



Analysis of Krishnamurti's Attitude towards Belief and Ideology

Mahdi Ghahraman

Assistant Professor of Sahand University of Technology, Tabriz, Iran

Email: mahdi_sut@yahoo.com

<http://dx.doi.org/10.18415/ijmmu.v8i1.2390>

Abstract

Ideology is one of the complex concepts that many thinkers from different sciences have talked about it and studied it; there is no comprehensive definition of what constitutes consensus among thinkers, or at least is acceptable to most of them; thinkers can be divided into three main spectrums regarding the definitions and characteristics that they have proposed for ideology. One group has a positive attitude towards ideology and has introduced it as a necessity for human life; another group has defined the ideology negatively, they not only did not evaluate it positively, but also introduced it as the cause of separation and division, etc., and sought to deny it; the other group introduces ideology as a neutral concept that can be characterized by both the positive features proposed by some thinkers and the negative features suggested by some other thinkers. Jiddu Krishnamurti is one of the thinkers who has a negative view towards ideology and rejects it due to some of the claimed characteristics such as segregation, separation, seduction and so on. This attitude is rejected by religious and non-religious thinkers.

Keywords: *Ideology; Belief; Thought; Krishnamurti; Islam*

Introduction

Ideology is one of the concepts that has been considered by thinkers in various fields of science. D. de Tracy was the first to use the term (Turkaman and Nikpay, 1389, 17); however, the definition of this word is not exclusive to him and many thinkers have started to provide a definition of this concept. Although many thinkers have presented many definitions for ideology, however there is no consensus definition for it that is accepted by all or most thinkers, but there is such a fragmentation in its definition that it is sometimes contradictory. So that, D. Mc Lellan considers "ideology" to be the most fluid and complex concept proposed in the social sciences (McLellan, 1995: 1).

Belief (*Aqīdah*) is rooted from the word "*Aqd*" meaning tying and gathering around something and tightening it. (*Rāghib Isfihānī*, 1404: 576; *Farāhīdī*, 1410: 1/140) Ideology has been formed from two words "idea" meaning thought, imagination, ideal, mental form and belief and "logy" meaning logic and cognition. So ideology means cognition of belief. An ideologist is a person who has a specific belief and ideology is a specific belief of a group, class, nation or race (Shariati, 1361 B: 66).

Dictionaries and glossaries have defined this word as ideal, idea, thinking, religion, religious belief, thought, knowledge of ideas, nature and source of ideas, doctrine, beliefs and ideas of a person, group and a specific class and set of ideas governing the social, economic, and political system (Brijanian, 1371: 393).

Some consider ideology to be the same as belief and they believe that it is not necessary to be obsessed with the translation of this word (Shariati, 1386: 516-517).

The Idiomatic Definition of Ideology

Scholars of different sciences have proposed many definitions for ideology, sometimes it is mentioned as a positive concept and a way to achieve the goals of an individual or a particular group. And sometimes it is mentioned as a negative concept for distorting reality, legitimizing political power, and maintaining the dominance of the ruling class, and in some cases it is also mentioned without positive judgment and as a neutral concept (Turkaman and Nikpay, 1389: 19-27.)

Some, such as Marx and Engels, have viewed it as a negative and derogatory phenomenon; some, such as Lenin, see it as a positive concept, and others, such as A. Heywood, have viewed it as a neutral phenomenon (Raja'i, 1381: 242).

The theoretical confusion and heterogeneity of the existing literature on ideology arising from the distance of this term from its literal meaning and also considerable differences in political, philosophical, psychological, sociological, and cultural approaches have been on this concept (F. Daneshvar 1395).

If the first concept of the word ideology - which has been mentioned at a point in time and place and in a specific scientific field - is separated from the body of the history of thought, to be studied separately, there will be a significant mistake in explaining its semantic meaning; this is where misunderstandings show themselves and the elements unrelated to the subject weaken the foundation of thought (Alam al-Hudā. 1396).

Comments

Shariati evaluates ideology as a conscious belief in how the situation is (Shariati, 1379: 83-84).

C. Geertz also considers ideology, like religion, art, etc., as a cultural system that has two main characteristics; first, the ideology is the referential and second, it has internal compatibility (*Imāmī*, 1391: 13) In this view, ideology is something more than a simple tool in the service of the personal interests of responsible politicians, and it is a coherent and consistent system of ideas, values, and symbols that carries the semantic structures developed in culture. It is obvious that in this approach, a value attitude towards ideology is considered positive and ideology is considered as a source for creating internal and social adjustment (Daneshvar, 1395).

