

**A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF DISCONTENT WITH
MODERNITY AND MODERNIZATION IN THE NOVELS OF
A. L. HUXLEY AND A. H. TANPINAR**

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY**

BY

HİLAL KAYA

**IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN
ENGLISH LITERATURE**

DECEMBER 2014

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Meliha Altunışık
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nurten Birlik
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Asst. Prof. Dr. Elif Öztapak-Avcı
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. Nursel İçöz (METU, FLE) _____

Asst. Prof. Dr. Elif Öztapak-Avcı (METU, FLE) _____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mine Özyurt Kılıç (DOĞUŞ U, FEF) _____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nazan Tutaş (ANKARA U, DTCF) _____

Asst. Prof. Dr. Margaret Sönmez (METU, FLE) _____

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

Name, Last name : Hilal Kaya

Signature :

ABSTRACT

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF DISCONTENT WITH MODERNITY AND MODERNIZATION IN THE NOVELS OF A. L. HUXLEY AND A. H. TANPINAR

KAYA, Hilal

Ph.D., English Literature

Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Elif ÖZTABAK-AVCI

December 2014, 346 pages

The aim of this dissertation is to explore Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar's philosophical and fictional engagement with Aldous Leonard Huxley in relation to the issues of modernity and modernization. Being attentive to the cultural specificities informing the work of each writer, this project has set out to find to what extent Tanpınar adopts, revises and/or contests Huxley's attitude towards modernity and modernization in his novels. This dissertation argues that Huxley and Tanpınar make a criticism of the understanding of the modern which is based on the liberal narrative of modernity by writing satirical novels of ideas. Some theoretical concepts developed later by the Frankfurt School thinkers like Adorno, Horkheimer and Marcuse will be used as a theoretical framework to explore better Huxley's problematization of modernity. The ideas of Henri Bergson, Walter Benjamin, Sufism and Multiple Modernities will also be used as a theoretical framework to discuss Tanpınar's approach to modernity. This study aims to contribute not only to the scholarship on Tanpınar's fiction but also to the critical studies on Huxley, whose works of fiction have rarely been examined from an international perspective. With this end in view A. L. Huxley's *Point Counter Point* (1928) and *Brave New World* (1932) and A. H. Tanpınar's *A Mind at Peace* (1949) and *The Time Regulation Institute* (1961) will be studied in a comparative manner.

Key Words: A.L. Huxley, A.H. Tanpınar, The Frankfurt School, Multiple Modernities.

ÖZ

A. L. HUXLEY VE A. H. TANPINAR'IN ROMANLARINDA MODERNİTE VE MODERNLEŞME MEMNUNİYETSİZLİĞİ ÜZERİNE KARŞILAŞTIRMALI BİR ÇALIŞMA

KAYA, Hilal
Doktora, İngiliz Edebiyatı
Tez Yöneticisi: Yard. Doç. Dr. Elif ÖZTABAK-AVCI

Aralık 2014, 346 sayfa

Bu tezin amacı modernite ve modernleşme konularına ilişkin olarak Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar'ın Aldous Leonard Huxley ile olan felsefi ve kurgusal diyalogunu incelemektir. Yazarların metinlerindeki kültürel farklılıkları göz önünde bulunduran bu çalışma, Huxley'nin romanlarında modernite ve modernleşme konularına ilişkin tavrını, Tanpınar'ın kendi romanlarında ne ölçüde benimsediğini, gözden geçirdiğini ve/veya bu tavırla ne kadar çatıştığını bulmak amacıyla yola çıkmıştır. Bu tez Huxley ve Tanpınar'ın satirik fikir romanları yazarak, liberal modernite söylemine dayanan modern anlayışını eleştirdiklerini iddia etmektedir. Adorno, Horkheimer ve Marcuse gibi Frankfurt Okulu teorisyenleri tarafından sonradan geliştirilen bazı kuramlar, bu çalışma tarafından Huxley'nin modernite sorunsallaştırmasının daha iyi incelenmesi amacıyla kuramsal çerçeve olarak kullanılacaktır. Yine, Henri Bergson, Walter Benjamin, Tasavvuf ve Çoklu Moderniteler tarafından geliştirilen fikirler, Tanpınar'ın modernite yaklaşımını tartışmak için teorik çerçeve olarak kullanılacaktır. Ayrıca bu çalışma hem Tanpınar'ın edebi metinleri üzerine yazılmış olan eleştirel literatüre hem de edebi metinleri nadiren uluslararası bir perspektiften değerlendirilen Huxley araştırmalarına katkıda bulunmayı amaçlamaktadır. Bu amaçla, A.L. Huxley'nin *Point Counter Point* (1928) ile *Brave New World* (1932) ve A. H. Tanpınar'ın *Huzur* (1949) ile *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* (1961) adlı romanları mukayeseli bir şekilde çalışılacaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: A.L. Huxley, A.H. Tanpınar, Frankfurt Okulu, Çoklu Moderniteler.

**To my dear husband and daughter,
Murat Utku Kaya
and
İda Kaya**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to Assist. Prof. Dr. Elif ÖZTABAK-AVCI for all the help and support she has given me throughout this study. Her enduring interest and positive attitude as well as her constant readiness and willingness to share valuable comments and suggestions have greatly contributed to the making of this thesis.

I would also like to express my gratefulness to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mine ÖZYURT KILIÇ and Assist. Prof. Dr. Margaret J. M. SÖZMEZ, whose comments and observations especially at the initial stages of this study have perfectly illuminated the later stages, too. Their lasting faith in me throughout has also been a constant source of guidance, motivation and encouragement.

Prof. Dr. Nursel İÇÖZ and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nazan TUTAŞ have all read and examined this study with great care and interest. I am indebted to them for their meticulous assessment, constructive criticism, illuminating questions, and suggestions for improvement. Prof. Dr. Ayten C. BEAR has been ready to listen, encourage, and reassure throughout. Talking to them is always a source of comfort. I am thankful for their genuine interest in what I do.

My friends have all been helpful and considerate throughout. I thank them not only for being good listeners and supporters but also for tolerating my long absences throughout the writing of this thesis. I would especially like to thank my best friend Murat Utku KAYA for his patience, tolerance and understanding right from the beginning. His presence is always reassuring, and he has a surprising way of boosting my spirits even when I am feeling down. I am much obliged to him for always being there to share, help, encourage, and motivate; especially during the times when I was pregnant with our baby, İda KAYA.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ÖZ	v
DEDICATION	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	viii
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Literature Review	2
1.2 Theorizing Modernity and Modernization	5
1.3 Modernity and Modernization in Huxley's and Tanpınar's Fiction	10
1.4 Methodology	11
2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND	22
2.1 Conceptualizing Huxley's Approach to the Modern, Modernity and Modernization	24
2.1.1 <i>Jesting Pilate, Proper Studies and Do What You Will</i> as Frameworks for Huxley's Satirical Novels	27
2.1.2 Mass Culture and Culture Industry	41
2.1.3 Progress	52
2.1.4 Work, Leisure and Pleasure	58
2.2 Conceptualizing Tanpınar's Approach to the Modern, Modernity and Modernization	65
2.2.1 Tanpınar, Huxley and the Frankfurt School Theorists	81
2.2.2 Tanpınar's Approach to the Modern	87
2.2.2.1 Tanpınar and the Multiple Modernities	

Approach	90
3. THE DIFFERING FORMULATIONS OF THE MODERN IN <i>POINT COUNTER POINT</i> AND <i>A MIND AT PEACE</i>	117
3.1 The Novel of Ideas	118
3.1.1 The Counterpoint Technique and the Musicalization of Fiction	122
3.1.2 The Role of Setting in the Discussion of Leisure and Pleasure	137
3.2 Huxley’s and Tanpınar’s Ideas of the Modern as Represented through Characters	158
4. THE CORRESPONDING FORMULATIONS OF THE MODERN IN <i>BRAVE NEW WORLD</i> AND <i>THE</i> <i>TIME REGULATION INSTITUTE</i>	181
4.1 Satire and The Modern Satirical Novel	182
4.1.1 <i>Brave New World</i> as a Satirical Dystopian Novel of Ideas	187
4.1.1.1 The Historical Context of <i>Brave New</i> <i>World</i>	203
4.1.2 <i>The Time Regulation Institute</i> as a Satirical Allegory	213
4.1.2.1 The Historical Context of <i>The Time</i> <i>Regulation Institute</i>	242
4.2 The Deconstruction of Temporal Binaries in Huxley’s and Tanpınar’s Configuration of the Modern: Multiple Experiences of Modernity	246
5. CONCLUSION	277
BIBLIOGRAPHY	281
APPENDICES	
A. CITATIONS FROM TANPINAR’S WORK IN TURKISH	311
B. TURKISH SUMMARY	329

C. CURRICULUM VITAE	345
D. TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU	346

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This study analyses Aldous Leonard Huxley's *Point Counter Point* (1928) and *Brave New World* (1932) and Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar's *A Mind at Peace* (1949) and *The Time Regulation Institute* (1961)¹ in a comparative manner and argues that both Huxley and Tanpınar wrote modern satirical novels of ideas as a result of their discontent with "the liberal narrative of modernity" (Mirsepassi 2). The thesis argues that these novels are informed by the ways in which Huxley and Tanpınar problematize modernity and modernization. The study further argues that modern satirical novels of ideas written by Huxley and Tanpınar differ from many novels of their contemporaries because they overtly deal with social and political issues and introduce a re-definition of and a new outlook on the modern.

