role of media and even Hollywood will be considered as causes of Islamophobia. This part will be finalized by defining the obsession of insecurity and also the political need of having an enemy in the western culture. How the enemy has changed from communism to Islam in the west will be the conclusion of this chapter.

The second chapter of the thesis will be 'Ideology and the Literary Theories'. In this part, the term ideology and its roots will be described. The center of the discussion will be Marxist ideology, so the ideological relationship between society and individual will be emphasized. The possibility of staying away from ideology will be questioned and Louis Althusser's ideological and repressive state apparatuses will be discussed in a detailed way. In the light of this discussion, the dynamics of society and the role of individual in his ideological structure will be defined. This part will be concluded by commenting on the inevitable relationship between ideology and society.

In the chapter entitled 'Ideology and the Literary Theories', Marxist Literary Theory will be discussed by referring to the starting point of the doctrine. The main principles of this literary movement will be defined and the class conflicts, materialism and ideological approach will be discussed as the key terms of Marxist Literary Theory. The concepts of base and superstructure in the Marxist philosophy and their influences in the literary criticism will also be emphasized in the chapter. How the dominant class in a society or the bourgeoisie in Marxist discourse shapes the ideology will also be discussed to reveal that ideology and social perception form the basis of Marxist literary criticism.

This theoretical chapter will continue with the explanation of Espionage fiction, its historical development and the function of this genre during the World War II and the Cold War. In the final part of the chapter, Jacques Derrida's deconstruction theory will be

discussed in a detailed way. The definition of the term and its main principles will be analysed. The main interest of this part will be in how and why a text should be deconstructed since John le Carré's selected novels will be analysed within the theoretical assumptions of Derrida's deconstruction.

The third chapter will be devoted to John le Carré's first selected novel, The Spy Who Came in from the Cold. The brief synopsis of the novel will be given at the beginning of the chapter. The corrupted psychology of the intelligence services or the Cold War practitioners will be emphasized by referring to certain characters of the novel. Fear of conspiracy and the feeling of insecurity defined in the theoretical part of the thesis will be exemplified in this chapter. The ideological dimensions of the Cold War will clearly be seen with the help of the details from the novel. While defining the individual corruption during the Cold War, the main dynamics of the 20th Century will also be identified. The well-known concepts of the modern period such as loss of identity and mistrust will be exemplified from the novel.

As aforementioned, there is a difference between the classes of society. The cold war is felt deeply by the members of the intelligence services and their surroundings. However, the ordinary people are far from these clashes and live in their empty and routine lives. This fact will also be analysed with the quotations both from the novel and theoretical sources. One of the major arguments of the chapter will be the legalization of intelligence activities. Both sides of the Cold war use their corrupted ideologies to maintain their illegal espionage activities. The justification of the Cold war by using the ideological clashes will be the main point of discussion in this chapter. The chapter will conclude the argument by reading The Spy Who Came in from the Cold as a prominent Cold War text.

The second selected novel by John le Carré, A Most Wanted Man, will be analysed in the fourth chapter. The chapter will begin with a synopsis of the novel. The end of the Cold War and the beginning of the Post Cold War will be briefly defined and the shift of le Carré's attitude as a novelist in these periods will be identified. The parallelism between the fear of communism and Islamophobia will be discussed and the concept of fear in the modern age will be analysed by referring to some theoretical sources and the Post 9/11 syndrome in the west will be revealed through quotations from the novel.

The intentional use of terrorist and terrorism is one of the biggest problems of the modern period. It is also obvious that western intelligence services and governments can easily use the term 'terrorism' to manipulate public opinion for their own sakes. This clash in the society will be discussed and exemplified from the novel. Immigration to western countries and its effects and contribution to Islamophobia will also be addressed in the chapter. The two opposite social concepts; toleration and racism will also be compared and exemplified.

At the end of the chapter, the fanaticism of radical Islamist groups and their differences as an enemy of the west will be revealed and theoretically discussed through the quotations from the novel. The hatred of radical Islamist movement towards the western hemisphere is far different from communist ideology. Another important point which will be analysed in this chapter is the techniques of western intelligence services against these Islamic groups. These intelligence services with their post 9/11 syndromes failed to adapt their skills and techniques to their new enemy; terrorism. They continued to gather information by using their Cold war techniques and they soon realized that they did not work on terrorism. Their failure will also be exemplified by quoting from the novel. The chapter will be concluded by referring to the western obsession and need for an enemy and the shift of the concept of enemy from communism to radical Islamism.

In the conclusion part of the thesis, two selected novels by le Carré will be compared to find out the thematic changes in le Carré's fiction. By comparing the novels, the historical and political dimensions from World War II to Post 9/11 Period will also be evaluated. Ideology, social class differences and conflicts both in the Cold War and Post Cold War periods will be discussed and the main argument of the thesis will be restated at the end with a conclusion.

CHAPTER I: HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION

The Cold War

Doubtlessly, World War II was the biggest and the worst catastrophe that humanity has ever seen and caused. Throughout the war, people witnessed devastation and casualties. As Thomas G. Patterson notes; it was a war that “a world was overturned” (Pateron, 6). Nearly 60 million people lost their lives, two-thirds of whom were civilians. Poland and Yugoslavia lost between 10-20 percent of their population during the war. Robert J. McMahon points at this tragic result of the war in his book, The Cold War: A Very Short Introduction:

If the exact toll of this wrenching global conflagration continues to defy all efforts at statistical precision, the magnitude of the human losses it claimed surely remains as shockingly unfathomable two generations after World War II as it was in the conflict’s immediate aftermath (McMahon, 2003: 2).

After a war and catastrophe like World War II, international system and politics were razed. As US Assistant Secretary of State Dean Acheson said; “The whole world structure and order that we had inherited from the nineteenth century was gone” (McMahon, 2003: 12). Approximately 500 year old Eurocentric international system was torn to pieces and it was so clear that this fallen system would be replaced by a new one. As McMahon points out, “As the war moved into its final phase, even the most casual observer of world politics could see that the United States and the Soviet Union held most of the military, economic, and diplomatic cards.” (Mc Mahon, 2003: 3).

This world in ruins became one of the major reasons of the Cold War that aroused due to the efforts of the USA and the USSR as two world superpowers to reshape it as they wish. Thus, it is common that conspiracy, distrust and conflict are inevitable in this kind of political rivalry. However, history shows that victors of wars generally reach an agreement at the end. Just after the World War II, the majority of intellectuals, academicians and politicians also expected a compromise which is academically called “great power condominium” among victors. In contrast, ideological, political and financial differences of the USA and the USSR caused this great conflict known as the Cold War.

In brief, it was the divergent aspirations, needs, histories, governing institutions, and ideologies of the United States and the Soviet Union that turned unavoidable tensions into the epic four-decade confrontation that we call the Cold War (McMahon, 2003: 5).

The results of the World War II and the Cold War were not only political or military but also sociological. One effect of this international conflict is apparently the feeling of insecurity. In the USA, neither the growing military power nor the financial achievements were able to hide the fear of international uncertainty. Besides, Pearl Harbor attack destroyed the illusion of invulnerability which Americans had had since 19th Century. It can be said that the roots of the American obsession of national security lay in this Japanese attack of 1941.

The USA politicians understood that Atlantic and Pacific Oceans could no longer protect the continent from enemies due to growing military and aero technologies. Therefore, this feeling of insecurity “led defence officials of the Roosevelt and Truman administrations to advocate the establishment of an integrated, global network of US-controlled air and naval bases, as well as the negotiation of widespread military air transit rights” (McMahon, 2003 7). This would enable the USA to destroy their potential enemies before they grow stronger and become a threat for them.

Likewise, the post war strategies of the Soviet Union were also constructed upon the fear of insecurity. In parallel with Pearl Harbor, sociological effects of Adolf Hitler’s 1941 attack to the USSR played a major role in Soviet obsession of national security:

Searing memories of the German attack and occupation merged with other, longer memories – of the German invasion during World War I, of Allied intervention during the Russian civil war, of Napoleon’s attempted conquest of Russia at the beginning of the previous century – to induce in the Soviet leadership a veritable obsession with ensuring the protection of their homeland from future territorial violations (McMahon, 2003: 11).

Geopolitical situation of the Soviet Union was apparently worse than the USA since it was three times bigger than the USA geographically and two important financial capitals of the country; Siberia and European Russia were far away from each other. Therefore, these factors raised the importance of national security and the need to protect Soviet mainland becomes the primary concern of Soviet international strategies.

In a time of conflict after the world's second biggest war, ideologies also played an important role to legitimize the Cold War performances. Governments and even individuals use ideology as a tool to manipulate and persuade both themselves and each other. Marxist-Leninist ideology, which formed the basis of the USSR, affected Iosif Stalin's policy and he was sure that proletarian power would one day become dominant in the international system. For this reason, they did not insist on certain benefits and prevented military conflict and they made a cold war possible. As Foreign Minister V. M. Molotov put it, "our ideology stands for offensive operations when possible and if not we wait" (McMahon, 2003: 14).

In this sense, it may be inferred that Soviet and American post war strategies and ways of approaching to the new world order were nearly the same although their ideologies were strongly opposite. Both citizens and governments thought that their actions were not only for their national security but also for the welfare of the future world.

Ideology imparted to Soviets and Americans alike a messianic faith in the world-historical roles of their respective nations. On each side of what would soon become the Cold War divide, leaders and ordinary citizens saw their countries acting for much broader purposes than the mere advancement of national interests. Soviets and Americans each, in fact, saw themselves acting out of noble motives – acting to usher humanity into a grand new age of peace, justice, and order. Married to the overwhelming power each nation possessed at a time when much of the world lay prostrate, those mirror-opposite ideological values provided a sure-fire recipe for conflict (McMahon, 2003: 15).

Therefore, the two big superpowers, which emerged from the ashes of World War II, tried to dominate a new world order primarily for their national security. However, the need of security was not the only cause of the Cold War period, ideological, economical and sociological differences all formed a basis for rivalry and conflict which would last 40 years and effect the entire international system. As the British wartime leader; Winston Churchill stated, "From Stettin in the Baltic to Trieste in the Adriatic, an iron curtain has descended across the Continent" (McMahon, 2003: 26).

The first recorded usage of the term is seen in V. Vasily Rozanov's 1918 work, The Apocalypse of Our Times as a term which describes the situation of Communist Russia. It is highly possible that Winston Churchill read the English translation of the book which was published in 1920:

With clanging, creaking, and squeaking, an iron curtain is lowering over Russian History. “The performance is over.” The audience got up. “Time to put on your fur coats and go home.” We looked around, but the fur coats and homes were missing. (Rozanov, 1977: 26)

The Post Cold War

There are several propositions about the end of the Cold War and the beginning of the Post Cold War period but the most common and prominent one is the fall of Berlin Wall. It was a euphoric event not only for Germans but also for the entire world since Berlin Wall was a symbol of the “iron curtain” of the Cold War. It emerged as a hope that a new and democratic international system would replace the insecure atmosphere of the Cold War period.

The assumption was that everything could be explained in terms of the cold-war; it stood to reason then that once it came to an end everything would get resolved automatically (Laidi, 1994: 2067).

The fall of the wall and the end of the Cold War was regarded also as the fall of ideological conflicts. It was thought that international co-operation and better relations would be possible when ideological disagreements finished. People started to imagine a globalized world that would develop civilized relations among nations. “Deideologisation and globalisation would mutually reinforce each other, heralding in a world government which, through the UN, would manage the common fund of mankind” (Laidi, 1994: 2067). Deideologisation and globalisation are so-called the aims of that “new world” after the Cold War.

Nothing happened as expected. People soon realized that it was not so easy to forget about the conflicts of the cold war and finish ideological differences. People thought that everything would be just like the Enlightenment Period. However;

“what we have today is a loose international system whose distinctive feature is not ‘disorder’, a necessarily relative and mainly descriptive term, but the growing tension between the dynamics of power which under economic pressure are pushing towards globalisation and integration, and the problematic of meaning which, ever since it lost its teleological base, appears to be progressively divisible, flaky and transient” (Laidi, 1994 2067).

One of the most important problems of the post cold war period was insecurity and identity problem which emerged with globalization. Globalization which becomes an ideal international order by the end of the Cold War threatened regional and ethnic sense of identity:

It is often debated whether globalization is a useful or harmful approach of humanity. Some people believe that globalization brings increased domination and control by developed and rich nations over underdeveloped and developing countries while others think that it is a need of modernism and progress. It is regarded as an aspect of democracy and fresh economic opportunities (Kellner, 2002: 286).

To understand globalization, we should comprehend the scientific and technological developments and revolutions. Industrial revolution of the west might be regarded as the main reason of globalization since technology started to become global and communication systems developed with this industrial and economic bloom. With the emergence of industrial revolution, capitalism became the main economic system of the world. In this sense, globalization was a need to generate capitalist market system:

Some critical theorists depict globalization as the triumph of a globalized hegemony of market capitalism, where capital creates a homogenous world culture of commercialization, commodification, administration, surveillance and domination (Kellner, 2002: 288).

By analysing the aspects above, one might arrive at the idea that most theories about globalization are one-sided and undialectical since they fail to identify the relations between capitalism and democracy. Globalization both serves for capitalism and democratic developments.

Dominant discourses of globalization are thus one-sidedly for or against globalization, failing to grasp the contradictions and the conflicting costs and benefits, upsides and downsides, of the process. Hence, many current theories of globalization do not capture the novelty and ambiguity of the present moment, which involves both innovative forms of technology and economy and emergent conflicts and problems generated by the contradictions of globalization (Kellner, 2002: 296).

Globalization built such a world that it was easy to reach what you would like in theory. It became easier to reach fresh economic opportunities. International cooperation was developed thanks to globalization again. Nations, cultures and religions came together regardless of borders and continents. This can be regarded as a positive aspect of

globalization at first sight. However, it is generally stated that these opportunities and freedom are only possible for a limited population in the world. South African President Nelson Mandela stated this problem in his speech.