Another group of theorists such as Althusser and Freud have pointed to human needs for ideology and its psychological influences.

The starting point of this approach is the individual and the effects of ideology on his behavior. In this approach, ideology is seen as a source of stabilization for the individual's psychological system that helps him to resolve internal conflicts. (Fotuhi, 1388).

According to Ayatollah Mesbah, since the essence of religion and Islamic law is man's connection with God and this is possible through obedience to God, then religion is a set of beliefs (worldview), principles and practical rules (ideology) which have been created based on a special

interpretation of Existence (God, nature and man) and the explanation of the special relationship between man, God and nature and its purpose is the evolution, transcendence and growth of man (Mesbah Yazdi, nd: 4).

According to Shahid Motahhari, ideology determines do's and don'ts and shows how it should be, how we would be, and how it should be built. And finally, ideology is a practical wisdom and the worldview of the theoretical wisdom (Motahhari, 1361: 11), ideology means the need for a general theory, a comprehensive and coordinated plan that is the main goal of human perfection and providing public happiness and in which the main lines and methods, the do's and don'ts, the good and the bad, the goals and means, the needs and the pains and the treatments, the responsibilities and the tasks have been specified and it has been the source of inspiration for the tasks and responsibilities for all people (Motahhari, nd: 45).

In an interview with Pierz (2001), G. Lakoff looks at ideology from a cognitive perspective, seeing it as a kind of mental and abstract system that also contains a moral system and separates right from wrong. In his opinion, ideology has both conscious and obvious aspects and unconscious and hidden aspects (Ghazanfari, 1385).

Napoléon Bonaparte was the first to use the term in a negative sense. He considered ideologues to be individuals who sought to replace politics with abstract considerations (T. Ball and R. Dagger, 1387, 46).

K. Marx considers ideology as the consciousness and perceptions that the ruling class has of facts according to its position and interests; he considers ideology as nothing but a false awareness of reality (Marx, 1380).

According to F. Dumont, ideology is a system of clear and organized ideas and judgments that is used to describe, explain, infer, or justify the position of a group or society, and is essentially derived from values and provides an accurate guide to the historical action of that group or society. (J. Baechler, 1372: 7).

M. Duverger considers ideology as an intellectual system with two important roles of coordinating private protests and shaping them in the form of collective conflicts and giving the character of protest to the prevailing and existing values of these conflicts (J. Baechler, 1372: 5).

R. Wuthnow defines ideology as a set of systematic structures that work to describe and convey participatory collective meanings (Akhavan Monfared, 1380, 34).

Some, such as J. Locke and D. de Tracy, have taken an epistemological approach and considered ideology as a branch of science whose subject is the study of the truth and falsity of beliefs on the basis of scientific criteria (Kennedy, 1978). Some late thinkers have also taken the same approach by insisting on confronting ideology as false consciousness with true cognition (Turkaman and Nikpay, 1389: 27).

Characteristics of Ideology in the Definitions of Thinkers

From a set of definitions presented by thinkers of all sciences about ideology, some features are obtained that confirm the complexity of the meaning of this word in the minds of thinkers; on the one hand, it is not possible to combine all these features into a single definition, and on the other hand, removing any of them from the definition of ideology will make its definition incomplete in the eyes of others.

Some of the characteristics attributed to ideology by great thinkers of various sciences are:

Organizing, assigning to a specific class (Soroush, 1372: 14), claiming the basic intellectual and scientific basis (Turkaman, 1389: 29), in order to advance the goals of the same class, following the creation of the bordering (Baechler, 1370: 67), focused practically (A. Heywood, 1393: 66), following the creation of a special social order (Turkaman, 1389: 29), with explanatory, evaluation, identification, and programmatic functions (T. Ball and R. Dagger, 1387: 20) a product of the ruling class and in order to maintain the existing order, to legitimize the political power of the ruler (Marx, 1970: 47), to distort and present a selection of facts (T. Eagleton, 1943: 30) with official commentary (J. Fiske, 1381: 120) Inflexibility against innovation (Soroush, 1372: 121), totalitarianism (H. Arendt, 1962: 468), determination of individual and social responsibilities, formation of belief system (Shariati, 1386: 116), creation of belief and faith, creating mobility of social currents (Fooladi, 1394), the veil of facts, the necessity of human life, belonging to a social class (Soroush, 1373: 103), false consciousness (Marx, 1380), emotionality, justification of interests, constructed with the appearance of logic and reason and cohesion (J. Baechler, 1372: 8), scientific character (Arendt, 1392: 323), limited and bordered (J. Plamenatz, 1373: 18), beliefs and theories of being social, mostly confiscatory, referring to a collection of non-false beliefs or theories (Plamenatz, 1373: 79 & 92), a psychosocial phenomenon (G. Roche, 1368: 103), a completely interconnected, coordinated and organized collection of perceptions and the expression and presentation of opinions (G. Roche, 1368: 99), being descriptive, with the power of foresight and justification, independent of experience, based on values and emotions, having rational, logical, symbolic characteristics and coherent sets (Fooladi, 1394), instinct issue and continuation of instinct in human (Shariati, 1361: 102), selective and conscious, rational and acceptable and rejection-able (Shariati, 1368: 582), the foundation of all social movements and developments and the guide of the path of social change (Shariati, 1361: 147-148), self-awareness (Fooladi, 1394) combined with deception, miraculous-ness, deceptive (Soroush, 1372: 120).