Being attentive to the cultural specificities informing the work of each writer, this dissertation argues that both Huxley and Tanpınar were engaged with the issues of modernity and modernization and that their understandings of the modern manifested both differences and similarities. The thesis argues that although Tanpınar's attitude towards the idea of the modern was more or less the same throughout his writing career, Huxley's engagement with modernity went through a change. That is, when he wrote *Point Counter Point* his idea of the modern was closer to the liberal narrative of modernity: *Point Counter Point* idealizes "the West" and equates it with modernity. From *Brave New World* on, however, Huxley

¹ Throughout this study, all the references given from Tanpınar's non-literary work and poems (except the part taken from "Neither Am I inside Time") are translated from Turkish to English by the writer of this dissertation, unless otherwise stated. However, the references given from Tanpınar's novels are taken from the translated versions (from Turkish into English) of the novels by Ender Gürol (*The Time Regulation Institute* 2001) and Erdağ Gökner (*A Mind at Peace* 2008). See Appendix A for the Turkish origins of all references.

started to make a criticism of this understanding of the modern and re-conceptualized his attitude to modernity. Some theoretical concepts that were developed later by the Frankfurt School thinkers like Theodor Adorno (1903-1969), Max Horkheimer (1895-1973) and Herbert Marcuse (1898-1979) will be discussed, both to show how Huxley and the Frankfurt School thinkers are similarly attached to the discussion of modernity and to enrich the exploration of Huxley's problematization of modernity. In other words, this study argues that the theories developed later by the Frankfurt School thinkers concerning their critical attitude to modernity, encompassing *Dialectic of Enlightenment* (1944), *Eros and Civilization* (1955) and *One-Dimensional Man* (1964), provide a valuable means to explore Huxley's novels' critical attitude to modernity. In addition to this, after introducing the ideas of Henri Bergson (1859-1941), Walter Benjamin (1892-1940), and Sufism, and briefly outlining how the idea of Multiple Modernities offers an epistemological framework through which to understand Tanpınar's approach to modernity, the thesis argues for the validity of and value in relating the philosophies and ideas of Bergson, Benjamin, Sufism and Multiple Modernities to Tanpınar's understandings of time and the idea of the modern. It proposes that such an analysis can situate both Huxley and Tanpınar in relation to twentieth-century debates about modernity and modernization. This study also aims to contribute not only to scholarship on Tanpınar's fiction but also to critical studies on Huxley, whose works of fiction have rarely been examined from an international perspective.

1.1 Literature Review

The work of Huxley and Tanpınar have not been explored from a comparative perspective yet, and in this respect this study aims to fill in a void in the scholarship on Huxley's and Tanpınar's fictions.

Huxley is today best known for his dystopian novel *Brave New World* (1932) and his experiments with LSD, but he played a broader role as an intellectual and especially as a supporter of pacifism and a spiritually-

inspired idea of a cosmopolitan community. He wrote essays and novels to explore an account of modern political and social international affairs, and to define and satirize the social and political conditions of England as a microcosm of the modern Western civilization. He thought that fiction was one of the most effective means of transmitting his ideas to the widest possible audience. Therefore, in his novels he dealt with such issues as science, technology, social criticism, social engineering, the role of time, alienated labor and forms of entertainment. Yet, as mentioned before, his name is most frequently associated with utopian/dystopian literature and his novels are thus compared with other writers of utopian/dystopian literature from English literature like Thomas More, Jonathan Swift, H. G. Wells and George Orwell.² This study claims to be distinctive because it explores Huxley's works of fiction from an international perspective and in relation to the issues of modernity and modernization.

As an essayist, critic, poet and novelist, Tanpınar dealt with lots of ideas which have led to many debates, and therefore his works allow multiple and sometimes contradictory readings. What makes Tanpınar different from his contemporary Turkish intellectuals and authors is that he was equally concerned with religious life, the concept of civilization, modernization, the notion of the nation and the relationships among them throughout his entire career. Several studies have been carried out to highlight certain historical events in Turkey that played a direct role in Tanpınar's work and affected his intellectual and artistic progress in a

² Corrado, Adriana. *Da un'isola all'altra: il pensiero utopica nella narrativa inglese da Thomas More and Aldous Huxley*. Napoli: Scientifiche Italiane, 1998.
Mencütekin, Mustafa. "Platonic influence on utopian literature: *Republic* and T. More's *Utopia* (16th cen.), J. Swift's *Gulliver's Travels* (book IV) (18th cen.), A. Huxley's *Brave New World* (early 20th cen.)." M.A. Thesis. Fatih Üniversitesi, 2000.
Pavičić-Ivelja, Katarina. "Mindless Pleasure or Constant Pain – *Brave New World* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*: The Comparison." M.A. Thesis. University of Rijeka, 2014.
Bhat, Yashoda. *Aldous Huxley and George Orwell: A Comparative Study of Satire in Their Novels*. New Delhi: Sterling, 1991.

chronological order parallel to the Turkish history.³ The recurrent issues in Tanpınar's work that inform these studies are love, death, irony, satire, the woman, the issues of "the West" and "the East," religion, society and the civilization/modernization crisis. The similarities between Tanpınar's and Benjamin's ideas concerning time and past have been emphasized by critics such as Oğuz Demiralp, Nurdan Gürbilek and Besim Dellaloğlu,⁴ and this parallelism will provide a valuable means by which to interpret Tanpınar's novels in the analytical chapters. Furthermore, it should be added that Tanpınar's literary works have been explored in a comparative manner with other modernist writers like James Joyce, Marcel Proust, Eduardo Mendoza, T. S. Eliot and Paul Valéry.⁵

This study aims to bring Huxley out of the confines of genre-specific and nation-based scholarship and explore his novels along with a Turkish novelist's two major novels regarding the ways in which they formulate and represent their discontent with modernity and modernization.

³ Adalı, Murat. "Geleneğin Farklı Bir Yorumcusu: Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar" *Hece* No. 61 Ocak 2002.

Okay, Orhan. "Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar" *TYB Akademi* No. 5 Mayıs 2002.

Lekesiz, Ömer. "Tanpınar Nereden ve Nasıl Bakar?" *Hece* No. 61 Ocak 2002.

Turinay, Necmettin. "Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar: 1932 Öncesi ve Sonrası" *Hece* No. 61 Ocak 2002.

Şevki, Abdullah. "Toplumumuza Bakış Açısı ve Siyasi Duruşu Yönünden Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar" *Hece* No. 61 Ocak 2002.

⁴ Demiralp, Oğuz. *Kutup Noktası*. İstanbul: YKY, 1993. Print.

Gürbilek, Nurdan. *Benden Önce Bir Başkası*. İstanbul: Metis, 2010. Print.

Dellaloğlu, Besim F. *Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar-Modernleşmenin Zihniyet Dünyası ve Bir Tanpınar Fetişizmi*. İstanbul: Kapı Yayınları, 2012. Print.

⁵Gündoğdu, Servet. "*Huzur ve Ulysses*'te derin semantik olarak zaman sorunu." M.A. Thesis. Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi, 2012.

Günday Rıfat. "Problèmes du temps chez Marcel Proust et Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar." PhD. Diss. Marmara Üniversitesi, 1997.

Şenyıldız, Özlem. "Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar ve Eduardo Mendoza'da mekândan Öte Şehirler: *Huzur*'un İstanbul'u ile *Mucizeler Kenti*'nin Barcelona'sı." M.A. Thesis. İstanbul Üniversitesi, 2009.