Is globalization only for the powerful? Does it offer nothing to the men, women and children who are ravaged by the violence of poverty? (Flanigan, 1999)

Throughout the post cold war period, individual identity came forward as a reaction to globalization. Theoretically, a globalized world would make the world one and finish the conflicts since it would strengthen communication among nations. However, in practice, this “end of geography” created a feeling of distrust and insecurity in micro-societies and “the perception of living in a larger world created a certain amount of insecurity” (Laidi, 1994: 2067).

Another global problem throughout the post cold war was the change of the meanings of some specific terms which belonged to cold war period. The most remarkable change was in the meaning of “national power”. Unlike the cold war period, power was no longer military. Armies were not ultimate signs of power. For instance, Russia had the strongest and largest army in Europe after the cold war but it was not evaluated as a threat. In this ‘globalized world’, policy and diplomacy started to be regarded as power. In this sense, defence and security and their relationship also changed their meanings. Defence made a sense in terms of technology and information. Military defence lost its importance and meaning. In parallel with defence, security changed its meaning since both of the terms were no longer national. With the growing number of terrorist attacks as a result of globalization and developing supra-national identities, defence and security became common problems which should be tried to be solved internationally.

If the fall of the Berlin Wall were considered as the first phase of the post cold war, the second phase would definitely be the Gulf crisis in August 1990. The underlying reason of the crisis was to extend the supra-national and capitalist market democracy to East and South. With the political disappearance of the USSR during the crisis, the Western post war euphoria was again heightened. The uncertainty which newly emerged just after the USSR’s getting off the stage was a great chance for the west to apply their ideal new world order:

There was neither any ideological alternative left-something one knew since the fall of the Berlin wall-nor any strategic alternative, a fact that the southern countries- or nearly all of them-discovered to their great dismay. This period was to see flourish the idea of a ‘new world order’ based on the triumph of international law and reason. In truth, it was less a question of building a new world order than framing the rules of a new public order founded on a new and optimal connection between principles and means in the east as in the south (Laidi, 1994: 2069).

Gulf crisis ended with a great dominance of the west and the disappearance of the USSR. The western international principles and domination were accepted globally and the USA was regarded as the so-called “victor” of the post-cold war period. It is easy to say that the USA had ruled the international system without any serious opposition until September 11, 2001. 9/11 terrorist attacks reshaped American policy and international relations. Consequently, the USA and the western civilization got a new enemy after a short break.

Islamophobia in the West and Post 9/11

Islamophobia is a controversial concept and used in various fields. It is possible to say that the term has two major usages one of which is sociological and the other is psychological. Sociologically, the term, Islamophobia refers to the intolerance and discrimination against Muslims. It can be inferred from here that this is an attitude against a social group and is also behavioural. Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC) defines the term as ‘an irrational or very powerful fear or dislike of Islam’ (OIC Observatory, 2008). This definition shows that while Islamophobia is regarded as a subject of hate in literature and often explained as racism or a sociological problem, it is also seen as a psychological defect that can be explained with the help of the common indications of some phobias such as acrophobia or arachnophobia:

Its manifestations include prejudice, stereotyping, hostility, discriminatory treatment, denigration of the most sacred symbols of Islam, and non-recognition of Islam and Muslims by the law of the land (Moten, 2012: 156).

These manifestations of Islamophobia describe two dimensions of the problem. The first one is related to physical appearances of Muslims including their skin colours to dress codes and the second one is the intolerance of their cultural background and religious beliefs. These are the physical and cultural aspects of Islamophobia:

The Runnymede Trust points out that Islamophobes consider Islam as a static bloc separate from the West and are seen as the “other,” inferior, irrational, barbaric and violent (Moten, 2012: 156).

This islamophobic consideration also forms the basis of collective western unconscious about and against Islam. This extremist attitude against Islam is a great cause of concern in the Muslim world. According to the former Secretary General of the UN, Kofi Annan; “Islamophobia is at once a deeply personal issue for Muslims, a matter of great importance to anyone concerned about upholding universal values, and a question with implications for international harmony and peace” (Secretary General, 2004).

All these definitions and evaluations of Islamophobia lead us to a conclusion that Islamophobia means a negative attitude towards Muslims and their religion, Islam. To find the roots of this negative attitude formation and explain its reasons, there are some social theories to apply such as the social identity theory:

People belonging to a group evaluate themselves positively as against others who are looked at negatively. People usually identify themselves with the national group and develop positive attitude towards their own country and people while holding a negative attitude towards out-groups living within the country or abroad. Such negative evaluations may be due to the conflicting values and beliefs and the actual or perceived threat posed by the members of the out-group (Moten, 2012: 156).

This attitude formation which causes racism or Islamophobia is completely about one’s search for a social identity. To define ourselves within a social group, we unconsciously develop negative attitudes towards other out-groups. The source of these negative attitudes is not only about developing a self-identity but also deeply related to social surrounding. Some negative messages derived from one’s social surrounding including friends, family and the mass media also shape person’s opinions and help him or her develop a set of negative attitudes and behaviours towards Muslims:

Islamophobia, it has been noted by many scholars, does not refer to a critical study of Islam or a disapproving analysis of Islam. It refers specifically to negative attitudes towards Islam and Muslims and their manifestations in words and deeds (Moten, 2012: 157).

Hate crimes and prejudice against Muslims have also increased in Europe and America in the 21st Century. Muslim institutions have been attacked in many countries and even bombed. Especially, these kinds of crimes have increased by 600 percent after London

Bombing on July 7, 2005 (Moten, 2012: 158). Muslims are also isolated from the society especially in America. They are not wanted as neighbours or colleagues by Americans. A Gallup poll made by USA Today newspaper reflects this social problem:

According to the USA Today/Gallup poll, some 39 percent of Americans felt some prejudice against Muslims. Almost the same percentage favored requiring Muslims, citizens and non-citizens alike, to carry a special ID as a “means of preventing terrorist attacks in the United States.” Some 22 percent of respondent to USA Today/Gallup poll would not want American Muslims their neighbours (Council on American-Islam Relations, 2007: 6).

This prejudice and racist attitude towards Muslims are so strong that Barack Obama, the President of the USA, was even attacked by this racist ideology. The New Yorker magazine illustrated Barack Obama in a Muslim robe and his wife, Michelle Obama, with a machine gun and Usama Bin Laden on the background on its cover page in July, 2008:

The intention obviously was to further instil fear in the minds of people should Obama, alleged to be a Muslim, be elected president of the United States (Moten, 2012: 159).

It is a common opinion that the main reason of the increase on hate crimes and prejudices against Muslims is 9/11 incidents. The negative view of Islam became more visible in America after these terrorist attacks and Islam was seen as the source of terrorism throughout the West. Many people believed that Islam encouraged violence amongst its followers. A Washington Post Poll pointed out in 2006 that the negative view of Islam amongst Americans has increased by seven percentage points from 39 to 46 (Moten, 159). Kofi Annan also referred to this increase in his speech and said it is a sad and troubling development. (Secretary General, 2004).

The phobia and hostility towards Muslims and Islam date back to the time of the Crusades. For the justification of the Crusades, Muslims were portrayed as savage people who believed in a wrong religion. It is known that William Shakespeare and Christopher Marlowe used Turk and Saracen as negative terms in their works and it also helped to develop that negative perception of Islam:

Why, how now, ho! From whence ariseth this?
Are we turned Turks? And to ourselves do that
Which heaven hath forbid the Ottomites?
For Christian shame, put by this barbarous brawl (Othello, Act II, Scene III, 133,134)

Many a time hath banish'd Norfolk fought
For Jesus Christ in glorious Christian field,
Streaming the ensign of the Christian cross
Against black pagans, Turks, and Saracens;
And toil'd with works of war, retir'd himself
To Italy; and there at Venice gave
His body to that pleasant country's earth,
And his pure soul unto his captain Christ,
Under whose colours he had fought so long (King Richard II, Act IV, Scene I, 96,105)

The major historical reason of hatred against Islam is colonial concerns. Portraying East cultures as “uncivilized” and “barbaric” has been a major strategy of Western civilizations throughout the history. The need to “enlighten” and “civilized” Eastern cultures and Islam has been constructed into collective unconscious:

The idea of a barbaric, uncivilized, fanatic Muslims was used to justify conquering the Muslim land and colonizing the subject people. Colonialism was a mission to civilize the “natives.” During the colonial period, Orientalists became more active and started the negative portrayal of Islam and Muslims, which continues unabated. Drawing on a civilizational view of history, the Orientalists constructed the West as ancient, unique civilization with a core set of values such as freedom, rationality, scientific progress and development. Conversely, the land inhabited by Muslims came to be characterized as static, undemocratic and uncivilized (Moten, 2012: 161).

It is also possible to say that direct contacts of two different cultures have mostly resulted in a positive way throughout the history but it is not the same for Islam and Christianity:

Many studies found that direct contact may increase stereotyping and lead to negative attitudes. The long historical contact between the West and Islam has been negative, the former considering Muslims as savage and uncivilized (Moten, 2012: 161).

The growing population of Islam in the West is also another important reason of Islamophobia. For centuries, Muslims have been living in Western countries but the sudden increase of their population was in 1960's economic boom. They settled in big cities as migrant workers. Different from western families, Muslims have a high birth rate and constitute a large percent of the society.

In the United Kingdom, in 2001, one third of the Muslim population was under the age of 16 compared to one fifth of the UK population. The average age of the Muslim population

in the UK is 28,13 years below the national average. On 1 January 2004 some 38 percent of Muslims in the Netherlands were not migrants, but of migrant descent. [...] It is estimated that the Muslim population in Europe, as a whole, would double by 2015 (Moten, 2012: 162).

With that increase in population, Muslims have gradually built their own way of life inside Western societies. They built their mosques, schools, restaurants and even cemeteries. While they were regarded as minority and guest, they had a permanent part inside the society. However, many Western countries have not recognized Islam as a religion. It means that they are not regarded as an ethnic group. On the other side, Muslims are conservative about their way of life and religion and cannot integrate into Western culture:

Muslims are resisting assimilation into secular societies and are willing to integrate without losing their Islamic identity and practices (Moten, 2012: 162).

Growing Islamic population in Europe results in a fear, namely Islamization of Europe. Europeans are afraid that Europe will lose its secular identity. Muslims are seen as a demographic bloc gaining power against the native population and a threat for the future of the civilization:

The idea is that France, Europe in general, but France more precisely, is kind of held hostage by its growing Muslim population and that it is tilting towards a more and-Israeli and and-American position (OIC, 2011: 26).

Tellingly, after 9/11, President George W. Bush evoked the memory of the crusades, banned Islamic organizations, and signed into law the USA Patriotic Act that authorized, amongst others, indefinite detention of immigrants, carrying out searches without court order and without the permission of the owners (Moten, 2012: 164).

Undoubtedly, media has also a vital contribution to Islamophobia in the west. According to Organization of Islamic Conference 2011 report, Western media serves as a propaganda tower against Islam and Muslims. Islam is portrayed as a global threat for humanity and the source of terrorism. Even entertainment programmes such as talk shows in America have islamophobic attitudes and messages:

Appearing on The View on 14 October 2011, Fox News host Bill O'Reilly declared, "Muslims killed us on 9/11." Then on Fox & Friends on the following day, co-host Brian

Kilmeade said, “Not all Muslims are terrorists, all terrorists are Muslim.” [...] Another American talk show host, Glenn Beck, said he thought ten percent of all Muslims were terrorists. As ThinkProgress pointed out, Beck’s estimate would mean that roughly 157 million Muslims in the world were terrorists (OIC, 2011: 23-24).

The media in the West has created an Islamophobic atmosphere not only textually but also visually. A well known example of this is a Danish caricature of the Prophet Muhammad with a bomb in his turban published in the Danish newspaper Jyllands-Posten. The prophet of the religion is shown as a terrorist and it means that Islam is the source of terrorism. This hate-filled image of Islam was advocated as ‘freedom of speech’ whereas it symbolizes Islamophobia and racism:

The media would represent American leaders in cartoons with bold face, big eye glasses, bushy hair or small mouth. In contrast, Muslims are caricatured as wearing the Arab headdress and gown, bearded, moustachioed and holding a curved sword. After 9/11, cartoons appeared of Muslims in America as violence-prone and mentally backward bowing to the wishes of Usama bin Laden (Moten, 2012: 169).

Hollywood also supports this contribution of media. Many Hollywood films show Arabs and Muslims as alien and violent strangers. Especially after 9/11 incidents, Hollywood acted quickly to embrace this “new enemy of the west” and Islam, terrorism and heroic war films have increased dramatically (Moten, 2012: 168). This quick move of Hollywood has an important reason in detail:

According to Anthony Lane, the Arab people have always had the roughest and the most uncomprehending deal from Hollywood, but with the death of the Cold War the stereotype has been granted even more prominence (Moten, 2012: 169).

With the death of the cold war, the West lost its enemy, Soviets. Hollywood acted quickly to announce the brand new enemy of the west, Islam. These hate-filled images produced by media and Hollywood have created a second stereotype of enemy after Soviets and legitimize racist attitudes against Muslims and Islam.

At this point, it is possible to see the political reasons of Islamophobia. This Islamophobic attitude in the society has also been used effectively by political leaders and governments in the West. Throughout the history, religion has constantly been used as a political tool to manipulate the society and known that it is a powerful weapon for policy.

At time of international conflict, the media and political leaders demonise the enemy and idealise their own side. Religion is used as an instrument to mobilize support and maintain morale (Moten, 2012: 170).