Given the issues raised and the characteristics of ideology mentioned, there is no definition on the basis of which a comprehensive view to ideology can be found that is at least acceptable to most thinkers.

Ideology and Krishnamurti

Krishnamurti is also one of the thinkers who does not have a positive view to ideology and constantly seeks to reject the ideology. Although the denial of ideology is inferred from Krishna's collection of sayings, he did not speak convincingly and ideologically about ideology and the reasons for its denial, and only in his conversations and speeches he has openly spoken about it. Krishna does not prescribe any philosophy, theology, or discussion on the supernatural ideas and concepts, and considers all ideologies to be utterly foolish (Krishnamurti, 1384: 42). He explicitly acknowledges that he does not believe in anything and interprets having no belief as freeing the mind from all the troubles of belief. (Krishnamurti, 1384: 93) According to his thought, man cannot understand the ultimate truth through any organization, group, religion, faith, prayer, ritual or philosophical or psychological knowledge. And the only way to achieve it is to study the intellectual structure and content and direct observation without the mediation of one's intellect (Kalantarinejad, 1380: 22).

Reasons for Krishnamurti's Rejection of Belief and Ideology

He has defined belief and ideology in the same sense and not only does not consider ideologies, beliefs and convictions useful for achieving absolute truth, but also considers it as an obstacle for human access to truth (Krishnamurti, 1384: 73-76); because the warp and woof of "self" is woven from them (Krishnamurti, 1384: 110). In Krishna's thought, the belief or theory is not truth; rather, in order to achieve the truth, it is necessary to abandon beliefs and to understand the truth, all ideas, inferences, and beliefs must be discarded (Krishnamurti, 1378: 109). He considered beliefs to be devoid of any truth and knows the truth as a human action, not his belief; and he believes that belief is simply an escape from a

monotonous, stupid and cruel life (Krishnamurti, 1386: 253). Krishna believes that knowing "what is" does not require belief, but on the contrary, belief, idea and prejudice is a definite obstacle in the way of "what is" (Krishnamurti, 1380: 75-76). In his opinion, due to the assumptions of the believing brain, the possibility of change and flexibility will be zero in them (Krishnamurti, 1372: 84). Because when a person becomes attached to a particular ideology, he looks at everything beyond that ideology and it is not possible to look at issues without confrontation, and this will lead to contradiction, conflict, judgment, justification and distortion (Krishnamurti, 1380: 16 and 17). According to Krishna, a man who has ideology is only bound by ideas and is interested in ideas and words instead of direct action; so ideology prevents the manifestation of direct action (Krishnamurti, 1378: 31); so ideology not only does not clarify an issue; rather, it causes double darkness, confusion and contradiction (Krishnamurti, 1382: 43). Krishna believes that political, philosophical, etc. beliefs and ideas separate human beings and put them against each other. He claims that many of us prefer our dogmatic and fanatical beliefs to reality; because belief causes motivation, effort, hope and promise and the person becomes aware of how belief works and one of the main causes of differences is eliminated (Krishnamurti, 1380: 76). And he recommends that man should free himself from hard and fanatical beliefs; because ideas, no matter how great, cleverly deceptive, are based on the illusion of the person and are the cause of division and destruction (Krishnamurti, 1378: 252). He states that again, if all human beings had a common ideology, a kind of equality would be established; but such a thing is impossible and the problem still remains (Krishnamurti, 1378: 33). According to his idea, a model-based society operates only within the framework of those ideas and beliefs that are a reflection of the same model; therefore, it has constantly caused violence and is collapsing (Krishnamurti, 1378: 144). Krishna acknowledges that belief and ideology prevent the distinction between right and wrong; therefore, when a person listens to something without any restrictions, beliefs or experiences, it becomes easier to understand right and wrong in the mind and to avoid committing wrong deeds (Krishnamurti, 1372: 6). He also believes that belief gives experience a "conditional" quality; and then experience helps to reinforce ideas and beliefs, and the person experiences what he or she believes in. The mind interprets the experience and accepts or rejects it. The mind itself is the product of experience, so it can only know or experience something that it is familiar with (Krishnamurti, 1380: 100). Without presenting a formula for distinguishing between small and large beliefs, he divides beliefs into small and major (the principle of belief formulation) and acknowledges that he does not mean small beliefs by denying ideas and belief; rather, it is the principle of formulation and major ideas. It means that thinking, beliefs, ideals and logical issues guide us and become important to us; therefore, according to him, he is questioning all the buildings of this issue (Krishnamurti, 1372: 98). He answered positively to the question of whether pure disbelief and lack of any theory is possible or not. He believed that the reason for believing was due to a lack of precise attention; in this way, if we listen carefully and pay close attention when receiving information, this will prevent the formation of the center and will not lead to the formation of belief. Because when attention is complete, there is no room left for the "center" and its function. Of course, such full attention is extremely difficult for a mind that has conflict and confusion, anger and imbalance, anxiety and restlessness, and has never faced the reality of anything and has not asked itself to act and work at its maximum capacity. (Krishnamurti, 1383: 116).