Çakmak, İdris. "The portraits of the artists as critics in the recreation of the modern with tradition: Tanpınar and Eliot." M.A. Thesis. Fatih Üniversitesi, 2008.

Yolcu, Burcu. "Reading Valéry through Tanpınar: The analysis of an influence." M.A. Thesis. Sabancı Üniversitesi, 2011.

1.2 Theorizing Modernity and Modernization

The idea of the modern is highly ambiguous and this becomes most apparent in the impossibility of specifying a single definition of it. The modern is associated with many other terms such as pre-modern, tradition, post-modern, hypermodern, modernization, modernity and so on.

According to Ali Mirsepassi, in order to theorize modernity and modernization and to understand “whether modernity is a totalizing ideology and inherently hostile to ‘local’ social and cultural experiences [...] or whether there is any possibility for different paths to modernity,” (4) one needs to “explore the genealogy of the Western modernity and its dichotomizing representation of non-Western cultures and societies” (1). Ali Mirsepassi’s categorization of the Western narratives of modernity in *Intellectual Discourse and the Politics of Modernization* (2004) – in which he aims to “lay out a story of Iranian modernity and to explore this troubled and troubling situation” (1) – provides this study with a set of working definitions of the terms central to this study. To begin with, he argues that “modernity as both an intellectual and a political project has a long history of differentiating, excluding and dominating the non-Western parts of the world” (4). He accordingly claims that one can talk about two major narratives of the Western modernity: “the liberal tradition of modernity” and “a more radical vision of modernity” (1, 2). In this categorization, he states that

the liberal tradition of modernity (Montesquieu, Hegel, Weber, Durkheim, Orientalism) privileges Western cultural and moral dispositions, defining modernity in terms of Western cultural and historical experiences. The liberal vision of modernity [...] considers Western culture an essential part of modernization, viewing non-Western cultures and traditions as fundamentally hostile to modernity and incompatible with modernization. (1, 2)

As a part of the liberal vision of modernity, modernization is also positioned against the traditional, or “the new” is posed against what “pre-existed.” Modernity’s temporality takes only one understanding of time, the history of the West, having a linear, progressive movement from past to future. The

modern which allegedly emerged distinctively and exclusively in the West claims to be universal and to represent the world history. In this respect, the conception of historical time renders modern history singular and uniform, and modern history refers to the advancement of modernity in “the West.” The idea of a single historical time either ignores the possibility of more than one history or tends to fit the other histories in to the historical time of the West. Furthermore, modernization describes the conflict between the modern and the traditional qualitatively; that is “the modern West” is taken as superior to “the traditional non-West.” As Timothy Mitchell points out, “modernization continues to be commonly understood as a process begun and finished in Europe, from where it has been exported across ever-expanding regions of the non-West” (1). Theorizing modernity is conventionally made up of studying the development of Western bourgeois socio-economic and cultural-intellectual formations. It presumes the existence of the dualism between the West and its exterior. In this respect, modernity is defined not just spatially but temporally or in historical stages.

Mirsepasi names the second narrative of modernity as “the radical vision of modernity (as articulated by Marx, Habermas, Giddens and Berman) [which] envisions modernization as practical and empirical experience that liberates societies from their oppressive ‘material’ conditions” (2). So the difference between the liberal and radical visions of modernity is related to the latter’s emphasis on modernity as a material condition, and thus it provides the existence of the likelihood of a more locally explained formulation of modernization. However, since the radical vision of modernity, like the liberal vision, tends to overlook ethnicity, the legacy of imperialism and colonialism, it is open to be appropriated by the Eurocentric theories of modernity and modernization. In other words, according to Mirsepasi, what both visions of modernity ignore is “the colonial terrain of modernity and universalism,” (4) and in this respect, both visions of modernity can be considered Eurocentric because they exclude the non-Western part of the world and they do not conceptualize modernity

from a universal perspective. For these visions, modernization means industrialization of the West. In the non-Western context, modernization can only refer to a project of “‘development’ or ‘catching up’ with, and homogenizing into, the economically, politically and culturally modern West” (Mirsepassi 6).

These visions of modernity have three fundamental assumptions: first, they define non-West as a singular, essentialized entity. In addition, Mirsepassi contends, they “frame the West as having an unchanging cultural essence, and ‘East’ and ‘West’ as disconnected, static, and ontologically separate ‘things’ [...] an endless logic of reductionist binaries springs from these obscure and essentialized categories” (8). Second, they define contemporary conditions in non-West in the sense of conditions of Western experience. And third, they make the assumption that there is only one fundamental route that leads to modernity in the world, and “the West” lived through this route in advance of “the non-West.” A critical exploration of these assumptions thus reveals that these visions of modernity are Eurocentric and are conceptualized to consolidate Western domination.

To the categorization of the Western narratives of modernity provided by Mirsepassi, we can add two more approaches to modernity that are informed by the qualities which the liberal and radical narratives lack or ignore: the third one is the critical discourse of modernity (as articulated by Huxley in the nineteen twenties and the Frankfurt School) and the fourth one is the Multiple Modernities approach, which will be used to explain Huxley’s (specifically after the nineteen thirties) and Tanpınar’s approaches to modernity and modernization.

The critical discourse of modernity as produced by Huxley (throughout the twenties) and later such Frankfurt School thinkers as Adorno, Horkheimer and Marcuse is similar to the liberal vision of modernity in that both narratives argue that modernity is a Western paradigm and for the non-West modernization means Westernization. In their depiction of modernity, “‘the West’ is the ideal model while the non-

Western world's existence can be summed up in terms of what it *is not* in relation to this ideal" (emphasis original, Mirsepassi 8). Yet, while the critical discourse of modernity agree with many important intellectual hypotheses of the liberal vision of modernity, its emphasis on (Western) culture and subjectivism renders the critical discourse of modernity articulated by Huxley, Adorno, Horkheimer and Marcuse different. In other words, Huxley and the Frankfurt School theorists criticized the liberal tradition of modernity for not taking "culture, values, morality, and religion" as "the first issue" (Mirsepassi 9). Placing priority on culture (even it is on the Western culture) and criticizing progressivism, the critical discourse is thus engaged with the paradigm of modernity. During the last century, the Frankfurt School thinkers produced a critique of both the liberal and radical visions of modernity in *Dialectic of Enlightenment* (1944). This study refers to the critical terminology – mass culture, progress, instrumental rationality, labor-leisure, pleasure and culture industry – produced by Adorno, Horkheimer and Marcuse for two purposes: to foreground how Huxley's ideas in his novels and essays became influential on the thinkers of the Frankfurt School in developing their theoretical concepts later, and to show that this connection between their ideas becomes instrumental in this study since it enriches our reading of Huxley's novels. Therefore, finding parallelisms between Huxley's ideas in his novels and the Frankfurt School thinkers' terminology is not an anachronistic approach. On the contrary, it indicates that Huxley and the theorists produced a critique of Western modernity in similar terms, and in this respect it can be argued that Huxley's arguments of modernity influenced the Frankfurt School thinkers' conceptualization of modernity and both Huxley's and the thinkers' arguments concerning modernity and modernization belong to the same critical narrative of modernity.

The failure to adequately theorize colonialism leaves both the liberal and radical visions of modernity close to the Eurocentric tendencies of prevailing narratives of modernity and modernization. Likewise, the

modernization theory claims that its aim is to make non-Western societies closer to the modern West; that is, in this equation, modernization means Westernization. However, as contemporary debates in postcolonial scholarship have revealed, the European “other” was functional in Western self-definition of its modernity. These debates re-contextualized the meaning attached to “modernity” and “modernization.” In addition, against the dominant forms of modernity, the idea of recovering the local or turning to the “authenticity” of the local is recognized. But by “local” resistance, Mirsepassi argues, what is meant is the “‘local’ politics based on local ‘identities’ in the ‘Third World’ as the invention of resistance against Western power, but not for this reason as anti-modern” (11). So, the weaknesses in the logic of the Western narratives of modernity and modernization theory paved the path for what we know today as the Multiple Modernities approach which aims to dismantle the Eurocentric beliefs of the Western narratives of modernity. The idea of Multiple Modernities also aims to deconstruct the conventional binary oppositions such as modernity vs. tradition, the developed/civilized vs the undeveloped/primitive which were instrumental in the self-explanation of “the West” and in the formation of the modern. According to the Multiple Modernities approach, there can be more than one path to modernity and every society may offer its own unique response which will spring from its specific cultural-traditional inheritance. That is, societies can experience modernity on their own terms; this is an actualization of a modernity which is based on national, cultural experiences and historical knowledge. In this respect, the Multiple Modernities approach aims to reconcile the modern with the traditional/the local/the cultural for the purpose of exploring the possibilities of plurality in defining the modern.