Islamophobic discourse has become popular in political surroundings especially after 9/11 incidents. It was seen as a perfect tool to legitimize and idealize American intervention to Iraq and Afghanistan. Politicians and newspaper editors insisted on claiming that Muslim terrorists were completely opposed to all Western existence. The most remarkable insistence about this was President George W. Bush's speech about 'Good versus Evil' on September 11, 2006:

Since the horror of 9/11, we have learned a great deal about the enemy. And we have learned that their goal is to build a radical Islamic empire where women are prisoners in their homes, men are beaten for missing prayer meetings, and terrorists have a safe haven to plan and launch attacks on America and other civilized nations. The war against this enemy is more than a military conflict. It is the decisive ideological struggle of the 21 st century, and the calling of our generation (...). This struggle has been called a clash of civilizations. In truth, it is a struggle for civilization. We are fighting to maintain the way of life enjoyed by free nations (The White House, 2006).

The political results of Islamophobia is not only limited to interventions. Islamophobic discourse is a very useful tool to gain support from the society by managing and manipulating their fear of terror. Some political parties in Europe increased their seats in parliamentary elections with the help of their anti-Islamic discourse. In the Netherlands, the anti-Islam Freedom Party become the third largest party in the 2010 Dutch elections by winning 24 seats (Moten, 2012: 171). However, this political tool is also a dangerous for the society since it causes social unrest and racist violence:

Islamophobia is also politically rewarding. Islamophobic speech and actions received support from the public, who were anxious about their identity (Moten, 2012: 171).

This political effort can also be related to some economic causes. Natural resources of Middle East countries are always a conspicuous fact for the USA. The need of these resources to maintain the position of 'a global superpower' explains the USA's insistency to show Islam as the religion of terror and enthusiasm to bring 'democracy' to Iraq and Afghanistan. Indeed, it was later understood globally that American intervention and war on terror in Iraq and Afghanistan ruin these two countries both socially and politically:

It's become clear that the War against Terror is not really about terror and the War on Iraq not only about oil. It's about a superpower's self destructive impulse toward supremacy, stranglehold, and global hegemony (Roy, 2004: 78).

The war on terror aims at controlling the regions of the Middle East and Central Asia so as to benefit from their strategic locations and their oil and natural gas resources. [...] U.S. invasions of Afghanistan and Iraq were justified by Islamophobic assertions that their leaders and people constitute security threat to "our" way of life and must be fought (Moten, 2012: 170).

Finally, it can be noted that American obsession of national security haunted in September 11, 2001 after 60 years from Japanese Pearl Harbor attack of 1941. The feeling of invincibility of Americans was damaged harshly for the second time and Islamophobia emerged as a social, political and even an economical need in the Western civilization. Fear of Islam was exploited by various social groups and even governments. All these reasons of Islamophobia increase violence and hatred against Islam and Muslims. Eventually, Islam emerged as a new common enemy of the Western civilizations after Communism and Usama Bin Laden replaced Iosif Stalin as the leader of the brand new enemy of imperialism.

CHAPTER II: IDEOLOGY AND THE LITERARY THEORIES

Ideology

The term, ideology, is used in a wide range of disciplines and mostly gives different meanings but generally refers to a systematic and delimited system of thought such as political or religious doctrines. In Marxist sociology, ideology is seen as a 'level or instance of a social formation' (Schmid, 1981: 57). It is vital to understand the term, 'social formation', to grasp the role of ideology in a society.

Emile Durkheim states that society is a system of social representations (Durkheim, 1938: xi). This means that society is a structure and individuals are just the carriers of these social representations. Individual is seen as a cell which contains the essence of these social structures:

The individuals are the material substratum of these representations, that is, the individuals are carriers of the collective representations (Schmid, 1981: 58).

The fact that individuals are carriers of representations means that the individual is shaped and convinced about the collective structures built by the society and reproduces these structures in his own actions and ideas. As individuals, it may be thought that we produce some ideas and lifestyles thanks to our life experiences and intellectual developments. However, we just reproduce what we have been thought either implicit or explicitly.

Durkheim also defines individual as a combination of nature and society. While it is a natural organism that develops constantly, it is also developed and shaped by the society:

This collective force must also penetrate us and organize itself within us. Thus, it becomes an integral part of our being and by that very fact this is elevated and magnified' (Durkheim, 1938: 230).

In this sense, is it possible to stay away from ideology? According to the well-known sociologists and writers such as Althusser, Zizek and Durkheim, it is impossible to keep our behaviours, thoughts and even daily routines away from ideological patterns. Mostly, people think that their approach to social and political issues is objective and they accuse each other of thinking or behaving ideological and partial. Ideology is always what other

people have and is regarded as an obstacle to produce objective and authentic ideas. Terry Eagleton refers to this situation:

[...] nobody would claim that their own thinking was ideological, just as nobody would habitually refer to themselves as Fatso. Ideology, like halitosis, is in this sense what the other person has (Eagleton, 1991: 4).

Louis Althusser is one of the most important writers who develops and explains the term ideology in a Marxist way of understanding. The former explained term, social representation, is called ideology by Althusser. Durkheim and Althusser's ideas are parallel to each other but they are defined in different terms. In Lenin and Philosophy, he gives a definition of the function of ideology in parallel with Durkheim's theory of social representations:

Ideas have disappeared as such (insofar as they are endowed with an ideal or spiritual existence), to the precise extent that it has emerged that their existence is inscribed in the actions of practices governed by rituals defined in the last instance by an ideological apparatus. It therefore appears that the subject acts insofar as he is acted by the following system (set out in the order of its real determination): ideology existing in a material ideological apparatus, prescribing material practices governed by a material ritual, which practices exist in the material actions of a subject acting in all consciousness according to his belief (Althusser, 1971: 170).

According to Althusser, ideology is a human condition which is a medium in which we live our lives. It supports a cycle in a society. Individual constitutes social institutions such as families. These social institutions reproduce the ideology and finally ideology reshapes the individual as the final phase of the cycle.

To understand the function of ideology in a society, Althusser leaves the former, classic Marxist understanding of ideology. According to this former belief, ideology creates a 'false consciousness' in a social structure. It can be explained as a false understanding of the function of the world we live. Althusser explains this way of understanding as:

Ideology is conceived as a pure illusion, a pure dream, i.e. as nothingness. All its reality is external to it. Ideology is thus thought as an imaginary construction whose status is exactly like the theoretical status of the dream among writers before Freud. For these writers, the dream was the purely imaginary, i.e. null, result of 'day's residues', presented in an arbitrary arrangement and order, sometimes even 'inverted', in other words, in 'disorder'. [...] Ideology, then, is for Marx an imaginary assemblage (bricolage), a pure dream, empty and vain, constituted by the 'day's residues' from the only full and positive reality, that of

the concrete history of concrete material individuals materially producing their existence (Althusser, 1971: 108).

For Althusser, by contrast, it is not possible to reach 'the real conditions of existence' (1971: 17). Ideology cannot be defined as an illusion or a dream. It is also not a false consciousness. Ideology is what people have and do in their real lives and should be regarded as a fact in society. Every single action of an individual can be related to some ideological patterns and backgrounds. Just like Durkheim, Althusser thinks that individual is the carrier of these ideological patterns and constitutes a collective understanding of a society. Herein, it is possible to reach the idea that ideology is a system of thoughts and ideas generated in a society. Althusser's this way of understanding ideology has influenced many Marxist sociologists and writers such as Terry Eagleton and Slavoj Zizek.

It is possible to see this influence in Terry Eagleton's work, Ideology: An Introduction. Eagleton declares in his work that ideology has been used in different meanings throughout the society such as an apparatus that serves to the dominant power in a society or helps to support the rights of ruling class. However, Eagleton sees these meaning 'narrow' and 'pejorative' and can only be parts to define ideology:

The term ideology has a wide range of historical meanings, all the way from the unworkably broad sense of the social determination of thought to the suspiciously narrow idea of the deployment of false ideas in the direct interests of a ruling class. Very often, it refers to the ways in which signs, meanings and values help to reproduce a dominant social power, but it can also denote any significant conjuncture between discourse and political interests. From a radical standpoint, the former meaning is pejorative, while the latter is more neutral. My own view is that both of these senses of the term have their uses, but that a good deal of confusion has arisen from the failure to disentangle them (Eagleton, 1991: 221).

In order to clarify the meaning and function of ideology, Althusser develops some hypotheses. With all these new set of ideas, he helps us to explore this complex term, ideology and gives a chance to open a new path in mapping ideology. At the beginning, he discusses the reality and the real conditions of existence:

Ideology represents the imaginary relationship of individuals to their real conditions of existence. We commonly call religious ideology, ethical ideology, legal ideology, political ideology, etc., so many 'world outlooks'. Of course, assuming that we do not live one of these ideologies as the truth (e.g. 'believe' in God, Duty, Justice, etc...), we admit that the ideology we are discussing from a critical point of view, examining it as the ethnologist

examines the myths of a 'primitive society', that these 'world outlooks' are largely imaginary, i.e. do not 'correspond to reality' (Althusser, 1971: 109).

According to Althusser, ideology represents the imaginary relationship of individuals to the real world. Ideology cannot be regarded as real but a bridge to reality. A person is always in an ideological situation since an individual establishes his or her reality with language and is dependent on it. It means that mankind develops and expresses himself within a language and language cannot exist without an ideological pattern. This leads us to the point that there are different ideologies like different languages so they cannot be accepted as 'real' but alternative ways to find reality.

Secondly, Althusser thinks that ideology does not have an ideal or spiritual existence but a material existence because it always exists 'in an apparatus, and its practice, or practices' (Althusser, 1971: 112). In a society, ideology is felt through actions which are 'inserted into practices' (Althusser, 1971: 114). The most common examples for these practices are religious rituals and traditional ceremonies. These social institutions constitute the system of ideology and give ideology a material identity. Thanks to this existence, an individual gets the chance to identify himself and believes to fill the emptiness of being lonely in the universe since mankind tries to be a part of a whole to comfort himself. With the help of all these social structures, individual feels as if he is the subject of his ideas. Althusser also tries to define the purpose of ideology and he comes forward with the idea that ideology constitutes "concrete individuals as subjects" (1972: 48). It means that ideology forms us as subjects so that we can create concrete ideas and personalities. By doing so, ideology achieves to form our ideas as reality and make us believe that they are obvious and unquestionable truths.

Althusser believes that becoming a subject in an ideology starts when an individual is born and even before it. Even before the birth of an individual, it is certain that he will have his father's name and it means that his identity is prepared long before he opens his eyes and meets life. With this pre-packaged identity, individual tries to shape his personality. He is exposed to family traditions and meets the first institutions and apparatuses of the ideology of his society. At this point, it is easier to understand the following ideas by Althusser:

As ideology is eternal, I must now suppress the temporal form in which I have presented the functioning of ideology, and say: ideology has always-already interpellated individuals as subjects, which amounts to making it clear that individuals are always-already interpellated by ideology as subjects, which necessarily leads us to one last proposition: individuals are always-already subjects. Hence individuals are 'abstract' with respect to the subjects which they always already are (Althusser, 1971: 119).

In such a process of developing an identity, individual always tends to support the dominant ideology in a society. They accept their ideological self-development as reality and try to avoid clashes between his point of view and repressive State apparatus since this apparatus is designed to avoid and punish oppositions to the dominant ideology. In this sense, it is nearly impossible for a subject to reject this dominancy.

In this regard, it is vital to understand what Althusser means by using the term ideological state apparatus. To comprehend the meaning of it, the origin of the term should be understood. Althusser grounds his concept of ideological state apparatus to Karl Marx's two basic terms which are used to define society; base and superstructure. It is clear that the concept of base and superstructure is of great importance in Marxist ideology. According to this concept, society consists of two main parts that are base and superstructure. Base stands for the relations of production in a society such as worker-employer relations and property relations while superstructure symbolizes the other parts of the society like culture, social institutions, literature and music. Karl Marx first introduces these terms in his *The German Ideology and A Critique of Political Economy* and they are further developed by Louis Althusser as *Ideological State Apparatuses*. These have been used by Marxists to explain and schematize the structure of society.

Base is the economic side of the society. Marx explains it as the economic structure which forms the material conditions of life. This structure consists of two levels, namely "the means of production" and "the relations of production". In the first level, raw materials are used. Nature is seen as the resource of the production and man is seen as the working power. The process cannot be regarded as a mass production. It is the simplest and the basic way of producing goods:

The way in which men produce their means of subsistence depends first of all on the nature of the actual means of subsistence they find in existence and have to reproduce. This mode of production must not be considered simply as being the production of the physical

existence of the individuals. Rather it is a definite form of activity of these individuals, a definite form of expressing their life, a definite mode of life on their part. As individuals express their life, so they are. What they are, therefore, coincides with their production, both with what they produce and with how they produce. The nature of individuals thus depends on the material conditions determining their production (Marx, 1972: 177).

This production is not individual and man does not produce goods just for himself in isolation. The process of production creates a relationship among people and there appears a “social production of life” as Marx points out (1972: 177). In the process of production, man needs others to complete the course. To illustrate, a baker needs a person who produces flour and this flour producer needs farmer to have his raw material, wheat. These three producers need customers to continue their production. These needs develop social relations in society and it is called as the relations of production:

In the social production of their existence, men inevitably enter into definite relations, which are independent of their will, namely relations of production appropriate to a given stage in the development of their material forces of production. The totality of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society, the real foundation, on which arises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. The mode of production of material life conditions the general process of social, political and intellectual life. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, but their social existence that determines their consciousness (Marx, 1996: 425).

As it is pointed out in the quotation above, these two levels of base structure create the second structure of the society, namely superstructure. Like base, superstructure also constitutes sub levels and the first level is “legal and political superstructure” (Althusser, 1971: 95). This level includes the adopted political system of the society. The instruments of this political system are also in this level of superstructure such as the governmental form, military institutions and existence and the laws. This legal and political superstructure grounds all other social and intellectual institutions in the society. These are both legal and non-formal institutions such as schools, religions, families, culture and media. At this point, we come across with Althusser’s concept of Ideological State Apparatuses and what he means by using this term.