Review and Analysis

According to the issues raised and also from the point of view of most religious and non-religious thinkers, Krishna's thought about ideology is not acceptable and can be fundamentally criticized. Because all thinkers in various fields of science, especially most religious thinkers, do not have a negative view towards ideology and believe that ideology can have all the negative and positive features that thinkers have mentioned. Some of them even consider the attribution of man to ideology as involuntary and beyond the scope of human authority. Krishna also like other thinkers has had his own definition of ideology - as, according to Baechler, all definitions of ideology have been arbitrary (Baechler, 1372: 15) - and according to the same definition, he has criticized ideology and issued a verdict invalidating it.

Shahid Motahhari considers the need for ideology to be a necessity of human life, as all human beings have needed it throughout history, and human beings today need such a plan for life more than ever (Motahhari, 1369: 58). After dividing ideology into human ideology and group ideology, he considers Islamic ideology to be of the first type and based on nature: "Each of these two types of ideology is based on a kind of view on human beings. General and human ideology, like Islamic ideology, has a kind of knowledge of man that is interpreted by nature. Undoubtedly, Islamic ideology is of the first type and its origin is human nature" (Motahhari, nd: 45). In his view, the ideology leads man to the purpose of life, how to live, how to build, and according to which patterns should these questions be directed? By dividing human activities into two types of pleasure and tact, he believes that human intellect prefers tactful activities to pleasurable activities and considering that tactful activity requires planning, the plan and planning that ensures the well-being of the individual and society is ideology (Motahhari, nd: 40). According to Shariati, ideology is a set of values and ideals that create a worldview and cause movement, dynamism and direction in life, and ideology motivates concepts such as love, worship, sanctification, commitment, self-sacrifice and... (Shariati, 1379: 112). He considers ideology as constructing individual and creating society and considers it possible to change the current situation by ideology and achieve an ideal society (Shariati, 1379: 137). Also, he considers the person who lacks ideology to be thoughtless and believes that a person who has no ideology is a person who only lives without thinking (Shariati, 1361, v. 64). Finally, he presents his theory of ideology for building an ideal society and offers a solution with more sensitivity to its harms so that one does not suffer from dogma and stubbornness (Alam-Hoda et al., 1396). P. Hawkins defines ideology as the source of most human tensions and sees it as a phenomenon that human beings deal with day and night as language itself. In his view, ideology refers to a set of beliefs and ideas that shape human experiences and expectations. (Ghazanfari, 1385) Therefore, according to both religious and non-religious ideology, ideology is both true and false, it is both transformative and a serious obstacle to social change (Fooladi, 1394). Krishna denies belief and ideology, while belief is the essence and elixir of human life, and life without belief is like the text without meaning and the body without soul (Refer to: Mir Musavi, 1381: 257). He considers belief and ideology as seductive and opposes it, while firstly: with what argument do they consider ideology as seductive, and secondly: this matter is explicitly in oppose with the verse:

(فبشر عباد الذين يستمعون القول فيتبعون أحسنه)

«So announce the Good News to My Servants, Those who listen to the Word, and follow the best of in it: those are the ones who Allah has guided, and those are the ones endowed with understanding.» (Zumar: 17 & 18)

Because according to this verse, man has the ability to separate the just from the unjust and the right from the wrong by using his intellect. Ignoring the semantic diversity of ideologies, Krishna has given it an instrumental role, also of a negative kind, and by extending it to all ideologies, he has denied them all; while dozens of different and varied meanings have been proposed for the ideology, most of which do not agree with Krishna's idea. He considers all ideologies and theories to be foolish, while, as mentioned earlier, ideology can be both negative and foolish and also positive and rational. "Ideology is stated in some words that its strength can be changed from a simple slogan to a complex intellectual system" (Nasri, 1377). The mission of ideology is to provide a rule or criterion to distinguish a friend from the enemy and to justify the selection of values and to cover up lusts, and to use morality in the service of politics, and to transform vice into virtue, and to make political action simple, clear, and complete. Therefore, ideology is not a superfluous and useless thing that we consider as the result of human evil or stupidity (Baechler, 1372: 96-7). He rejects ideology and belief and claims that his writings are not documented on any basis, principle or law; assuming we accept his claim, how does he consider it obligatory for people to study his torn and scattered works and to respond to the dimensions of their lives with them; and if his literary works are based on principles and laws, it is an ideological system itself (See. Ja'fari, 1378: 15-16). Krishna considers belief to be an obstacle to change, while according to Islamic thinkers, belief is not an optional action; as Allameh Tabataba'i, by rejecting the voluntary nature

of belief, considers its acceptance as a paradox (Tabataba'i, 4117: 2/117 and 4/124). In addition, ideology in itself is neither a factor of change nor an obstacle to it, ideology, as it can be the greatest factor of change in societies, can be the greatest obstacle to social change and divert the path of change (Fooladi, 1394). He believes that "any attempt done by movements, laws and ideologies to reform human societies has been failed." First: The intellectual greatness, will, action and activities of human beings in self-construction and socialization cannot be denied. Second: Ignoring all these cultures and literatures that reflect the channel of human life in the requirements and competencies, is equal to drawing a line of invalidity on all pages of history (Refer to. Ja'fari, 1378: 55 and 56) He considers the belief of the brain as an obstacle to change and flexibility, while the belief with a logical and rational support is not only not rejected, but also it is the criterion and degree of acceptance and rejection of other ideas. Krishna sees the existence of ideology as an obstacle to distinguishing between good and evil, while the existence of ideology and what is good and evil precedes their recognition and measurement. According to him, belief and ideology are the cause of separation, division and schism; first, belief and ideology must be the cause of separation; because otherwise its existence and absence will be the same; as their beliefs and ideologies are the cause of their separation from others. Second: Ideology in both religious and non-religious thought is also the cause of division, just as ideology is the cause of unity and harmony, (Fooladi, 1394) and according to "Guy Rocher", ideology can create both transformation and contradiction; because, at the same time, it can create both unity and sodality, as well as contradiction and opposition. This characteristic is, in fact, the essence of ideology, which at the same time is both connecting and separating (Rocher, 1368: 115). As according to the verse of the Qur'an, while ideology calls for unity and solidarity, one group responds to the call of unity and unites, and the other group chooses non-unity and division. (Surat al-Baqarah, 213) Another reason for Krishna's denial of ideology and belief is that it is impossible for everyone to agree on one belief, and his solution is for everyone to give up their ideology and beliefs; while, firstly: although it is difficult for everyone to accept one belief, but it is not impossible from the point of view of reason, secondly: disagreement of all in one belief is a requirement of freedom and authority, and accepting one belief by all is contrary to human free will. Third: According to which principle and ideology should everyone be convinced to give up their ideas?

He has considered belief to be destructive (Krishnamurti, 1386: 72); which lacks any reason and logic; because, as mentioned earlier, ideology does not in itself require destruction and development; so just as ideology can be destructive, it can also play a developmental role.

Conclusion

Although ideology has taken many concepts and meanings from its birth to the present day and has found a conceptual exaggeration through it, but the multiplicity of meanings and the resulting exaggeration cannot cause ambiguity in understanding its concept. This means that according to the intellect and logic of ideology, in any meaning that has been proposed, it will not be outside the three spectrums of negative, positive and neutral, which according to reason and logic, its negative meanings are rejected and its positive meanings are accepted and its neutral meaning is dependent on its usage and application. Thus, Krishnamurti's purely negative interpretation of ideology also lacks rational and logical support and can be seriously considered and criticized.