Huxley’s and Tanpinar’s critique of the modern presents affinities with that of Multiple Modernities in that Tanpinar throughout his writing career and Huxley specifically after the thirties formulated the modern not in terms of geographical spaces (east, west, Europe, non-Europe) nor did

they approach the modern in historical stages (past, present, future, the new and traditional). Although they do not criticize the idea of the modern, modernity and modernization *per se*, they adopt a critical approach to an understanding of the modern that sees the modern as a rupture, or in terms of dichotomies such as the west and the east or the modern and the traditional.

1.3 Modernity and Modernization in Huxley's and Tanpınar's Fiction

Huxley's and Tanpınar's critical approaches to the understanding of modernity and modernization are often reflected as uneasiness in their satirical novels. In other words, they criticize the modern not because it is "a stage of history but because history itself is staged by it" (Mitchell 1). In Huxley's *Point Counter Point* the liberal and radical visions of modernity are criticized not because they are Eurocentric but because, as the novel reflects, they preach a modern life that merely foregrounds mindless pleasure, instrumental rationality, developmentalism and the materialistic approach to life; they ignore the cultural approach. In his *Brave New World* and in Tanpınar's both *A Mind at Peace* and *The Time Regulation Institute*, a new conceptualization of modernity and modernization is presented and thus the modern is set free from the confines of the binary oppositions like the modern vs. the traditional. Their idea of the modern as implied in these novels proposes a new temporal formulation that transcends not only what Bergson calls "mathematical time" or "homogeneous empty time" but also the geographical signifiers.

In Huxley's novels, this approach to the modern in time-related terms manifests itself as a critique of the modern world that mechanizes time and thus dehumanizes the individual because the mathematical/mechanized time eliminates creativity and leaves the individual with the repetitive work and alienation. There is an affiliation between Huxley's thoughts and the theories developed later by the Frankfurt School thinkers; that is, Huxley's novels can be taken as a satire on what

Adorno and Horkheimer call mass production, progressivism, and the Enlightenment myths.

In Tanpınar's novels the formulation of the modern is informed by a feeling of discontent and critique of the modernization project in Turkey and is founded instead on his idea of "continuity in change," or the coexistence of evolution and preservation of the past traditions (*terkip*), and a formulation of time that is similar to Bergsonian "pure time" or "*durée*." Tanpınar's fiction lends itself to a Bergsonian analysis because Tanpınar's problematization and criticism of the idea of time advocated by the modernization project carried out in Turkey seems to be founded on a Bergsonian conceptualization of time. Also, tradition in Tanpınar's novels is approached as a source of cultural innovation and it helps "the process of coming to terms with the past" (Göle, "Snapshots" 92). According to Tanpınar, "Turkish reality" is haunted by what has gone by; in that sense history itself is a specter to be confronted. In his fiction, the process of settling accounts with the past becomes possible through Bergsonian understanding of "pure time" because it cannot be confined within the limits of spatial and temporal boundaries. Furthermore Tanpınar, whose ideas in his fiction are in accordance with the perspective provided by the Multiple Modernities approach, seeks ways to synchronize the local and traditional specificities of a culture and the modern.

1.4 Methodology

This study undertakes a comparison that is against any form of hegemonic centrism. Cognizant of the danger of imposing a universalist model that suppresses particular differences between two cultures, this thesis has two methodical challenges: the first is to perceive the literary world of Huxley and Tanpınar in its "fundamental unity." This imperative is similar to the one that leads Michael Riffaterre to declare that "a text becomes properly literary only when it is decontextualized [... so,] a text survives the extinction of the issues, the vanishing of the causes, and the

memory of the circumstances to which it responded” (68). So this view provides us with a cross-cultural attitude by “decontextualizing” the novels and it stresses the idea of literariness without feeling anxious about “the cultural and historical specificities about which,” Charles Bernheimer asserts, “cultural studies should worry” (“Introduction” 10). This view will be beneficial in the analysis of similar generic aspects of the novels. The second effort is to discuss the differences between Huxley’s and Tanpınar’s understandings of the modern and its reflections in their novels because of the fact that their work is constructed differently in different contexts and different historical moments. Although seemingly contradictory, these two efforts will be adopted throughout the analysis of the novels in Chapter 3 and 4 as well because, as Bernheimer states, in a comparative project “the two modes [explicating the similarities and differences] are inextricably bound together” (“Introduction” 16).

In accordance with its aim of accounting for Huxley’s and Tanpınar’s critiques in their fiction of an understanding of the modern which rests on the liberal narrative of modernity, this study begins with a theoretical chapter. Chapter 2 aims primarily to draw a theoretical framework, consisting of two main sections. The first one starts with an exploration of Huxley’s approach to the modern, modernity and modernization in his non-literary works like *Jesting Pilate* (1926), *Proper Studies* (1927), and *Do What You Will* (1929). Its aim is to shed light on the upcoming analytical chapters in which his understating of the modern that informs *Point Counter Point* (1928) and *Brave New World* (1932) will be highlighted. Huxley’s work between the 1920s and the 1930s exemplifies three different phases of his approach to modernity: first, his fascination with the Western narrative of modernity in the early twenties; then, his critique of it from a Eurocentric perspective in the late twenties; and finally, his critical approach to the liberal narrative of modernity and progressivism starting from the early thirties on. As mentioned earlier, parallelisms between Huxley and the Frankfurt School thinkers’ ideas concerning mass

culture, progress, labor-leisure, pleasure and culture industry are foregrounded in order to structure a theoretical framework to study Huxley's novels in the analytical chapters.

The second section of Chapter 2 provides historical information concerning the outcomes of the experience of modernity and modernization in Turkey and the notions such as the past, tradition, civilizational change, and time that inform Tanpınar's *A Mind at Peace* (1949) and *The Time Regulation Institute* (1961) are explored. Therefore, this part of the chapter explores modernity and modernization discussions in relation to Turkey to understand if Tanpınar's discontent stems from the idea of modernity itself or its application in Turkish society. So, the narratives that account for Turkey's modernization – the narrative resting on the liberal tradition of modernity and the narrative that defines the modern as local and multiple during the Ottoman *Tanzimat*,⁶ *Meşrutiyet*⁷ and in the early years of the Republic – are discussed in this part. Tanpınar's emphasis on a culturally-specific approach to modernity and his idea of "continuity in change" (*terkip*) in his fiction has often caused him to be considered as a conservative or reactionary writer. This part of the chapter also reveals how this view about Tanpınar is challenged in the last few decades. This section draws attention to how Tanpınar's ideas of time, history, cultural multiplicity and locality within the discourse of modernity and modernization may be aligned with the idea of Multiple Modernities. Discussing Henri Bergson's influence on Tanpınar's ideas and the parallels between Walter Benjamin's philosophy and Tanpınar's work, the chapter will also emphasize that time in Tanpınar's work is not linear; it is rather imagined as an infinite and monolithic totality. The section also aims to

⁶ "The *Tanzimat*, (Turkish: "Reorganization"), series of reforms promulgated in the Ottoman Empire between 1839 and 1876 under the reigns of the sultans Abdülmecid I and Abdülaziz. These reforms, heavily influenced by Western ideas, were intended to effectuate a fundamental change of the empire from the old system based on theocratic principles to that of a modern state" (*Encyclopedia Britannica Online*).

⁷ The period denotes the constitutional monarchy in the Ottoman Empire. *Meşrutiyet* took place twice in the Ottoman history; the first in 1876 and the second in 1908.

explore the possible reasons why Tanpınar found Bergsonism and *Mevlevi*⁸ Sufism equally appealing as reflected in his work. Modernity, according to Tanpınar, in its plural form is not something that is against traditions and spiritual (*manevi*) values. This section emphasizes that in his fiction Tanpınar challenges the idea which maintains that modernity and modernization in Turkey should be a variation on a universal model of euro-modernities. In this regard, his idea of *terkip* as a new outlook on modernity, which favors the coexistence of evolution and preservation of the past traditions, is explored here. *Terkip* reveals Tanpınar's suggestion concerning how a Turkish modernity can be created and experienced.