As mentioned formerly, Althusser develops Marxist understanding of base and structure and their relations to each other and adds his own concept of ideological apparatuses. He does not ignore the basic understanding but insists on the idea that ideology in a society is

more material than it was thought before. In this sense, he divides his concept into two as ideological state apparatuses and repressive state apparatuses:

The State is thus first of all what the Marxist classics have called the State Apparatus. This term means: not only the specialized apparatus (in the narrow sense) whose existence and necessity I have recognized in relation to the requirements of legal practice, i.e. the police, the courts, the prisons; but also the army, which (the proletariat has paid for this experience with its blood) intervenes directly as a supplementary repressive force in the last instance, when the police and its specialized auxiliary corps are 'outrun by events'; and above this ensemble, the head of State, the government and the administration (Althusser, 1972: 96).

The repressive apparatuses include some institutions such as the army, police departments and the courts. These are not seen as "ideological" apparatuses by Althusser since they function by violence:

They must not be confused with the (repressive) State apparatus. Remember that in Marxist theory, the State Apparatus (SA) contains: the Government, the Administration, the Army, the Police, the Courts, the Prisons, etc., which constitute what I shall in future call the Repressive State Apparatus. Repressive suggests that the State Apparatus in question 'functions by violence' – at least ultimately (since repression, e.g. administrative repression, may take non-physical forms) (Althusser, 1972: 97).

To distinguish these repressive apparatuses from ideological state apparatuses, Althusser gives a wide range of examples and subgroups of ideological apparatuses such as religious ideological apparatuses like private religious schools, the communicational ideological apparatuses as the media in society and the cultural ideological state apparatuses such as literature, sports, social and intellectual activities. These ideological apparatuses are believed to access the private lives of the individuals while repressive apparatuses only manipulate the public realities and conditions. Althusser tries to point out that dominant power in a society is not able to manipulate individual in a private manner by using physical power and violence. This fact leads us to define the main difference between ideological state apparatuses and repressive state apparatuses. Ideological apparatuses function by ideology unlike repressive ones. Dominant power can only manipulate the ideas and the lifestyle of an individual by using ideology tool:

What distinguishes the ISAs from the (Repressive) State Apparatus is the following basic difference: the Repressive State Apparatus functions 'by violence', whereas the Ideological State Apparatuses function 'by ideology' (Althusser, 1972: 97).

It does not mean that repressive apparatuses do not function by ideology. However, ideology is a secondary tool for them. They function primarily by violence and repression. It is also apparent that violence cannot be accepted in a society without the help of some ideological patterns. The similar condition is also true for ideological apparatuses. ISAs (Ideological State Apparatuses) also use violence and punishment as secondary tools to function.

This is the fact that the (Repressive) State Apparatus functions massively and predominantly by repression (including physical repression), while functioning secondarily by ideology. (There is no such thing as a purely repressive apparatus.) For example, the Army and the Police also function by ideology both to ensure their own cohesion and reproduction, and in the 'values' they propound externally:

In the same way, but inversely, it is essential to say that for their part the Ideological State Apparatuses function massively and predominantly by ideology, but they also function secondarily by repression, even if ultimately, but only ultimately, this is very attenuated and concealed, even symbolic. (There is no such thing as a purely ideological apparatus.) Thus Schools and Churches use suitable methods of punishment, expulsion, selection, etc., to 'discipline' not only their shepherds, but also their flocks. The same is true of the Family.... The same is true of the cultural IS Apparatus (censorship, among other things), etc (Althusser, 1972: 98).

ISAs are also served as a tool to ensure the maintenance of repressive state apparatuses. Ruling class in a society is aware of the fact that ISA's should be kept under control since they guarantee the sustainability of the repressive apparatuses. It is a fact that repressive powers are not enough to keep the society under control and a pure power of repression is always weak against ideological revolutions and civil unrests:

To my knowledge, no class can hold State power over a long period without at the same time exercising its hegemony over and in the State Ideological Apparatuses. I only need one example and proof of this: Lenin's anguished concern to revolutionize the educational Ideological State Apparatus (among others), simply to make it possible for the Soviet proletariat, who had seized State power, to secure the future of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the transition to socialism (Althusser, 1972: 98).

Althusser also points out that it is so hard to take all these heterogeneous ideological apparatuses under control at once and keep it without a weakness. To make it easy, the dominant power in a society determines a dominant ideological apparatus to manipulate other apparatuses. The ruling classes of many societies discover that religion has an

enormous power of shaping people's ideas and behaviours. Therefore, the Church becomes the dominant ideological apparatus. However, with the developing technology and modernism, the power of religion loses its influence and the dominant ideological apparatus is changed. The new age's dominant apparatus becomes education and it is possible to say that this change is one of the most important discoveries of the 20th century:

Hence I believe I have good reasons for thinking that behind the scenes of its political Ideological State Apparatus, which occupies the front of the stage, what the bourgeoisie has installed as its number-one, i.e. as its dominant Ideological State Apparatus, is the educational apparatus, which has in fact replaced in its functions the previously dominant Ideological State Apparatus, the Church. One might even add: the School-Family couple has replaced the Church-Family couple (Althusser, 1972: 103).

In this dominant apparatus, individuals are shaped according to the needs of the society. Starting from the childhood, the dominant ideology and vital tools to generate ideas in the shade of this ideology are given and in the final phase, the individual gets ready to have his part in the social system. How long an individual stays in this education system determines the place and level of him in the society. Laborers do not have to stay long since they are not expecting to produce ideas and concepts for the dominant ideology but physical works. In contrast, the leaders of the society have to complete their further specialist training and it means that they stay long in the education system and are fully shaped mentally according to the needs and rules of the dominant power. In this sense, it gives a clear portrait of the importance and influence of education as a dominant ideological apparatus rather than religion. Religious doctrines can be interpreted in many ways in terms of social needs. However, ideology which is gathered through education is more concrete and cannot be changed or interpreted in different ways. This fact ensures the stability of the dominant power and its repressive state apparatuses as well as ideological ones:

Each mass ejected en route is practically provided with the ideology which suits the role it has to fulfil in class society: the role of the exploited (with a 'highly-developed' 'professional', 'ethical', 'civic', 'national' and a-political consciousness); the role of the agent of exploitation (ability to give the workers orders and speak to them: 'human relations'), of the agent of repression (ability to give orders and enforce obedience 'without discussion', or ability to manipulate the demagoguery of a political leader's rhetoric), or of the professional ideologist (ability to treat consciousnesses with the respect, i.e. with the contempt, blackmail, and demagoguery they deserve, adapted to the accents of Morality,

of Virtue, of 'Transcendence', of the Nation, of France's World Role, etc.) (Althusser, 1972: 105).

Other ISA's are also vital and they contribute to maintain the dominant ideology in a society. Though, no other apparatus is obligatory and free in a society. Every single member of a social group is expected to get education more or less in his social formation. Althusser states that:

[...] no other Ideological State Apparatus has the obligatory (and not least, free) audience of the totality of the children in the capitalist social formation, eight hours a day for five or six days out of seven (Althusser, 1972: 105).

To conclude, ideology has a great effect on our society since it constitutes a critical part of our social system. As mentioned above, ideology is a social formation and has a close relationship with individual. This formation is used to shape individual and all individuals become the carriers of this shaping tool of the society. Therefore, it is not possible to stay away from ideology since it starts even before the birth of an individual and continues throughout the life. All behaviours and every single part of a speech or an idea are closely related to our ideological perspective.

It is in the nature of the mankind that ideology is a vital need to identify ourselves in a group that will help us to repress our feeling of loneliness in the universe. In this sense, ideology of a certain culture makes us feel that we are a part of a whole. In society, dominant power knows this weakness of human psychology very well and uses it to control and manipulate social classes and individuals. At this point, ideology becomes a handmade reality of our lives and determines the truth, what reality is and what legal is in our society. It is impossible to get rid of it since we need ideology to identify ourselves while it needs us to survive among mankind.

Marxist Literary Theory

Marxism became a social and literary phenomenon in the twentieth century since it formed the basis of the Soviet Union governmental system. In 1845, Karl Marx announced his first unusual way of explaining society and social dynamics in his The German Ideology. “Dialectical materialism”, the well-known Marxist concept which also forms the basis of Marxist criticism, was first introduced in this work. According to this concept, means of production plays a significant role in controlling society’s institutions and ideology.

Later, Karl Marx met Friedrich Engels who was a political economist and they decided to identify the principles and their common ideas about communism. Creating an international sense about communism and getting the workers of the world united were their primary aims. These aims were pointed out in their Communist Manifesto (1848). In this work, Marx and Engels state the idea that class struggle is the main reason of all social events in history. They believe that this struggle may be a cause of a possible revolution that working class defeats capitalism and takes control of economic production. According to them, this movement would finish class distinctions:

The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions. Let the ruling classes tremble at a Communistic revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win. Working Men of All Countries, Unite! (Marx & Engels, 1998: 38).

In Das Kapital (1867) Marx argued that history is shaped by economic conditions of the world. Karl Marx’s writings about this new approach to society and social institutions have opened new angles in sociology, religious issues, politics, history and economics and eventually this approach has been called Marxism. Although Marxism was not primarily thought as a theory of literary criticism, the main principles of the approach were applied to literature and it was soon realized that Marxism provided a new way of understanding and analysing literature.

Marxist literary criticism is based on Marxism and focuses on the ideological aspects of a work such as culture, class conflicts, race or economic power. Marxist critics believe that a work of literature cannot be explained as an individual inspiration but it reflects the dimensions and ideology of its author’s social class and the class relations of the age.

According to Marxist social understanding, ideology plays a dominant role in constructing a social system and the basis of this system is the economic production.

Marxist literary criticism is not only about how the novel was published and its relations with working class. Class conflicts, materialism and ideological approach are the key terms of Marxist literary criticism but it is more than them. It is a pejorative attitude to limit this literary movement since Marxism tries to explain a work of art as a whole with its style, narration and themes. Historical background of a work of art affects the psychologies of characters and the themes of the work. Marxist literary theory also uses historical dimensions of the novel similar to most of the literary approaches. However, Historical reference is not what makes Marxist criticism unique but its revolutionist approach to history. Human relations in societies in different periods of the history are the key terms of Marxist criticism:

In the social production of their life, men enter into definite relations that are indispensable and independent of their will, relations of production which correspond to a definite stage of development of their material productive forces. The sum total of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society, the real foundation, on which rises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. The mode of production of material life conditions the social, political and intellectual life process in general. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their being, but on the contrary, their social being that determines their consciousness (Marx, 1970: 2).

Throughout the society, production of the material life forms the basis of the social relations between individuals. The “productive force” in a society such as landlords in feudalism or the capitalist class in modern societies and the set of social relations formed by these forces constitute “the economic structure in a society”. They are also called “base” and “superstructure” by Marxism (Marx, 1970: 2). The economic base in a society creates a superstructure which can be defined as the forms of law, politics and culture. According to the Marxist point of view, this superstructure created by the economic base functions to legitimate the power of the dominant social class which controls the economic production of the society. Karl Marx thinks that system of production forms the basis of a society. The economic rewards of manufactured goods are grasped by the owners of the factories although workers create it. At this point, superstructure plays an important role in justifying this inequality. Superstructure consists of political, ethical and religious forms of

social consciousness which are called ideology by Terry Eagleton in his Marxism and Literary Criticism (1976). He asserts that:

The function of ideology, also, is to legitimate the power of the ruling class in society; in the last analysis, the dominant ideas of a society are the ideas of its ruling class (Eagleton, 1976: 3).

According to this understanding of ideology, art is a part of the superstructure. Therefore, literature should be evaluated as a part of this superstructure of the society. The superstructure is a complex ideological tool of social perception that justifies the dominance of a social class in society. This perception avoids individuals to realize or react against the inequality caused by the ruling class:

The ideas of the ruling class are, in every age, the ruling ideas, i.e., the class which is the dominant material force in society is at the same time its dominant intellectual force. The class which has the means of material production at its disposal, has control at the same time over the means of mental production so that in consequence the ideas of those who lack the means of mental production are, in general, subject to it. The dominant ideas are nothing more than the ideal expression of the dominant material relationships, the dominant material relationships grasped as ideas, and thus of the relationships which make one class the ruling one; they are consequently the ideas of its dominance (Marx, 1972: 64).

Hence, we should understand the social process of society to understand its literature. According to Terry Eagleton, literary works “are not mysteriously inspired, or explicable simply in terms of their author’s psychology (Eagleton, 1976: 3). A work of art reflects the dominant way of understanding the world of its age. This phenomenon may be called social mentality or ideology of the age. Marxist criticism points out that this mentality is a product of social relations. Eagleton also emphasizes that “men are not free to choose their social relations” (Eagleton, 1976: 3). An author cannot escape from this phenomenon and is affected by it without his will. He points out this idea in his A Critique of Political Economy; “It is not the consciousness of men that determines their being, but on the contrary, their social being determines their consciousness” (Marx, 1972: 51). Thus, literary works should be analysed by taking this social mentality into consideration in Marxist criticism.

In Marxist point of view, the term, ideology, should not be regarded as a system of doctrines. It refers to the way people live in a class-society and their roles which are

determined by their social classes. This effect of ideology avoids an individual to grasp the true perception of his society as a whole. Terry Eagleton gives an example about this situation and states that The Waste Land is ideological: it shows a man making sense of his experience in ways that prohibit a true understanding of his society, ways that are consequently false (Eagleton, 1976: 8).

However, Louis Althusser thinks that art and literature should not be limited only to ideological perception. Althusser tries to explain the social system and Marxist point of view in a more complex way unlike traditional Marxist understanding which is explained above. He is against seeing literature as a simple and narrow reflector of the dominant ideology in a society. Literature has a vital importance to analyse ideology itself and reflects all aspects of a society from base to superstructure in a wide angle. Peter Barry points out Althusser's influence on Marxist criticism in his The Beginning Theory:

The attraction of Althusser to recent Marxist critics is that he offers ways of by-passing the crude base/superstructure model without giving up the Marxist perspective altogether. Althusser's views represent what we might call revisionist Marxism, which is to say that they rethink and repackage the basic concepts in a form which is more subtle and more flexible (Barry, 1995: 162).