References

- Akhavan Monfared, Hamid Reza, 1380 HS, the Role and Position of Ideology in the Theories of Revolution , *Matin Research Journal*, No. 10.
- Alam al-Hoda, Ali; Fayyazi, Ibrahim; Ziaei, Hamid Reza; Va'ezi, Ali, 1396 HS, Analysis of the concept of ideology in the thought of Shari'ati and Soroush, *Rite of Wisdom*, No. 31.

- Arendt, Hannah, 1392 HS, *Totalitarianism*, translated by Mohsen Thulāthī, Tehran, Thāliith.
- Baechler, Jean, 1372 HS, *What is ideology? A Critique on Western Ideologies*, Ali Asadi, Tehran, Publishing Company.
- Ball, Terence; Dagger, Richard, 1387 HS, *Ideals and Ideologies*, Translator: Ahmad Sabouri Kashani, Tehran: Ameh Publishing.
- Brijanian, Marie, 1371 HS, *Dictionary of Philosophy and Social Sciences Terms, Volume I*; Translator: Baha'uddin.
- Daneshvar, Faezeh, 1395 HS, *Rereading the Relationship between Law and Ideology in the Light of Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities*, No. 32.
- Eagleton, T., 1991 AD, *Ideology: An introduction*. New York: Verso.
- Farāhīdī, Khalil ibn Ahmad, 1410 AH, *Al-Ain, Qom, Hījrat*.
- Fooladi, Mohammad, 1394 HS, *The Relationship between Religion and Ideology; Ideological religion, religious ideology, modern religious thought*, No. 43.
- Fotuhi, Mahmoud, 1388 HS, *Reflection of the ideology in style and discourse*.
- Ghazanfari, Mohammad, 1385 HS, *Analytical Framework of Ideology Criticism in Translation and a Look at the English Translation of the Blind Owl*, Hedayat, Social Sciences and Humanities, Shiraz University, No. 46.
- Heywood, Andrew, 1393 HS, *Politics*, Translator: Abdul Rahman Alam, Tehran: Ney Publishing, the main year of work: 1997 AD.
- Ibn Manzūr, Muhammad ibn Mukarram, 1414 AH, *Lisān al-Arab*. Beirut: Dar Šādir.
- Imāmī, Yaḥyā, 1391 HS, *Sociology of Religion in the opinion of Clifford Geertz*, the specialized quarterly journal of social studies of religion.
- Ja'fari, Mohammad Taghi, 1378 HS, *Krishnamurti and his sophistry*, compiled by Mohammad Reza Javadi, Islamic Culture Publishing House, first edition.
- Kalantarinejad, Mohammad Reza, 1380 HS, *Real Teacher: A Journey to Ohio and Some Articles by Krishnamurti*, Tehran, Ashti Publications.
- Krishnamurti, Jiddu, 1372 HS, *Conversation with Krishnamurti*, translated by Nasrin Zahed, Tehran, Talayah Publishing.
- Marx, Karl et al., 1380 HS, *Ludwig Fubach and German Ideology*, translated by Parviz Babaei, Tehran, Cheshmeh.
- McLellan, D., 1995 AD, *Ideology*, 2nd ed. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Mesbah Yazdi, Mohammad Taghi, nd, *Comparative Ideology*, Vol. 1, Qom, Institute of in the Right Path.

Mir Musavi, Sayyid Ali, 1381 HS, *Fundamentals of human rights in Islam and other schools*. Tehran: Institute of Islamic Culture and Thought.

Motahhari, Morteza, 1361 HS, *Cognition*, Tehran, Shari'at.

Nasri, Abdullah, 1377 HS, *the Relationship between Religion and Ideology*, Qabsat, No. 7.

Plamenatz, John, 1373 HS, *Ideology*, translated by Ezzatullah Fooladvand, Tehran, Scientific and Cultural Publications.

Rāghib Isfihānī, Hussein Ibn Muhammad, 1412 AH, *Al-Mufradāt Fī Gharīb al-Qur'an*, Beirut, Dar al-Qalam.

Raja'i, Mustafa, 1381 HS, *Political Theory, Political Philosophy, Political Ideology*, Translator: Ahmad Reza Taheri Poor.

Rocher, Guy, 1368 HS, *Social Changes*, Mansour Vosoughi, Tehran, Ney Publishing.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).