Chapter 3 is a comparative study of Huxley's *Point Counter Point* (1928) and Tanpınar's *A Mind at Peace* (1949). The chapter sets out to explore to what extent Tanpınar's novel engages with and/or is in conflict with Huxley's novel regarding their approaches to the modern. The chapter makes it clear at the outset why and how *Point Counter Point* and *A Mind at Peace* are brought together in this comparative study. The sub-genre of the novel, the novel of ideas, is used by both Huxley and Tanpınar as the framework of their novels because it provides them with the necessary tools for the exploration and problematization of social, cultural issues and an analysis of the idea of the modern. Also, the novel of ideas is integrated with the counterpoint technique and the musicalization of fiction in both novels, which is a means of emphasizing the impossibility of an all-encompassing truth. Instead, they suggest the multiplicity of viewpoints and the idea of truth in-flux.

This chapter also focuses on a discussion of the setting in the context of leisure and pleasure. Whereas Huxley is engaged with the issue of "false

⁸ "The *Mevlevi* Order is an order of a mystical Islamic movement founded in Konya (then capital of the Anatolian Seljuk Sultanate) by the followers of Jalal ad-Din Muhammad Balkhi-Rumi, a 13th-century Persian poet, Islamic jurist, and theologian, whose popular title *mawlaw* (Arabic: "our master") gave the order its name. European travelers identified the *awlawiyah* as dancing (or whirling) dervishes, based on their observations of the order's ritual prayer (*dhikr*) performed spinning on the right foot to the accompaniment of musical instruments like a *ney*, a reed flute" (*Encyclopedia Britannica Online*).

or mind-numbing leisure” (*Point Counter Point* 57) as a problem stemming from modernity, Tanpınar does not regard leisure as false pleasure. In Marcusean terms, Huxley condemns “the horrors of modern ‘pleasure,’” or the prevalence of mass produced, widely accessible entertainment, and “compulsive good-timing” that dull the mind. Tanpınar, however, takes a far more positive view of leisure in the Turkish context because he thinks that leisure has a potential to create an aesthetic dimension in the individual soul, “demanding intelligence and personal initiative” (Huxley, “Pleasures” 356). Leisure can unravel this dimension by means of imaginative ingenuity and mental work; and in this way, Tanpınar thinks, the characters in *A Mind at Peace* can experience genuine pleasure by means of the Sufi and Bergsonian conceptualization of pure time.

The last section of Chapter 3 focuses on the characters in pairs based on their similar attitudes to life in order to demonstrate the critical perspectives and attitudes Huxley and Tanpınar held towards some aspects of their society in matters of modernity and modernization. Huxley’s novel, through one of the characters, Rampion, raises one of the most severe criticisms of modern human beings and modernity itself. In this part it is reflected how the novel emphasizes the rottenness of the London intelligentsia as a microcosm of the modern Western civilization. The novel, through Rampion again, criticizes “modern progressivist thought which reached its apotheosis in the positivism and scientism of the century of industrialism” (Grosvenor 6) leading up to the World War I. Rampion preaches (D. H. Lawrence’s philosophy of) vitalism, spontaneity, immediacy and intensity of feeling. This part of the chapter also illustrates how Huxley’s formulation of the modern and its implied definition in the late twenties (as manifested through Rampion’s arguments) were founded on a Eurocentric perspective. His conceptualization of modernity in this novel relies on the liberal narrative of modernity that sees modernity as a distinctively and exclusively Western notion. This section also explores Tanpınar’s formulation of the modern and contrasts it with Huxley’s attitude

to the modern in the late twenties. This part reveals that Tanpınar's understanding of the modern is different from that of Huxley in that his formulation of the modern is based upon his idea of *terkip*, which emphasizes the idea of "establishing a new life particular to us" (*A Mind at Peace* 106). Having parallelisms with the Multiple Modernities approach, his notion of *terkip* suggests an idea of modernity that is local, polycentric and respectful to multiplicity of identities. The modernization project as carried out in Turkey is characterized by experiences of "break," "rupture" and "crisis," and his idea of *terkip* can be taken as a way to cope with the problems brought about by the modernization project. Unlike Huxley, Tanpınar reads modernity in terms introduced by Bergsonian and Sufi philosophies. By means of the Sufi music and Bergsonian understanding of pure time, in Tanpınar's novel the categories like the traditional, the past, the East and the modern, the present, the West lose their distinction and dissolve in his monolithic understanding of time. To Tanpınar, the Turkish modernity can be achieved by means of *terkip*, or "to change by continuing and to continue by changing."

Chapter 3 is concluded with a discussion of similar suicides of two characters from each novel. It is argued that in Tanpınar's novel *Suad* commits suicide in a similar way to Spandrell in Huxley's novel because Tanpınar aims to pinpoint the problematic nature of the modernization project carried out in Turkey: modernity and modernization in Turkey were wrongly taken as Westernization. This section argues that "the borrowed or translated suicide" of Tanpınar's character underscores the inauthenticity of the modernization project carried out in Turkey, and Tanpınar satirizes it through a "borrowed" suicide scene.

Chapter 4 is a comparative study of Huxley's *Brave New World* (1932) and Tanpınar's *The Time Regulation Institute* (1961) in terms of their structural and thematic features which seem to be shaped by the writers' discontent with modernity and modernization. Unlike the previous one, this chapter aims to reveal that the distance between the two writers regarding

their understanding of the modern decreases towards the later years of their writing careers and to show that their discontent with modernity as exposed in their novels has resemblances particularly in terms of both novels' criticisms of the formulation of time in the liberal tradition of modernity and in their deeming modernity a rupture. In this respect, the chapter aims to indicate that *Brave New World* manifests a paradigm shift in Huxley's understanding of the modern because the novel is structured around a conceptualization of the modern not in terms of space but of time. This shift is significant because, firstly, it indicates that Huxley's understanding of the modern is now closer to that of Tanpinar's; and, secondly, both writers' attempt to conceptualize the modern in terms of time indicates that they are discontented with the ways in which the modern is imagined.

The chapter discusses both novels as examples of the modern satirical novel. It initially argues that satire is a literary mode that enables Huxley and Tanpinar to express their discontent with the idea of the modern. Also, the subgenre of the satirical novel makes it possible for both Huxley and Tanpinar to make a critique of modernity and modernization. That is, one can find a connection between the genre and the writers' critique of modernity: Huxley's *Brave New World* is an example of the dystopian novel of ideas and Tanpinar's *The Time Regulation Institute* is a satirical allegory, in which both writers approach the idea of the modern critically.

Chapter 4 touches upon Huxley's novel as a dystopian novel of ideas and explores to what extent the novel can be called so. The historical context of the novel is also delineated in this chapter to put forward Huxley's fears concerning modern science, particularly applied science and technology which inform his novel. As a political satire in the form of a dystopian novel, the novel seems to underscore the concerns and problems regarding totalitarian ideologies, uncontrolled science and over-consumption. Particularly the supposedly neutral nature of science must

have caused Huxley to worry about ethical issues, which makes it possible to analyze the novel in the light of Marcuse's "technical reason."

The chapter proceeds with an exploration of Tanpınar's novel as a satirical allegory and the historical context in which it was written. In his novel Tanpınar depicts a Turkey in transformation as a consequence of the modernization project. This section of the chapter aims to display that modernization, as the novel's title indicates, should not be understood as a mere institute/a building/a name. *The Time Regulation Institute* is a novel in which Tanpınar explores the Turkish modernization and the societal effects of this process. Yet, unlike *A Mind at Peace*, *The Time Regulation Institute* is a more overtly political novel which questions the very foundations upon which the modernization project of Turkey was placed, such as progressivism, bureaucratization and the belief that there is a binary opposition between modernity and tradition. Tanpınar's novel does not approach the issue of Turkish modernization in terms of a dichotomy between the modern/present and the traditional/past. It equally criticizes "the new" and "the old" in the context of the modernization project. The novel suggests that Turkish society faced by duality is destined to fail because of a nation-wide inability to understand what the modern in Turkish context means. Therefore, it is a critique of the mentality behind the establishment of this institute in the novel which aims to justify the systematization of labor to increase the efficiency of work; yet, which ironically, turns out to be the very symbol of corrupt bureaucratization.