To conclude, Marxist criticism makes a division between the surface and hidden meaning of a work of literature. The main interest is focused on the hidden meaning and this side of the work is related to Marxist themes such as class conflicts, forces and relations of production. Marxist way of analysing a literary work also deals with the social class of the author. Marxist critics believe that an author reflects the basic ideology and understanding of his social class and he cannot avoid it. Therefore, it gives a chance to critics to evaluate the events and ideas from the perception of the author's social class. Author is completely unaware of his reflecting the class ideology. This also leads Marxism to explain a specific literary genre according to its social and historical period since the author reflects the general dimensions of the society of that period while revealing his class ideology. For instance, Peter Barry relates the rise of the novel in the late eighteenth century to the rise of the middle class with the industrial revolution. He states:

The novel 'speaks' for this social class, just as, for instance, Tragedy 'speaks for' the monarchy and the nobility, and the Ballad 'speaks for' for the rural and semi-urban 'working class' (Barry, 1995: 164).

When we look at the basis of Marxist literary criticism, it is understood that the base and the superstructure and their relationship in a society forms art and literature. The dominant class in a society or the bourgeoisie in Marxist discourse shapes the ideology in a society and this ideology and social perception form the basis of Marxist literary criticism.

Espionage Fiction

Espionage fiction can be defined as a recent literary genre and focuses on the activities of spies and well-known espionage legends. The plot is generally based on real events and characters are also influenced by real people. Spy novels date back to the beginning of World War I when the first intelligence services in the world started to be heard. In these novels, the social and political atmosphere of the world is shown as dangerous and the fuel of the genre can be defined as the feeling of national insecurity which emerged with the World War I. The spy novels became prominent especially after the rise of fascism and as a reaction to it, communism just before the World War II. In the time of Cold War, the genre became one of the most popular. The context of “the enemy of the West” has changed during the time. However, the popularity of espionage fiction has never ended. The spies of these novels have fought against different enemies from communist Soviet agents to radical Muslim terrorists. The common point of these enemies is that they are portrait as threats to western democracy and civilization.

Espionage fiction is not easy to define since the borders of this genre are not clear and mostly related to crime novels. It may be said that spy novels are between crime novels and adventure novels. What separates espionage fiction from crime novels is that the story of the espionage fiction is generally political and the subject is international. The main aim of the espionage fiction is to make the reader experience the world of a spy and see the political atmosphere of the period from a spy’s eyes.

CHAPTER III: THE SPY WHO CAME IN FROM THE COLD

The novel opens at a check point between East and West Berlin. The West Berlin Office of the British Intelligence Service does not perform well and the Head of the Office, Alec Leamas, tries to save his last and the best agent, Karl Riemeck. He waits for Riemeck to pass the checkpoint from East Berlin to the West to be safe. Unfortunately, he is detected by the East Berlin Police and shot dead.

Leamas loses his last agent and he is recalled to London by Control, the head of the Circus. Control commands Leamas to stay 'in the cold' for a short time and he is going to be given one last mission. He is going to provide the East German Communists with false information that Mundt, the leader of the German Communists, will be implicated as a British double agent. It will not be too difficult since Fiedler, Mundt's second-in-command, already suspects. With the help of this strategy, Mundt will be executed. George Smiley and Peter Guillam give a briefing to Leamas for his important mission.

The Circus fires Leamas to make the East Germans believe that he is left in the lurch by the Service. He finds and then loses a small job in a library and stays in a ruined pension. In the library, he meets Liz Gold, a young Jewish woman and the secretary of the local cell of the Communist Party of Great Britain. Liz falls in love with Leamas and they become lovers. To follow the next phase of his mission, Leamas makes Liz promise not to look for him, whatever she hears, and says farewell to her. Leamas also makes Control promise to stay away from Liz and Control promises. Then, according to the plan, Leamas lands in the jail after a fight with a local grocer.

After his release from the jail, an East German agent in England approaches Leamas. Leamas is taken abroad to the Netherlands first and then to East Germany to meet the senior officials of the Abteilung, the East German Intelligence Service. During his meetings, he intentionally drops some hints about a double agent in Abteilung who is paid by British Service. Meanwhile, George Smiley and Guillam visit Liz in her apartment saying that they are close friends of Leamas. They ask some questions about him and offer a financial help.

In East Germany, Leamas finally meets Fiedler. They get closer to each other and have some ideological and philosophic discussions while Fiedler tries to have some conclusive proof against Mundt. Leamas observes that Fiedler is a brilliant and intelligent character and he is sympathetic. In contrast, He sees Mundt as a brutal and an opportunist former Nazi. Eventually, Leamas believes that helping Fiedler to destroy Mundt is not only his mission but also a worthy act. In the meantime, Liz is invited to East Germany for a meeting of the Communist Party.

The hidden war in the Abteilung becomes apparent when Mundt orders Leamas and Fiedler arrested and tortured. However, the leaders of the East German regime intervene because Fiedler had earlier applied for an arrest warrant for Mundt on the same day that Mundt arrested Fiedler and Leamas. They are released and present their cases to a tribunal in the town of Görlitz.

During the trial, Leamas shows a series of secret bank account payments that Fiedler matches to the movements of Mundt. Fiedler also claims that Carl Riemeck passed Leamas some information that he had no formal access but Mundt did. After presenting some other proofs against Mundt, Fiedler claims that Mundt was captured in England and set free after agreeing to work for the British Service as a double agent. Everything seems to be against Mundt until he calls a surprise witness to the tribunal for the defence; Liz Gold. Although she does not want to say something against Leamas, she admits that George Smiley paid for her apartment lease and she promised Leamas not to look for him when he disappeared. At this point, Leamas offers to tell everything in return for Liz's freedom. He confesses that Control gave him the mission of framing Mundt as a double agent of British and also adds that Fiedler is not a part of this operation and he is unaware of that. However, the tribunal finishes the trial and arrests Fiedler. Only then, Leamas gets the real side of Control and Smiley's operation.

Liz is sent to prison but Mundt sets her free and puts her in a car where Leamas is ready to escape with her. During their drive to Berlin, Leamas explains everything to Liz and the final part of the operation which Leamas learned at the end of the trial. The so-called 'fake bank accounts' are real and Mundt is actually a double agent reporting to Smiley and Guillam. The true nature of the operation is that it is completely against Fiedler, not Mundt

since Fiedler was about to expose Mundt as a double agent. Fiedler was too strong for Mundt to destroy him alone, so Smiley did destroy him for Mundt by using Leamas. By falling in love, Leamas and Liz made it easy for Smiley and Mundt. Liz is shocked with the reality that the Circus killed an intelligent and considerate young man to protect a despicable and brutal man like Mundt and she questions her feelings towards Leamas.

Despite her moral disgust, Liz follows Leamas to the break in Berlin Wall to pass through West Berlin. They have to climb the wall with a perfect timing to escape. In the concluding chapter of the novel, Leamas climbs to the top of the Wall and reaches down to pull Liz up. However, East German spotlights suddenly turn on them and Liz is shot and she falls to the East German side of the Wall. From the Western side, Leamas hears Smiley's voice that he calls him to jump to the western part. However, Leamas jumps back to the eastern part after seeing Liz dead and the border guards of the East Berlin shoot him dead.

As one of John LeCarré's most prominent works, The Spy Who Came in from the Cold, clearly reflects the political and military tensions of the late 1950s and early 1960s of the Cold War period in Europe. By making a close reading and deconstructing several quotations from the novel, it is possible to reach the psychological, social and individual dynamics of the Cold War period. By focusing on the cold war practitioners, it is possible to analyse the relationship between individual and society under the corrupted setting of the time.

Throughout the novel, Le Carré portrays a corrupted world of Intelligence Services, in other words, the Cold War practitioners. At the very beginning of the novel, he gives a clear portrait of a British Cold War agent and his mental defects in a conversation between Alec Leamas and Liz Gold:

“But Alec, you might as well say--”

“I should have added,” Leamas interrupted, “that I don't like people who tell me what I ought to think.” She knew he was getting angry but she couldn't stop herself any more.

“That's because you don't want to think, you don't dare! There's some poison in your mind, some hate. You're a fanatic, Alec, I know you are, but I don't know what about. You're a fanatic who doesn't want to convert people, and that's a dangerous thing. You're like a man who's. . . sworn vengeance or something” (Le Carré, 1964: 38).

Unintentionally, Liz introduces the major psychology of the cold war practitioners; agents. 'Hate' and 'being fanatics' are the main impulses of cold war period and this situation is defined as 'a poison in mind' by le Carré. With this poison, le Carré claims that they may never be called as ordinary individuals. They have the similar psychology with cage animals. They try to get used to their situation and obey the rules of their world. However, they are mostly aware of their hopeless situations.

As Leamas pointed out in a conversation with Fiedler; "We are nothing. Just people." (le Carré, 143), he tries to simplify his way of life and character. However, le Carré does not let him do that. He builds the character of his protagonist as complicated as possible since the fragmented characteristics of the modern people consist more than one adjective. Myron Aronoff explains le Carré's strategy in The Spy Novels of John le Carré:

The complexity of characters like Leamas cannot be reduced to labels like cynic or romantic. As paradoxical as these sounds, it is consistent with le Carré's belief that individuals with fragmented personalities can express contradictory character traits. It also accords with my interpretation of the search for balance, which entails moving back and forth between idealism and realism. Wolfe suggests that Leamas, in reaction to his career of deception and self-denial, affirms romantic love through death. The naïve cynic dies a faithful romantic (Aronoff, 2001: 117).

Conspiracy, espionage and fear of conspiracy do not let these people live simple, safe and reliable lives. When they become aware of this situation that they are being used by the ideologies, they try to simplify their way of life; at least they hope for it. They soon realize that their lives do not belong to them and never enjoy the simplicity of the ordinary life as ordinary men:

He knew then what it was that Liz had given him; the thing that he would have to go back and find if ever he got home to England: it was the caring about little things--the faith in ordinary life; that simplicity that made you break up a bit of bread into a paper bag, walk down to the beach and throw it to the gulls. It was this respect for triviality which he had never been allowed to possess; whether it was bread for the sea gulls or love, whatever it was he would go back and find it; he would make Liz find it for him. [...] With fifteen thousand pounds, a gratuity and a pension from the Circus, a man--as Control would say--can afford to come in from the cold (Le Carré, 1964: 97).

In fact, they have ordinary emotions but their ideological construction of their minds prevents them living these emotions apparently. These emotions under pressure blow out to the surface in an unexpected time and their simple moments suddenly turn out to be the

nightmares since they possibly relate them to their past cruel deeds. Le Carré definitely knows this situation and reflects it in the novel. In the quotation below, Leamas misses his meeting with a counter-spy just because of his ordinary, simple emotions:

He drove seventy kilometres in half an hour, weaving between the traffic, taking risks to beat the clock, when a small car, a Fiat probably, nosed its way out into the fast lane forty yards ahead of him. Leamas stamped on the brake, turning his headlights full on and sounding his horn, and by the grace of God he missed it; missed it by a fraction of a second. As he passed the car he saw out of the corner of his eye four children in the back, waving and laughing, and the stupid, frightened face of their father at the wheel. He drove on, cursing, and suddenly it happened; suddenly his hands were shaking feverishly, his face was burning, his heart palpitating wildly. He managed to pull off the road into a lay-by, scrambled out of the car, and stood breathing heavily, staring at the hurtling stream of giant lorries. He had a vision of the little car caught among them, pounded and smashed, until there was nothing left nothing but the frenetic whine of klaxons and the blue lights flashing; and the bodies of the children, torn, like the murdered refugees on the road across the dunes (Le Carré, 1964: 110).

In this quotation, Leamas cannot control his panic and most probably, he relates the scene of children with his past illegal deeds in Berlin. 'Like the murdered refugees on the road' supports this claim and this panic situation of Leamas may also be interpreted as a regret of a practitioner.

These interpretations lead us to the well known dynamics of 20th Century society and modern individual approaches. Le Carré reads the tension of a modern individual well and gives a clear portrait of him throughout the novel. The well known terms of 20th Century such as loss of identity and mistrust of human being shape the characters of the novel. The devastation of World War II still affects the society and individuals during the cold war period. When the results of the war are seen statistically, these psychological defects should not be seen as a surprise. As McMahon stated in Cold War:

Approximately 60 million people lost their lives as a direct result of the war, fully two-thirds of them non-combatants. The war's losers, the Axis states of Germany, Japan, and Italy, suffered more than 3 million civilian deaths; their conquerors, the Allies, suffered far more: at least 35 million civilian deaths. An astonishing 10 to 20% of the total populations of the Soviet Union, Poland, and Yugoslavia perished, between 4 and 6% of the total populations of Germany, Italy, Austria, Hungary, Japan, and China. If the exact toll of this wrenching global conflagration continues to defy all efforts at statistical precision, the magnitude of the human losses it claimed surely remains as shockingly unfathomable two generations after World War II as it was in the conflict's immediate aftermath (McMahon, 2003: 1-2).

Without any doubt, Leamas is the perfect character to reflect this corruption as the protagonist of the novel. He is a symbol of the educated, post war man, so Le Carré uses him to reveal the thoughts and worlds of these modern men. As Tony Barley states in Taking Sides: The Fiction of John Le Carré; “Le Carré needs Leamas to straddle the decades – he is the post-war or Cold War everyman, the ‘educated man-in-the-street’” (Barley, 1986: 36). Le Carré lets him state his ideas about humanity and modern society as a post war individual:

“Christ Almighty!” Leamas cried. “What else have men done since the world began? I don’t believe in anything, don’t you see--not even destruction or anarchy. I’m sick, sick of killing but I don’t see what else they can do. They don’t proselytize; they don’t stand in pulpits or on party platforms and tell us to fight for Peace or for God or whatever it is. They’re the poor sods who try to keep the preachers from blowing each other sky high.” (Le Carré, 1964: 219).