The last section of Chapter 4 deals with the deconstruction of the temporal binaries both in *Brave New World* and *The Time Regulation Institute*, and it explores the ways in which the novels reveal the importance of a plural experience of modernity. The novels indicate a similar conceptualization of the modern that challenges the limits of conventional time and deconstructs the binary oppositions like the past and the present, progressive and primitive, and private and public time. In the first part of this section it is argued that seeing "the dark side of the Western experiences

of modernity” (Mirsepassi 18) in the early thirties – such as the use of technology and science to control society, instrumental rationality, the Enlightenment faith in universalism, the emergence of a consumer society and of an authoritative state and “the West”’s fabrication of a dichotomy between itself and the notion of a non-Western “Other” and so on – Huxley seems to have begun deviating from his temporal and spatial formulations of modernity which previously, in *Point Counter Point* for instance, made him formulate time as a linear, progressive movement from the past to the future, and modernity as moving from the West to the East. That is, it seems that around the nineteen thirties in Huxley’s understanding of the modern a paradigm shift in the metaphysics of space and time occurred, which as a consequence brings his approach to the modern closer to that of Tanpinar’s. To both Huxley and Tanpinar, the space-based explanations of the modern reality bring forth a rupture in the flow of time and dichotomies like “the West” and “the East.” In their fiction, they challenge the limits of conventional time and manage to heal the breach between these dichotomies: neither the concept of the past nor the present is elevated or idealized.

In *Brave New World* the breach in the flow of time, that is, the rupture between the past and the present is emphasized through the use of the counterpoint technique. “The primitive” John the Savage is placed in opposition to “the modern” Mustapha Mond and the novel criticizes both positions equally. The climactic discussion scene between Mustapha Mond and John the Savage proves the neither world-view righteous or ideal, but it points out a stalemate or a huge dilemma. The novel suggests a way out of this dilemma by introducing a third character, Helmholtz Watson, who represents an alternative world-view to the philosophies of Mond and John. He stands for the hope to set both “the modern” and “the primitive” people free from their loop because he has the potential to transcend these constructed notions. *Brave New World* suggests that the problem of breach/rupture/dichotomy is solved by opening and widening the concept of

time so large that it is able to accommodate both the traditionally-defined concepts of the past and those of the future. Huxley's reconfiguration of the modern indicates the denial of binary oppositions and the prioritization of the concept of time, and in this respect it implies that Huxley after *Brave New World* abandoned his tendency to formulate the modern in Eurocentric terms.

In the second part of this section, Tanpınar's understanding of time, which is instrumental to formulate his idea of the modern in his satirical novel *The Time Regulation Institute*, is explored. It is argued that Tanpınar's discontent with the Turkish experience of modernity and modernization stems from what he sees as cultural cancellation or a cultural non-specificity as a consequence of a rupture in temporality. He does not explore the modern in terms of binaries set between the West and the East, the present and the past. In this sense, his critique of the modern in his fiction contributes to the critical studies on modernity which formulate it as global and multiple lacking a governing center. In his novel, by means of an institute, he criticizes the mentality that imposes its own concept of time, that is, mathematical time, in order to design and regulate individuals' lives. Mathematical time works according to a rationale, instrumental rationality, which sees people as means to gain economic profits. Such an understanding of time is a trait of the progressivist narrative of modernity in Turkey. The novel also reflects two different attitudes to modernity in Turkey: the spiritual and philosophical interpretation of time in Turkey before westernization begins, which is represented by Nuri Efendi, and the utilitarian and capitalistic mentality in that time is defined in terms of money, which is represented by Halit the Regulator. This section also emphasizes that the modern time, or the sense of a homogenous temporality, helped the state-building cadres of the Republic create the modern Turkish subject belonging to a national community and sharing a common sense of temporality. Thus, the nation building can be seen as a modern compulsion related to political, economic and social causes as theorized by Benedict

Anderson in *Imagined Communities* (1983). The chapter argues that *The Time Regulation Institute* is another literary testament of Tanpınar's understanding of the modern explored further in terms of time. Tanpınar's conceptualization of time as a monolithic entity, which rejects any sort of distinctions between the past, the present and the future, or between private and public time, should be regarded as a tool through which he formulates his idea of the modern.

Chapter 4 is concluded by the argument that Huxley's and Tanpınar's discontent with modernity and modernization as exposed in *Brave New World* and *The Time Regulation Institute* show close resemblances especially in terms of both novels' critiquing the formulation of time in the liberal vision of modernity and their understanding of modernity or modernization based on this vision as a rupture. Thus in this chapter it is also pointed out that a paradigm shift from space to time in Huxley's understanding of the modern has occurred. In this sense, the chapter claims that the distance between Huxley and Tanpınar regarding their understanding of the modern becomes smaller towards the later years of their writing careers.

CHAPTER 2

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Traversing disciplinary boundaries between literary studies, cultural studies and sociology, this chapter aims to explore the parallelisms and distinctions between the work of Huxley and Tanpınar regarding their approaches to the modern, modernity and modernization that inform their novels. First, Huxley's essays and other non-literary work will be surveyed; furthermore, some theoretical concepts developed by such Frankfurt School thinkers as Adorno, Horkheimer and Marcuse like mass culture, progress, labor-leisure, pleasure, culture industry and instrumental reason will be explicated before their employment in the analysis of Huxley's problematization of modernity in his novels in the following analytical chapters. Later, Tanpınar's non-literary work will be referred to in order to point out to what extent he was influenced by Huxley and the Frankfurt School.⁹ Furthermore, it will be shown that Tanpınar's work is characterized by an understanding of the modern, modernity and modernization which goes beyond the ideas of Huxley, and the afore-mentioned Frankfurt School theorists. That is, Tanpınar's way of seeing the modern seems to have more in common with the Multiple Modernities approach than does Huxley's and this will also be discussed in this chapter.

The chapter consists of two main sections: in the first part, Huxley's journey-book *Jesting Pilate* (1926), and his two essay-collections *Proper Studies* (1927) and *Do What You Will* (1929) will be studied in detail. These

⁹ From the outset of my discussion, it is important to emphasize that there is no singular, coherent view among the Frankfurt theorists about the theoretical and standard aims of critical theory. The resultant difficulty entailed in treating the work of these theorists in a general way led to the decision to focus mainly on the arguments of Horkheimer, Adorno and Marcuse, who "produced some of the first accounts within critical social theory of the importance of the mass culture and communication in social reproduction and domination" (Kellner 1989).

essays will help structure the upcoming analytical chapters of this study because they register Huxley's critical ideas about modernity and modernization. Some of the ideas in his essays, which would later appear again in his fiction *Point Counter Point* (1928) and *Brave New World* (1932), are the dichotomy between the East and the West, human diversity, mass behavior, parliamentary democracy, instrumental reason, progress and eugenics. Next, the chapter will explore Huxley and the Frankfurt School thinkers together because they all believed that there occurred corruption in the values of humankind, and because they also produced a similar critique of the modern age and the modern society as this corruption's product. Huxley's ideas about mass culture, progress, work-leisure and their influence on and parallelisms with Adorno and Horkheimer's notion of a "culture industry" as well as Marcuse's ideas on labor-leisure and technological rationality will be discussed in detail because these concepts will be used in the analysis of Huxley's fiction.

In the second part of the chapter, I will discuss the outcomes of the experience of modernity and modernization in Turkey, and how such notions as the past, tradition, modernization, civilizational change, time, art, technology, progress and mass society inform the work of Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar. Conceptualizing Tanpınar's understanding of the modern, modernity and modernization by means of his discursive and fictional work, I will try to find out how Tanpınar as a novelist and thinker adopts, revises and/or contests Huxley's and the Frankfurt School thinkers' attitudes towards modernity and modernization in his novels. Underlining Henri Bergson's (1859-1941) influence on Tanpınar, I will also indicate the intellectual similarities between Tanpınar and Walter Benjamin (1892-1940), which arose because they were both influenced by Bergson's notion of "pure time" (*The Creative Mind* 2). In the last section, I will draw attention to how Tanpınar's ideas of time, history, cultural multiplicity and locality within the discourse of modernity and modernization may be aligned with the Multiple Modernities approach. In this regard, emphasis

will be placed on his idea of having a new outlook on modernity, or (*terkip*), which favors the coexistence of evolution and preservation of the past traditions.