This hopeless situation of the educated modern man makes us think the conditions of the ordinary way of life in the modern society. The cold war is felt deeply by the members of the intelligence services and their surroundings. However, the ordinary people are far from these clashes and live in their empty and routine lives. Although the main argument of the struggle among the intelligence services is to protect the lives of ordinary people, there is nothing to do with them. Le Carré implies this situation with a detail in the novel. Liz tries to help Leamas lying in a fever in his room and when she goes through the window, she realizes that the ordinary life runs very close to them peacefully and empty. While Cold War rocks and hits so many lives and creates crisis among governments, ordinary way of life still keeps its emptiness. Ordinary people are completely out of this war:

Soon he fell asleep, and she drew the blanket over his shoulders and went to the window. Parting the threadbare curtains, she raised the sash and looked out. The two windows in the courtyard above the warehouse were lit. In one she could see the flickering blue shadow of a television screen, the figures before it held motionless in its spell; in the other a woman, quite young, was arranging curlers in her hair. Liz wanted to weep at the crabbed delusion of their dreams (Le Carré, 1964: 43).

Throughout the novel, Le Carré keeps touching to the point of ‘saving ordinary men’ argument (Le Carré, 1964: 218). Through the end of the novel, we see Leamas explaining the understanding of British security strategy according to his ideological perception. He tries to legalize the deeds of the service by claiming that all of them are to protect the

nation. Although Cold war and intelligence services completely serve to the ruling class, proletariat and safety of ordinary people are always shown as a reason behind the cruel acts of the services. Everything is always for the safety of ordinary people:

“There’s only one law in this game,” Leamas retorted. “Mundt is their man; he gives them what they need. That’s easy enough to understand, isn’t it? Leninism--the expediency of temporary alliances. What do you think spies are: priests, saints and martyrs? They’re a squalid procession of vain fools, traitors too, yes; pansies, sadists and drunkards, people who play cowboys and Indians to brighten their rotten lives. Do you think they sit like monks in London, balancing the rights and wrongs? I’d have killed Mundt if I could, I hate his guts; but not now. It so happens that they need him. They need him so that the great moronic mass you admire can sleep soundly in their beds at night. They need him for the safety of ordinary, crummy people like you and me.” (Le Carré, 1964: 218).

In the modern world, ordinary daily life is not the only thing that is empty inside. The relationships inside the society are also empty. Relationship between society and individual are full of symbols that are empty inside. Le Carré puts an emphasis to that situation by using prison as a ground for social relations. Prisons are institutions that theoretically mend ill-tempered people and prepare them to society but in practice, prison is nothing but a meaningless cage against human freedom. After weeks, months or even years, individual is released to society again as a so called ‘rehabilitated person’. The truth is that the person is back to life as lost and stolen:

Perhaps the strangest thing of all about prison was the brown paper parcel when he left. In a ridiculous way it reminded him of the marriage service--with this ring I thee wed, with this paper parcel I return thee to society. They handed it to him and made him sign for it, and it contained all he had in the world. There was nothing else. Leamas felt it the most dehumanizing moment of the three months, and he determined to throw the parcel away as soon as he got outside (Le Carré, 1964: 47).

One of the most important dynamics of society is ‘need’ in 20th century. If you need something or someone, you develop a feeling like love but not itself actually and most importantly, when you do not need someone, you can be neutral but if someone does not need you, hate appears on the stage of your soul:

He was contemptuous of his cellmates, and they hated him. They hated him because he succeeded in being what each in his heart longed to be: a mystery. He preserved from collectivization some discernible part of his personality; he could not be drawn at moments of sentiment to talk of his girl, his family or his children. They knew nothing of Leamas; they waited, but he did not come to them. [...]He seemed pleased to despise them all, and they hated him because, like the world outside, he did not need them (Le Carré, 1964: 47).

John le Carré does not criticize only one side of the Cold War. Throughout the novel, reader comes across with various dialogues and monologues criticizing both Soviet Communism and Western Imperialism. He claims that communism in the Soviet Union is not a perfect one as it is introduced by Karl Marx. He comes forward with the idea that both sides of the Cold war use their corrupted ideologies to maintain their illegal espionage activities. The following quotation from the novel puts emphasis on the Soviet Union's philosophy and the way of justification during the cold war period. It also proves that Cold war is justified by using clashes of ideology:

But what is the justification then? What is it? For us it is easy, as I said to you last night. The Abteilung and organizations like it are the natural extension of the Party's arm. They are in the vanguard of the fight for Peace and Progress. They are to the Party what the Party is to socialism: they are the vanguard. Stalin said so--" he smiled drily, "it is not fashionable to quote Stalin--but he said once 'Half a million liquidated is a statistic, and one man killed in a traffic accident is a national tragedy.' He was laughing, you see, at the bourgeois sensitivities of the mass. He was a great cynic. But what he meant is still true: a movement which protects itself against counterrevolution can hardly stop at the exploitation--or the elimination, Leamas--of a few individuals. It is all one, we have never pretended to be wholly just in the process of rationalizing society. Some Roman said it, didn't he, in the Christian Bible--it is expedient that one man should die for the benefit of many? (Le Carré, 1964: 129).

This similarity of the sides is apparently symbolized by a character in the novel, Liz Gold. Aronoff identifies Liz as "the paradigmatic naïve victim. She is identified as Jewish (as are many of le Carré's victims), and is ostensibly a communist" (Aronoff, 2001: 117). Liz's search for the reality in the novel gives the reader an opportunity to analyse the similarity of the concrete differences of the Cold War. In Chapter 19, she compares a Party meeting with a church ceremony and tries to locate herself inside the emptiness of the period:

It was like the meetings in Bayswater, it was like midweek evensong when she used to go to church--the same dutiful little group of lost faces, the same fussy self-consciousness, the same feeling of a great idea in the hands of little people. [...] Sometimes she thought Alec was right--you believed in things because you needed to; what you believed in had no value of its own, no function. What did he say? "A dog scratches where it itches. Different dogs itch in different places." No, it was wrong, Alec was wrong--it was a wicked thing to say. Peace and freedom and equality--they were facts, of course they were. And what about history--all those laws the Party proved? No, Alec was wrong: truth existed outside people, it was demonstrated in history, individuals must bow to it, be crushed by it if necessary (Le Carré, 1964: 185-187).

To clarify these similarities, Le Carré also indicates that there is also fascism inside the Soviet Communism. The equality of communism in theory never comes to practice in Cold War Soviets. Le Carré implicitly recommends that communism turns out to be a dictatorship in the hands of Soviets in Cold War era. He especially puts emphasis on the relationship between communism and individual in his novel. He suggests that Stalinist communism ignores the existence of individual. This may be interpreted as a corrupted interpretation of the function of equality in society. The Commissar and her speech symbolize the fascism inside communism since state and ideology are seen more important than individual:

“I am a worker,” the woman replied acidly. “The concept of brain workers as a higher category must be destroyed. There are no categories, only workers; no antithesis between physical and mental labor. Haven’t you read Lenin?”

“Then the people in this prison are intellectuals?”

The woman smiled. “Yes,” she said, “they are reactionaries who call themselves progressive: they defend the individual against the state. Do you know what Khrushchev said about the counterrevolution in Hungary?” [...] “He said it would never have happened if a couple of writers had been shot in time” (Le Carré, 1964: 208).

Freedom, which is offered by the Marxist Socialism, is also a false image in the Soviet version of this ideology. As George Orwell’s renowned sentence –which may also be labelled as a slogan –in Animal Farm (1945) suggests, “All animals are equal, but some animals are more equal than others” (Orwell, 1954: 53). The same situation in Orwell’s story may be seen in the Soviet communism. While communism theoretically offers freedom and freedom of thought and speech, The Party politically tries to keep individuals under control. This proves that ideology is only a tool to manipulate people during the Cold war period:

“I don’t want to stay,” Liz cried. “I want--”

“The Party knows more about us than we know ourselves,” the woman interrupted. “You must stay here. It is the Party’s wish” (Le Carré, 1964: 211).

Leamas also emphasizes the same situation in a political discussion with Liz. From his complicated character, an educated man suddenly appears and he tries to enlighten Liz about the reality of her ideology. Here, the irony is that Leamas also believes in a corrupted ideology, namely British imperialism:

“What the hell are you complaining about?” Leamas demanded roughly. “Your Party’s always at war, isn’t it? Sacrificing the individual to the mass. That’s what it says. Socialist reality: fighting night and day--the relentless battle--that’s what they say, isn’t it? At least you’ve survived. I never heard that Communists preached the sanctity of human life (Le Carré, 1964: 217).

It may be suggested that John Le Carré aims to produce something more than a literary work. His primary aim is to put emphasis on the political dimensions of the Cold War period before creating a literary work. It is highly demanded that his work, The Spy Who Came in from the Cold, is not rich in terms of literary art. It is true that his discourse is not complicated which is not full of literary devices and deeper meanings. However, he portrays the dimensions of the Cold War period and the psychological and sociological situation of the individuals perfectly. Tony Barley states about this issue that:

There is no doubt that le Carré intended to elicit responses based on the politics of his novel (at the time of its writing) and that whatever its literary merits and whatever literary choices affected its composition, it was designed to keep the reader’s attention on the specific, extra-literary issues it intersected. 1963-66 may have witnessed a slight de-intensification of the Cold War but the Cold War functions not as a fortuitous background but as a principal subject of The Spy Who Came in from the Cold (Barley, 1986: 30).

The Spy Who Came in from the Cold is set in the early 1960s before many important global events such as the assassination of John F. Kennedy and the Vietnam War. Therefore, it may be suggested that the tone of the novel belongs to 1950’s grey colours. The colour is grey since World War II is still a fresh memory for the people of that period and most of them are the survivors of the war. It explains the depressive characters of the novel such as Liz and Leamas. In fact, le Carré introduces Leamas as a veteran. It is not false to say that the world which is introduced to us in the novel is far away from what we have now. With the effect of the devastation of World War II, people begin to lose their belief in God and they try to identify the existence in some different ways. At this point, Le Carré’s nearly nihilist messages which are given implicitly through the characters of the novel also make the novel a perfect example of the period.

Finally, the phrase, “coming from the cold”, represents a human empathy and respect for other people that are seen as disappeared manners in that period. It is clear that Leamas comes from the cold as a person, not as a spy. Le Carré points out the idea that Leamas is not a machine as he is supposed to be. Cold War intelligence services and its practitioners

believe that they have to live without their emotions. Control says to Leamas in the novel; “We have to live without sympathy” (Le Carré, 1964: 92). However, Le Carré shows that it is impossible to stay away from humanly feelings even in that period. The novel ends with Leamas losing his life and at that time, he proves that he is a human being coming from the cold:

They seemed to hesitate before firing again; someone shouted an order, and still no one fired. Finally they shot him, two or three shots. He stood glaring around him like a blinded bull in the arena. As he fell, Leamas saw a small car smashed between great lorries, and the children waving cheerfully through the window (Le Carré, 1964: 227).

CHAPTER IV: A MOST WANTED MAN

At the outset of the novel, a young Turkish boxing champion named Melik, who lives in Hamburg, notices a strange young man in a black coat who follows him. The young man later stands in Melik's doorstep and asks for his help to give him refuge. Although Melik does not accept it at first, they allow this young man, Issa, to stay in their attic upon Melik's mother's insistence when Issa declares that he aims to be a doctor in the future. Issa soon contacts a human rights organization where he meets Annabel, the organization's young attractive lawyer. She takes Issa's case to a small British bank in the city and contacts the owner of the bank, Tommy Brue, for a mysterious and probably illegal Lippizaner fund which was once established by Tommy's father. Annabel organizes a meeting for Tommy and Issa. During the meeting, Issa claims that he is the son of a Russian soldier, Colonel Karpov, who has also a great amount of money in the Lippizaner fund. However, Issa refuses to accept his father's money when Tommy tries to learn much about him and his father's case. In the meantime, Tommy is attracted by Annabel and under the spell of her beauty; he gives her a personal cheque for Issa's short term expenses.

After meeting with Issa and Annabel, Tommy receives a couple of visits from British Intelligence Service. They declare that they are aware of his bank's illegal funds and mafia sources and ask Tommy to call them when Issa contacts him again. In the mean time, a German Intelligence agent, Bachmann, visits Annabel and informs her that Issa is a Chechen Islamist terrorist and arrested entering Sweden from Turkey by illegal means, escaped from prison and finally, found his way to Hamburg. Annabel decides to protect Issa from the Intelligence service and moves him to a new apartment that she has recently bought. However, this is regarded as suspicious by the service and she is arrested in a street around her home. Bachmann and her partner, Erna Frey, question her and offer Annabel to cooperate with them to protect Issa from other intelligence services. Later, Annabel accepts their offer only if they accept that Issa will be given a German passport and residence permit.

Bachmann and Frey ask Annabel for her help to convince Issa to give his money to an Islamic philanthropist, Abdullah, who will distribute the money among some Muslim charities and also finance his own medical training. The service tries to prove Abdullah's secret connections to Islamic terrorist groups, so they want to use Issa's money as a proof for funding. Unaware of the deal between Annabel and the service, Issa continues to stay in her apartment and Annabel makes long speeches to persuade him to give his money to Abdullah. Meanwhile, Tommy agrees to cooperate with the British Intelligence agents to protect himself and his bank.