2.1. Conceptualizing Huxley's Approach to the Modern, Modernity and Modernization

To understand better why and how Aldous Huxley expressed his discontent with modernity and modernization in his times, we need to look at the characteristic features of modernity and modernization in England in the nineteen twenties and thirties, when Huxley wrote *Point Counter Point*, (1928) and *Brave New World* (1932). The following is a discussion on the outcomes of the English experience of modernity and modernization, and how notions of imperialism, aristocracy, parliamentary democracy, technology, instrumental reason, progress and mass society inform the work of Aldous Huxley.

The nineteen-twenties and thirties were Huxley's most creative period; he produced a series of satirical novels and essay-collections which expressed the fears and anxieties of the post-First-World-War generation. He first wrote essays "assessing the state of arts and immerse[d] himself in the current culture. Then [he took] up a trip round the world to observe other ways of doing things. Finally, [he] reviewed Western philosophy since the Enlightenment against recent perceptions of the modern, post-war world" (Meckier, "Prepping" 144-5). Since his non-fictional writings throw light on the ideas dealt with in *Point Counter Point* and *Brave New World*, Huxley's non-fictional writings, particularly *Jesting Pilate*¹⁰ (1926) and essay-collections such as *Proper Studies* (1927) and *Do What You Will* (1929)

¹⁰ "The phrase 'jesting Pilate' is traditionally used as a description of the passage from the Gospel of St John (18:37, 18:38) in which Pontius Pilate answers Jesus's claim that he is the witness of the truth with 'Truth, What is truth?' and pronounces Jesus innocent. [...] The notion of being witness to the truth is treated jestingly by Pilate" (Moroz, "The Narrative Personae" 166). Also, in one of his essays, "Of Truth", Francis Bacon, an early advocate of experimental science, wrote: "'What is truth?' said jesting Pilate, and would not stay for an answer" (*The Essays* 1).

provide a useful background to this study. Huxley's essays and other non-literary writings are selected and categorized mainly with reference to the subject-matter and themes in *Point Counter Point* and *Brave New World*. Much of what is found in his novels can be considered a fictional re-working of ideas in his non-fictional writings. These essays present, among other things, an analysis of contemporary history, cultural change, and the destabilizing effects of Western modernity and modernization. Understanding his approach to society, politics, and science portrayed in his afore-mentioned essay-collections will indicate to what extent Huxley was influential in shaping the ideas of the Frankfurt's School's thinkers in those fields of study. In brief, this part of the study aims to situate Huxley's fiction of the nineteen twenties and thirties within its social and political context and to emphasize the influence of Huxley on the Frankfurt School thinkers by considering his essays of the period.

Robert S. Baker discusses Huxley's attitude to his times in the "Introduction" to the volumes in which he and James Sexton brought together Huxley's essays, as follows:

[o]ne of the principle motifs of the novels and essays [of the nineteen-twenties and thirties] was the concept of modernity, a cultural condition and a philosophical idea that Huxley construed as the linchpin of history since the eighteenth century. He also regarded it as one of the founding assumptions of European and, in particular, American civilization. ("Introduction" Vol. II, xi)

As the quotation signals, for Huxley, the concept of modernity was fundamental in his idea of modern history. The concept of modernity also helped him formulate a modern concept of time which in the twenties he conceived as a linear, progressive movement from past to future. His inter-war essays and works of fiction from *Crome Yellow* (1921) to *After Many A Summer* (1939) reflect three different phases of Huxley's approach to modernity: in the early twenties, he was fascinated with modernity which he took as a characteristic and an outcome of Western civilization and science. As Baker puts it, "in the essays of early twenties, Huxley was often explicit

in his endorsement of a pattern of thought fully deployed by the end of the eighteenth century, the idea of positive knowledge or the empirical truth of modern science as having a global or noncontingent validity” (“Science and Modernity” 36). In the late twenties, however, he started to have a more critical attitude to his earlier views. He criticized the Western modernity; yet, he approached it from a Eurocentric perspective. Huxley’s belief in “the idea of positive knowledge or the empirical truth of modern science,” which he took as a trait of Western reason, made him believe that Western civilizations were technologically and economically superior to Eastern civilizations. The third phase, which began in the early thirties, is characterized by Huxley’s reformulation of his critique of modernity from within a temporal framework. That is, as will be explored in Chapter 4, starting from his writings of the early thirties on, Huxley, rather than adopting a Eurocentric discourse configuring Europe at the forefront of a linear and progressive movement of the historical time, reformulated a concept of the modern and of time that transcends the oversimplified geographical signifiers. In this phase, he started to feel more skeptical about the “rationally purposive consciousness” (or the “Cartesian ego”) because he believed that this rationality was problematic in that, in the name of social betterment and planning, it showed tendencies to dominate nature and humankind. So in this phase of his life, Huxley began to question the idea of “progress” and the notion of “the autonomous ego as the principal agent” (Baker, “Science and Modernity” 36), which he previously had taken as the two major products of Western Enlightenment, because he saw that these concepts failed to realize humanity’s potentials. Huxley was discontented with the misuses of technology and scientific discoveries in the West which, he believed, aimed to rob Western people of their capacity for free-thinking and creativity. According to Baker, “[t]he key to Huxley’s assessment of Western modernity lay with his analysis of the role of science and instrumental reason in Western culture and its relationship to Eastern (and Western) forms of religious mysticism” (“Science and Modernity” 35).

That is to say, Huxley assessed the Western experiences of modernity and modernization with a more critical eye when, during his journeys, he confronted other countries in the West and the East.

Huxley in his fictional and non-fictional writings elaborates on some significant subjects, which are frequently mentioned in the discussions of modernity. There are the role of science, instrumental reason, technology and the popular culture in history. The idea of modernity was at the center of what Huxley called “the novel of social history” (*The Olive Tree* 23), referring to his own novels of the 1920s and early 30s.¹¹ In other words, Huxley regarded his own fiction as an example of the novel of social history since, he thought, fiction “provide[d] a picture of life now and of life in the past, but also [was a] vehicle for the expression of general philosophic ideas, religious ideas, social ideas” (“An Interview with Huxley”).

2.1.1 *Jesting Pilate, Proper Studies and Do What You Will as Frameworks for Huxley’s Satirical Novels*

This part of the chapter will elaborate on one of Huxley’s journey books and those of his essays that were written just after his journeys, because these journeys changed him as a human being and a writer (*Jesting Pilate* 207); therefore, this part aims to show how these journeys changed and helped him write more satirical novels. This way of analysis – starting from Huxley’s non-fiction to fiction – follows the order of Huxley’s production, and is a useful background to the following chapters, because the subjects in these non-fictional works – democracy, religion, perversion of values, materialism and social organizations, diversity of human nature, Freudian theories and the eugenics program, and modernity – are re-introduced and will be analyzed in his next two novels, *Point Counter Point* and *Brave New World*.

¹¹ By the thirties, however, “Huxley’s assault on the universalizing claims of Western reason to be based on Cartesian rules and consciousness, or the Kantian belief in the emancipatory rationalism of the autonomous individual, had begun to center on the concept of science” (Baker, “Science and Modernity” 36).

Jesting Pilate: The Diary of A Journey (1926), which recounts Huxley's experiences in his travels through six countries – India, Burma, Malaya, Japan, China and America –, reveals his approach towards the social, economic and political structures that existed in these regions. During his travels, Huxley commented on how his travels changed him as a human being and a writer:

[I] set out on my travels knowing, or thinking that I knew, how men should live, how be governed, how educated, what they should believe. I knew which was the best form of social organization and to what end societies had been created. I had my views on every activity of human life. Now, on my return, I find myself without any of these pleasing certainties. Before I started, you could have asked me almost any question about the human species and I should glibly have returned an answer. [...] The better you understand the significance of any question, the more difficult it becomes to answer it. Those who like to feel that they are always right and who attach a high importance to their own opinions should stay at home. When one is travelling, convictions are mislaid as easily as spectacles; but unlike spectacles, they are not easily replaced. (*Jesting Pilate* 207)

Huxley then frankly admits that in compensation for what he lost, he acquired two new convictions. The first of which is “that it takes all sorts to make a world [...]” (*Jesting Pilate* 207), a saying which Huxley needed to see, confirmed by encountering a number of different people with his own eyes. In other words, having acquired an intimate realization of the truth of the proverb with his travels, Huxley practically experienced and understood the fact of human diversity.¹²

Secondly, he realized that “the established spiritual values are fundamentally correct and should be maintained.” According to Huxley, “[a]ll men, whatever their beliefs, their habits, their way of life, have a sense of values. And the values are everywhere and in all kinds of society broadly the same. Goodness, beauty, wisdom and knowledge ...” (*Jesting Pilate* 208). However, Huxley thinks that because of different factors in different

¹² The notion of human diversity and the perversion of values would be the main ideas in *Point Counter Point*, and these subjects will be elaborated more in the following chapter.

places, these “fundamentally true,” “standard” and “universal” values are “perverted” or “distorted.”