A meeting is held by German Intelligence service in Hamburg where a British agent and two CIA agents attend as observers. The subject of the meeting is Abdullah, or Signpost as his code name. They declare that nearly all of Abdullah's donations and activities are legal. However, they focus on a small transport company which carries a small part of Abdullah's shipments of food and claim that it is used to support terrorists. Issa's future is also discussed at the meeting and they conclude that Bachmann should keep his promise given to Annabel but the handover at Tommy's bank will be followed by a large number of police and the services as a security measure.

On the handover day, Annabel and Issa meet Tommy in his office at the bank and Issa gives the key to open the safe deposit box which contains the documents of the fund. Issa takes the money from Tommy and Abdullah arrives to receive it for the distribution. The suspected transport company is also included in the list of distribution. By monitoring the meeting, agents find sufficient evidence they need and as planned, Bachmann approaches to the group disguised as a taxi driver while they are leaving the bank to arrest Abdullah. Meanwhile, a van carrying a group of masked man crashes into Bachmann's taxi apprehends Abdullah and Issa and disappears. Annabel, Brue and Bachmann are shocked with that when Newton, an American agent, says "Justice has been rendered, man. American justice" (Le Carré, 2008: 415).

1989 was an important year for international politics since the Cold War 'physically' ended with the fall of the Berlin Wall, live on televisions from Berlin. This brutal symbol of the Cold War politics was smashed down with hammers. The event was bad news not only for the Communist Russian politicians or enemy-based western politics, but also for

the Cold War novelists. The golden age of the Cold War spy fiction was over and espionage was no longer a matter of interest in the Post Cold War popular culture.

In such an atmosphere, it was a matter of whether or not John le Carré could survive as a spy novelist. Nevertheless, le Carré shows that he has found a fruitful source for his Post-Cold War spy novels with his 21st novel, A Most Wanted Man in which he admits that communism is replaced by the fear of global terror after the Cold War.

It is not hard to state that there is a parallelism between the fear of communism and Islamophobia in the west. Both fears were born from the ashes of war and attacks and used as political tools. Fear-generated hate and hate-caused violence in society started just after the World War II and the last shape of this phenomenon in society is called Islamophobia in the west. In A Most Wanted Man, John le Carré analyses this type of social fear and the novel is a perfect basis to study the change of enemy in western culture in the post cold war period.

During the Cold War Period, the spread of the Soviet communist ideology and nuclear warfare at the last stages of the period were the main dynamics of the politics of fear. On the contrary, the concept of fear becomes a part of the popular culture today. Media and the common use of internet make the spread of fear faster and systematic. Today, in our daily lives, it is possible to see the images of fear almost everywhere. Frank Furedi puts emphasis to that situation in Preface to Culture of Fear: Risk-taking and the Morality of Low Expectation:

The image of massive skyscrapers, big cars, a dynamic popular culture and energetic people has dominated the global imagination. However, under the surface, Americans - like their British cousins — have for some time been enveloped in a culture of fear (Furedi, 2002: vii).

Without any doubt, terror is the best way to systematize the politics of fear in Post-Cold War period. Especially, 9/11 terrorist attacks in the USA makes fear of terror a popular culture in the world. Approximately 3000 people were killed in those attacks and Islamophobia has become a controversial concept in the western world:

A day after the destruction of the World Trade Center, a commentator predicted in the Los Angeles Times that the ‘next big thing’ would not be ‘some new technological innovation

or medical breakthrough'but'is likely to be fear'. No doubt the tragic events of 11 September 2001 will make millions of people, Americans and others, fearful of the world around them (Furedi, 2002: vii).

At this point, the term, terror, is used according to the needs of the governments to generate fear inside society. It is clear that Post Cold War period can also be called as the age of terror. The definition of terror changes according to the strategies of major countries. John le Carré implies in A Most Wanted Man that after a period when communism is seen as terrorism, religious and racist terror definitions emerge as a need to cover up the benefits of western cultures:

“Everyone persecutes Chechens except us,” she continued. “It is normal all over Russia and the world. Not only Chechens, but Russian Muslims everywhere. Putin persecutes them and Mr. Bush encourages him. As long as Putin calls it his war on terror, he can do with the Chechens whatever he wishes, and nobody will stop him. Is that not so, Issa?” (Le Carré, 2008: 5)

Le Carré also suggests that definitions of terror and terrorist are totally intentional in post 9/11 period. Ideology can also urge people to fight against each other as well as material reasons. One of the best examples for it is Post 9/11 western understanding. During this period, many innocent people were accused of being terrorists because of their ‘dangerous’ ideas. In addition, many countries were isolated against the effects of their religion and Islamic ideology. Eagleton explains this situation in Ideology: An Introduction:

What persuades men and women to mistake each other from time to time for gods or vermin is ideology. One can understand well enough how human beings may struggle and murder for good material reasons - reasons connected, for instance, with their physical survival. It is much harder to grasp how they may come to do so in the name of something as apparently abstract as ideas. Yet ideas are what men and women live by, and will occasionally die for (Eagleton, 1991: xi).

Anyone can be a terrorist and evil for western countries. It is also obvious that western intelligence services and governments can easily use the term ‘terrorism’ to manipulate public opinion for their own sakes. Islamophobia shows itself bitterly in the quotation below. It shows that this phobia is a need for intelligence services to stay legal inside societies:

“So he finances terror,” he retorts loudly, spelling matters out for the benefit of the many.

“In effect, Herr Burgdorf, yes. If what we believe is true. Ninety-five percent of him does not. Ninety-five percent of him supports the poor and sick and needy of the Umma. But five percent of him finances terror. Consciously, and with ingenuity. He is therefore an evil man. That is his tragedy” (Le Carré, 2008: 294).

This fear of conspiracy and the growing fear of terror create paranoia among people that can be used politically. This paranoia becomes a perfect ground for racist deeds of the governments and intelligence services. However, it has a dangerous side effect in society. Trying to keep other ideologies under control causes hatred and fear among people. Using a terrorist attack to take control of the lives of ordinary people just because they are foreigners causes a great sociological and psychological unrest among the members of the society. Le Carré reflects this Post 9/11 syndrome well in his novel. He points out to that prejudice against Muslims by referring to Hamburg mosques:

And this second encounter was all the less probable because Leyla and Melik scarcely ever went to mosque, not even a moderate Turkish-language one. Since 9/11, Hamburg’s mosques had become dangerous places. Go to the wrong one, or the right one and get the wrong imam, and you could find yourself and your family on a police watch list for the rest of your life. Nobody doubted that practically every prayer row contained an informant who was earning his way with the authorities. Nobody was likely to forget, be the Muslim, police spy or both, that the city-state of Hamburg had been unwitting host to three of the 9/11 hijackers, not to mention their fellow cell-members and plotters; or that Mohammed Atta, who steered the first plane into the Twin Towers, had worshiped his wrathful god in a humble Hamburg mosque (Le Carré, 2008: 4).

One of the main reasons of this hatred and fear against other social groups is immigration in western countries. Immigrants, especially those who come from Eastern countries to Europe, can find it hard to adapt western culture. This hopeless and problematic situation of these mostly illegal immigrants may be regarded as a cause of racist attitudes. As it is explained in the historical background of this work, social identity theory may reflect this attitude of local people who consider themselves right to react against foreigners or immigrants since they are seen as a threat for their national and social identities. Terry Eagleton explains this justification of racism as ‘rationalization’ in his work:

An ideology may be seen not simply as ‘expressing’ social interests but as rationalizing them. Those who believe that there will be no air left to breathe in Britain if we allow more immigration are probably rationalizing a racist attitude (Eagleton, 1991: 51).

John le Carré also suggests that illegal immigration and immigration-provoked racism are among the major problems in western countries. Migration provokes racism and paranoia in society and mostly results with deportation:

“Yet the boy’s air of desperation need not have troubled Melik all that much since the travel shop was situated at the edge of the main railway station concourse, where every variety of lost soul—German vagrants, Asians, Arabs, Africans, and Turkish like himself but less fortunate—hung around all day long, not to mention legless men on electric carts, drug sellers and their customers, beggars and their dogs, and a seventy-year-old cowboy in a Stetson and silver-studded leather riding breeches. Few had work, and a sprinkling had no business standing on German soil at all, but were at best tolerated under a deliberate policy of destitution, pending their summary deportation, usually at dawn”(Le Carré, 2008: 5).

It is obvious that the opposite notions such as ‘toleration and racism’ or ‘culture and ignorance’ stand side-by-side in modern societies. It can be explained as the corruption of modern way of collective understanding. Therefore, it is not false to say that one side goes back in time while one side of the society is moving intellectually forward. Le Carré uses a stunning image to show that contradiction in his novel. The purpose of classical music symbolizes the clash in society since something which produces peace is used to ignore or exclude a social group here to look down upon them:

A further good reason to ignore the boy was the classical music that the station authorities boom at full blast over this section of the concourse from a battery of well-aimed loudspeakers. Its purpose, far from spreading feelings of peace and well-being among its listeners, is to send them packing (Le Carré, 2008: 2).

Mostly, how individuals react to certain events is completely the same with societies. To protect what they have or their present situation, individuals can ignore toleration or consciousness of responsibility. Fear of conspiracy forces individuals and nations to act cruel in some situations. People are bombarded with images of fear and pessimistic scenarios in their daily lives and this culture of fear provokes violence among people:

But Melik by now had a full head of outrage. All right, he wasn’t the greatest intellect his school had ever seen but he objected to feeling guilty and inferior, and being followed and preyed upon by a beggar with attitude. When his father died Melik had proudly assumed the role of master of the house and his mother’s protector and, as a further assertion of his authority, done what his father had not succeeded in doing before his death: as a second-generation Turkish resident, he had launched himself and his mother on the long, stony road to German citizenship, where every aspect of a family’s lifestyle was taken under the microscope, and eight years of unblemished behaviour were the first prerequisite. The last

thing he or his mother needed was some deranged vagrant claiming to be a medical student and begging on their doorstep (Le Carré, 2008: 5).

The problem of fear and hatred is not only for western side of the clash. Radical Islamic ideology also uses the culture of fear and racism to rationalize their cruel deeds. Throughout the history, fanaticism has played an important role in constructing an authority and the best way to achieve this goal is creating an ideological system. Likewise, Post 9/11 period creates its own fanaticism both in radical Islamic surroundings and in the west. They take measures against possible revolts by doing that. Eagleton suggests that:

The most efficient oppressor is the one who persuades his underlings to love, desire and identify with his power; and any practice of political emancipation thus involves that most difficult of all forms of liberation, freeing ourselves from ourselves. The other side of the story, however, is equally important. For if such domination fails to yield its victims sufficient gratification over an extended period of time, then it is certain that they will finally revolt against it (Eagleton, 1991: xi).

Like the spies of Cold war and the intelligence services of Post 9/11 period, Muslims try to justify their terrorist attacks with the help of their ideology. However, Muslim ideology is religion for this time. It is not a political doctrine but a religious one. This fact allows fanatics act crueller since the motivation of his violence is not a doctrine but promise for his hereafter. Therefore, it is more efficient than Althusser's ideological state apparatuses. John le Carré grasps this dimension of radical Islamism and reflects in his novel:

They have a place for terror in their minds and it is not an entirely negative place. They regard it"—is he searching his own conscience and pretending it is Abdullah's?"—as a painful but necessary tribute to the great diversity that is the Umma. Unfortunately, that does not constitute an excuse. But it constitutes, I would venture to suggest, an explanation. Therefore while Signpost may be sure in his own mind of what he considers the right path, he would not actually go so far as to tell the militants to their faces that they are wrong. Because in his heart, he is not totally sure. That is his insoluble paradox, and he is not alone. For are not all true believers looking for the right path? And are not God's commands difficult to comprehend? Signpost may deeply dislike what the militants do. Probably he does. But who is he to say that they are less pious, or less guided by God, than he is himself—assuming always that the persuasive evidence persuades us?" (Le Carré, 2008: 291)

A well known example of this religion-sourced hatred and provocation is a Danish caricature of the Prophet Muhammad with a bomb in his turban published in the Danish newspaper Jyllands-Posten in September, 2005. The prophet is shown as a terrorist, obviously implying that Islam is the source of terrorism. This hate-filled image of Islam

was advocated as ‘freedom of speech’ whereas it symbolizes Islamophobia and racism. Only a small caricature of Muhammad was enough for millions of Muslim people to react against western culture. The source of hate is always ready in radical Islamism and to awaken it is as easy as pressing a button. This polarization of Muslims and western culture is referred in John le Carré’s novel as well. The quotation below reflects that Radical Islamism does not care about individuals; its ideology is fed by the hate towards western civilization. It is completely different from the clashes between imperialism and communism:

They were pissed off by a couple of very bad Danish cartoons of the Prophet Mohammed that some German newspapers reprinted because they thought they were being brave and setting us free, okay?” [...]What pulled their triggers doesn’t matter a fuck. What does matter is the threat we are dealing with doesn’t see the difference between personal and collective guilt. It doesn’t say: ‘You’re good and I’m good, and Erna here is no good at all.’ It says: ‘You’re all a bunch of no-good apostates and blasphemers and murderers and fornicators and God-haters, so fuck the lot of us.’ For those guys, and all the guys we’d like to meet who share their perceptions, it’s the western hemisphere versus Islam, and no stops between (Le Carré, 2008: 75).

It is clear that radical Islamist groups and Western intelligence services’ justification of their mostly illegal actions are completely obsessive and ideological. Before 9/11, during the clashes of the Cold War, Soviet intelligence service and the western contemporary of it used their corrupted ideology to compete against each other. This obsessive world of Cold War clash is interpreted by Eagleton:

If I am obsessed about brushing my teeth because if the British do not keep in good health then the Soviets will walk all over our flabby, toothless nation, or if I make a fetish of physical health because I belong to a society which can exert technological dominion over just about everything but death, then it might make more sense to describe my behaviour as ideologically motivated. The term ideology, in other words, would seem to make reference not only to belief systems, but to questions of power (Eagleton, 1991: 5).

However, things are not the same after 9/11 attacks. Ideological threat replaces with a new type of enemy. Terrorist groups are completely different for western security practitioners since they do not represent a legal and institutionalized enemy like Soviets. This change of the enemy provoked anti-western ideology among Islamic communities and western intelligence services had to overcome this new enemy. During Cold War period, especially American and British intelligence services worked actively against communist threats and

gained valuable experience on espionage. However, they soon realized that the enemy was completely different from the former one and the same espionage strategies were not valid for radical Islamic groups. These intelligence services with their post 9/11 syndromes failed to adapt their skills and techniques to their new enemy; Islam under the pseudonym of terrorism. They continued to gather information by using their Cold war techniques and they soon realized that they did not work on terrorism:

You think everything changed after 9/11?” he demanded, furious with them, or himself. “You think that on 9/12, our fine foreign intelligence service, fired by a global vision of the terror threat, put on their kaffiyehs and went down to the souks of Aden and Mogadishu and Cairo and Baghdad and Kandahar and bought themselves a little retail information about where and when the next bomb would go off and who would be pushing the button? Okay, we all know the bad joke: you can’t buy an Arab, but you can rent one. We couldn’t even rent one, for fuck’s sake! [...]But they’re not live sources. They’re not venal, disenchanted, radical imams, or Islamist kids halfway to the bomb belt. They’re not Osama’s sleepers, or his talent spotters, or his couriers or his quartermasters or paymasters, not even at fifty removes. They’re just nice dinner guests (Le Carré, 2008: 71-72).

Finally, it can be noted here that American obsession of national security haunted in September 11, 2001, 60 years after Japanese Pearl Harbor attack of 1941. The feeling of invincibility of Americans was damaged harshly for the second time and Islamophobia emerged as a social, political and even an economical need in the Western civilization. Fear of Islam was exploited by various social groups and even governments. All these reasons of Islamophobia increase violence and hatred against Islam and Muslims:

We thought we could charm them across the line to us. We thought we could lure them with our good faces and fat wallets. [...] Nobody showed up. We trawled the airwaves to break their codes. They hadn’t got any fucking codes. Why not? Because we weren’t fighting the Cold War anymore. We were fighting off-cuts of a nation called Islam with a population of one and a half billion and a passive infrastructure to match. We thought we could do it the way we’d done it before, and we were plain, stupid, fucking wrong (Le Carré, 72).

As it is reflected in the quotation above, Islam eventually emerged as a new common enemy of the Western civilizations after Communism and Usama Bin Laden replaced Iosif Stalin as the leader of the brand new enemy of imperialism. Western policy produced this enemy according to its political needs. However, Western intelligence services and security practitioners failed to adapt and compete with this new enemy. This time, enemy is not structured on an ideology but on a religion.

CONCLUSION

The main aim of this study is to reveal the need for an enemy in the West by focusing on John le Carré's two popular novels; The Spy Who Came in from the Cold and A Most Wanted Man. As widely known, the enemy was the Soviet Communism in the West after World War II. However, the meaning has changed during the Post-Cold War period and Islam has emerged as the brand new enemy of the West especially after 11 September 2001. Therefore, another important focus of this thesis is to shed light on how the enemy has changed in Western civilization. This sudden change of enemy creates some radical questions in mind about the functioning of the Western social dynamics.

Without doubt, World War II created a black hole in human soul and humanity lost the chance of living in a peaceful world. National, continental and even global enemies emerged as a result of the war. Belief of a creator, empathy and reliance were damaged with the thousands and thousands of victims of this global violence. After a war like that, nobody should expect a ceasefire which would lead to a global peace. It may be suggested that the war still continues not with weapons but policies today. World War II caused a great conflict namely the Cold War which divided the world into two as West and East. One of the most common dynamics of the Cold War is the obsession of national security both in the West and East. This obsession triggered hate and racism towards the non-Western cultures and values depicted as the "Other". Therefore, the entire international policy of both Western and Eastern hemispheres were focused on destroying the "Other" and defending themselves against enemies.

This new international system enabled governments and policy makers to legalize their criminal activities against other enemy countries. To preserve peace and security, espionage and even murder began to be regarded as national obligations. This situation created a higher class who controlled and cashed on these illegal espionage activities and corruption inside society. Rich people increased their wealth while governments guaranteed their power by imposing the culture of fear and enemy in society. The concept

of enemy eventually became a social and political need in the world. Both communism and western imperialism used this weapon during the Cold War Period.

However, the fall of the Berlin Wall and the collapse of the USSR created euphoria that it would be possible to overcome hatred and corruption. Communism was no longer a threat for the West and there was no obstacle to construct a better international system. This means that West lost its enemy. Therefore, a part of the society lost their political weapon. The enemy was kept alive by Western efforts during the Post-Cold War years. Cuba and some other Latin communist cultures were used to create the image that the USSR was haunting the West ideologically.

At this point, 9/11 terrorist attacks in the USA emerged as a help to maintain the culture of fear in the Western society. Islam suddenly became the main source of terrorism and threat against western culture. International policies were built on this new concept of enemy. This sudden change of enemy increased the density of hate and racism in western society. This culture of fear created a serious social corruption. Therefore, Islamophobia emerged as a political weapon for political parties in the West. In this respect, comparison of John le Carré's A Most Wanted Man and The Spy Who Came in from the Cold, reflecting two different periods of the modern period, may show us the social, political and ideological transformation of the western hemisphere.

In The Spy Who Came in from the Cold, John le Carré draws a clear portrait of the Cold War period by focusing on the lives of intelligence service workers. Leamas, the protagonist of the novel, reflects the western ideology and hate against Soviet Communism. The individual conflict of Leamas makes us think about the problems of a modern individual at the time of the Cold War. He tries to get rid of his emotions and humanly feelings towards other people while he struggles with his hatred against the enemy which is imposed on him ideologically. The way he dies and the last moments and the setting of the novel's ending do not only reflect the end of Leamas but also the tragic fate of modern people.

Liz is also an important symbol in the novel. Le Carré shows the corrupted communist ideology of the USSR with the help of Liz's innocent character. The reader clearly sees

that Communism in the USSR is far from its theory and there is almost no difference between the imperialist western ideology and the communist USSR. Le Carré suggests in this novel that the game of the Cold War is played according to its own rules by both sides of the conflict.

Throughout the novel, John le Carré implies that the Cold War has nothing to do with the ordinary members of the society. Intelligence services and their high class member bosses are the practitioners of the war. Ordinary citizens live their monotonous simple lives while governments and higher social class members try to legalize and finance their corrupted existence. That is why le Carré introduces Leamas as the spy who came in from the cold. Here, the term, 'cold', symbolizes the corrupted illegal conflicts of the governments and high class members in the society. Leamas tries to get rid of this cold. However, he dies on the most important symbol of the conflict, the Berlin Wall.

It is so easy to see that John le Carré adapts his style to the changing conditions of the Post-Cold War period in A Most Wanted Man. As it is stated and also quoted in the Introduction, le Carré transforms from being an espionage fiction writer to a political one. The novel clearly reflects the new enemy of the west and its struggle to fight against this new threat.

Issa, the protagonist of the novel, stands for the target of hate, fear and preconceptions. Just like Leamas, he also tries to get rid of his personal conflicts which are created by his religious ideology. Western intelligence services regard him as a way to decipher the terrorist network and try to fight against this imaginary network by using their Cold War espionage techniques. Throughout the novel, these espionage practitioners confess that fighting against radical Islamic terrorism with their Cold War traditions is a big failure since the enemy is no more ideological but religious.

The obsession of security haunts Western society after 9/11 attacks and this Post 9/11 syndrome can clearly be analysed in the novel. A country, with all its official security organizations, can perceive a teenager as a national threat. Issa and his mysterious past are regarded as the source of terrorism and a security threat by German, British and American

intelligence services. It shows us the fact that Western culture is addicted to an enemy to keep hate and fear alive inside the society.

When these two novels by John le Carré are compared, it is inevitable to come to the conclusion that nothing has changed in the West but the concept of enemy still remains throughout the modern period beginning from the Cold War to the Post 9/11 World. The culture of fear and the need for an enemy in the West have legalized the dark deeds of governments and higher social classes in the society while ordinary members of the society struggle with their daily survival. In this era, anything, from epidemic diseases to daily relations and activities, becomes the source of fear. This fear helps hatred grow inside the society and covers the illegal powers of institutions and social groups.

To conclude, John le Carré uses the need for an enemy in Western culture in his two selected novels; The Spy Who Came in from the Cold and A Most Wanted Man. As an author of espionage fiction, he shows the fact that the entire policy of Western culture is based on an enemy. However, le Carré is far different from other espionage authors since he proves that spy novels are not dependent on Cold War setting and political background. He proves also that brand new enemies and conflicts of our time can also be a perfect ground for the 21st Century spy novels. This thematical change in John le Carré's fiction can clearly be examined in A Most Wanted Man and surely is a pioneer for brand new spy novels without communism as a threat and enemy in the 21st Century.

REFERENCES

- Althusser, Louis. *Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses in Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*, Monthly Review Press, London, 1972.
- Althusser, Louis. *Lenin and Philosophy*. Monthly Review Press, London, 1971.
- Aronoff, Myron. *The Spy Novels of John Le Carré: Balancing Ethics and Politics*. Palgrave, 2001
- Barley, Tony. *Taking Sides: The Fiction of John Le Carré*. Philadelphia: Open University Press, 1986.
- Barry, Peter. *Beginning Theory: An Introduction to Literary and Cultural Theory*. Manchester University Press, 1995.
- Carré, John Le. *The Spy Who Came in from the Cold*. New York: Coward-McCann, 1964.
- Carré, John Le. *A Most Wanted Man: A Novel*. New York: Scribner, 2008.
- Council on American-Islamic Relations. *Islamophobia and Its Impact in the United States January 2009- December 2010: Same Hate, New Target*. Washington: CAIR, 2011.
- Culler, Jonathan. *On Deconstruction*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press. 1982.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Of Grammatology*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1976.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Writing and Difference*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1978.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Monolingualism of the Other, Or, The Prosthesis of Origin*. Stanford, CA: Stanford UP, 1998.
- Dickens, David. R. *Deconstruction and Marxist Inquiry*. Sociological Perspectives, Vol.33, No. 1, Critical Theory (Spring, 1990), pp. 147-158.
- Durkheim, Emile. *The Rules of Sociological Method*. Free Press, New York, 1938.
- Eagleton, Terry. *Marxism and Literary Criticism*. Berkeley: U of California, 1976.
- Eagleton, Terry. *Ideology: An Introduction*. London: Verso, 1991.
- Flanigan, James. 1999. *Los Angeles Times*, February 19.
- Furedi, Frank. *Culture of Fear: Risk-taking and the Morality of Low Expectation*. London: Continuum, 2002.
- Hamilton, William C. *The Experience Of Place In The Spy Novels Of John Le Carré*. *The Canadian Geographer/Le Géographe Canadien* 35.4 (1991): 404-12.

- Kearney, Richard. *Dialogue with Jacques Derrida*. Dialogues with Contemporary Continental Thinkers, Manchester, England: Manchester University Press. 1984.
- Kellner, Douglas. *Theorizing Globalization*. Sociological Theory, Vol. 20, No. 3 (Nov., 2002), pp. 285-305
- Laidi, Zaki. *Rethinking Post-Cold War*. Economic and Political Weekly, Vol. 29, No. 32 (Aug. 6, 1994), pp. 2067-2069.
- Marx, Karl. *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*. New York: International, 1970.
- Marx, Karl, Friedrich Engels, C. J. Arthur, and Karl Marx. *The German Ideology*. New York: International, 1972.
- Marx, Karl, and Friedrich Engels. *Das Kapital: A Critique of Political Economy*. Washington, DC: Regnery Gateway, 1996.
- Marx, Karl, and Friedrich Engels. *The Communist Manifesto*. New York: Monthly Review, 1998.
- McMahon, Robert J. *The Cold War: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2003.
- Moten, Abdul Rashid. *Understanding and Ameliorating Islamophobia*. *Cultura. International Journal of Philosophy of Culture and Axiology* 9(1)/2012:155-178.
- Orwell, George. *Animal Farm*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1954.
- Paterson, Thomas G. *The Origins of the Cold War*. Lexington, MA: Heath, 1974.
- Roy, Arundathi. *An Ordinary Person's Guide to Empire*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: South End Press. 2004.
- Rozanov, V. V. *The Apocalypse of Our Time, and Other Writings*. New York: Praeger, 1977.
- Secretary-General on *Confronting Islamophobia: Education for Tolerance and Understanding*. Press Release, SG/SM/9637, HR/4802, PI/1627. July, 16. 2010.
- Shakespeare, William. *King Richard II*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1984.
- Shakespeare, William. *Othello*. Toronto: Bantam, 1988.
- Shmid, Herman. *On the Origin of Ideology*. *Acta Sociologica*, Vol. 24, No. ½, Work and Ideology (1981), pp. 57-73.
- The OIC Observatory on Islamophobia. *The 1st OIC Observatory Report on Islamophobia, May 2007 – March 2008*. http://www.oicoci.org/oicnew/is11/english/Islamophobia-rep_en.pdf. 2008. July 15, 2010.

The OIC Observatory on Islamophobia. *The 4th OIC Observatory Report on Islamophobia (Intolerance and Discrimination Against Muslims) May 2010 to April 2011*. Jeddah: OIC, 2011.

The White House, *President's Address to the Nation*. <http://georgewbush.whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2006/09/20060911-3.html>, 2006. January 2, 2012.

VITA

Name and Surname : Mustafa BÜYÜKGEBİZ

Mother's Name : Hülya

Father's Name : Rifat

Place of Birth and Date : Isparta / 1984

B.A. : Pamukkale University
Faculty of Science and Letters
Department of English Language and Literature

Graduation Date : 2008

Work Place and Position : Pamukkale University
School of Foreign Languages
Instructor of English