Convinced by practical experience of man’s diversity, the traveler [...] will observe the ways in which each standard is perverted. [...] In one country, he will perceive, the true, fundamental standard is distorted by an excessive emphasizing of hierarchic and aristocratic principles; in another by an excess of democracy. Here, too much is made of work and energy for their own sakes; there, too much of mere being. In certain parts of the world he will find spirituality run wild; in others a stupid materialism that would deny the very existence of values. (*Jesting Pilate* 208)

The quotation above uncovers the conclusions Huxley drew from his travels. He emphasizes the multiplicity of world-views in the world, and societies’ tendency to either deny or falsify the “standard” values. Huxley claims that these values are perverted on the basis of several religious, ideological and pragmatic tendencies and preferences: he holds that the most prevalent ground for falsifying these values in the East, specifically in India, is the caste-system and spirituality or “the interest in the other world.” In the West, on the other hand, and particularly in America, the prevalent means to falsify these values are what he calls “democratic prejudice” (*Jesting Pilate* 198) and materialism.

It seems that Huxley sets his world view on the basis of some values that he deems “standard.” It is interesting that Huxley contradicts himself when he emphasizes both the multiplicity of world-views and the “universality” and “fundamental-trueness” (*Jesting Pilate* 208) of values. That is, despite his claim of a multiplicity of perspectives, Huxley at this stage of his writing career views everything from this unexplored assumption of “fundamental” and “universal” values.¹³ Although he never clearly states what these “standard” values are, one can infer from his writings of the twenties and thirties that he may be referring to an idea of the harmony of body, soul and passion in human beings.

¹³ With *Brave New World* (1932) Huxley’s reconceptualization of the idea of modernity and time would resolve this confusion and contradictoriness. This idea will be elaborated more in Chapter 4.

About the caste-system in India, Huxley wrote:

[s]erfs, burghers, nobles – we read about them in our history books; but we find it difficult to realize what medieval society was really like. To understand our European Middle Ages, one should go to India. Hereditary aristocracies will exist in the West – exist, but *pour rire*; they are scarcely more than a joke. It is in India that one learns what it meant, six hundred years ago, to be a villein, a merchant, a lord. Aristocracy, there, exists in fact, as well as in name. Birth counts. You come into the world predestined to superiority or abjection. (*Jesting Pilate* 87-88)

According to Huxley, in India the superiority of the higher castes over the lower castes is a matter of religious dogma and it is almost heretical to suppose that the lower-caste masses have rights. Also, in his book, Huxley explains that “to my mind, ‘spirituality’ (ultimately, I suppose, the product of the climate) is the primal curse of India and the cause of all her misfortunes” (*Jesting Pilate* 83). Hence, Huxley believed that aristocracy and spirituality in India are the essential causes of falling away from “fundamentally true,” “standard” and “universal” values. At this point it should be emphasized again that Huxley judges Indians in these terms by relying on a set of his own “universally correct values” that he never explicitly defines and discusses. Huxley’s abstaining from defining and discussing these values, may stem from his assumption that these values are “standard and universal” in that they do not even require an explanation. He simply envisages that “[a]n immense energy which, if it could be turned into political channels, might liberate and transform the country, is wasted in the name of imbecile superstitions. Religion is a luxury which India, in its present condition, cannot possibly afford” (*Jesting Pilate* 97).

A further point may be taken from the *Jesting Pilate* quotation above. His statement that “[t]o understand our European Middle Ages, one should go to India” is a notable illustration of Huxley’s attitude to modernity. As has already been pointed out, his is a linear and Eurocentric understanding of time; he locates India as belonging to a time in Europe’s past, which suggests that there is a single line of progress towards modernity

led by Europe and should be followed by the rest. Here it should be clarified that in this study the term “Eurocentrism” is sometimes interchangeably used with the term “Western-centrism,” because I want to talk about a set of problems that are linked with this association. That is, this study will emphasize the assumption that Europe constitutes the Western tradition. In *Orientalism* (1978), Edward Said argues that the discourse of the Western tradition created Orientalism as the West’s way of defining ‘who we are not;’ the Orient was taken as an image of the “Other” to Europe and it enabled the West to define itself by giving a contrasting image.

Huxley, who associates India with the “primitive” and “irrational” East, is reluctant to offer a solution to what he sees as a problem concerning the capacity or incapacity of Indians to govern themselves. Huxley criticizes India for being a superstitious, inefficient and caste-ridden society because, he thinks, these are the hindrances to its being a free and independent country. However, in the book he seems to be getting closer to a sense of disillusionment with the experience of Western modernity and modernization. Toward the end of *Jesting Pilate*, Huxley gives an example of how “standard” values are denied or falsified also by Western civilizations, and particularly by America. To illustrate, during his visit to Malaya, a movie-night took place where local people were shown a Hollywood movie. Discomforted by this experience as a Westerner, Huxley wrote about the Hollywood movies and how they revealed “the white man’s world to the colored peoples” (146) as follows:

[a] crude, immature, childish world. A world without subtlety, without the smallest intellectual interests, innocent of art, letters, philosophy, science. A world where there are plenty of motors, telephones and automatic pistols, but in which there is no trace of such a thing as a modern idea. A world where men and women have instincts, desires, and emotions, but not thoughts. A world, in brief, from which all that gives the modern West its power, its political, and, I like patriotically to think, its spiritual superiority to the East, all that makes it a hemisphere which one is proud to have been born in and happy to return to, has been left out [in the world of this Hollywood movie]. (*Jesting Pilate* 146)

It is clear from this that Huxley is critical of the representation of Western society as if it was only about these things and emotions. The technological tools of Western life, as displayed in the movie, create and contribute to a shallow culture and are a part of “a crude and immature childish world” for the spectators. Furthermore, Huxley explains that technology and science are betrayed when they are used for silly entertainment via popular tools and means like Hollywood movies which, to Huxley, cause and encourage moral and cultural corruption. It is clear that Huxley wrote these lines from an imperialist perspective. Huxley resents those who make the Western civilization appear “stupid” in these movies. He believes that “the share of Hollywood in lowering the white man’s prestige is by no means inconsiderable” (147). He criticizes Hollywood for failing to justify the reason why “an oriental crowd should be ruled by the Western people” (147).

The essays in *Jesting Pilate* are written from a self-consciously Western perspective where the colonized are viewed as a homogenous mass, who are inefficient, intellectually inferior, incapable of self-government and deeply sunk in religious quietism. Huxley believes that Hollywood is just one of the examples of the misuse of technologies’ blessings. What Huxley tries to foreground is that “the fruits of knowledge and discoveries are abused and wasted. [...] The ideas of a handful of super-men are exploited so as to serve the profit and pleasure of the innumerable subtermen,¹⁴ or men *tout court*” (*Jesting Pilate* 183-184). Here, by “super-men” Huxley refers to Faraday, Maxwell and other famous scientists. He believes that “we have turned their discoveries to the service of murder, or employed them to create a silly entertainment” (*Jesting Pilate* 184).

At the end of *Jesting Pilate*, Huxley writes about his visit to New York and imagines “Vitality, Prosperity, Modernity” (*Jesting Pilate* 201)

¹⁴ “Subtermen” is a phrase coined by Huxley but he does not explicate it in any of his writings. So, relying on its use in his *Jesting Pilate*, one can infer that he uses the phrase to refer to all people other than those who are capable of producing knowledge and scientific/technological discoveries.

could be American mottoes. His definition of American modernity is as follows: “[m]odernity in this context may be defined as the freedom (at any rate in the sphere of practical material life) from customary bonds and ancient prejudices, from traditional and vested interest; the freedom, in a word, from history. Modernity emerges as a façade for moral and cultural corruption” (*Jesting Pilate* 201). The New York chapters of his book show that he despises the ways Americans have been falsifying “established standards” under the pretense of being modern and democratic. As is evident in the quotation above, he is critical of America.

Briefly, *Jesting Pilate* is a book in which Huxley, through the eyes of a Westerner, looks at the East, and criticizes India’s spirituality, which allegedly supports the country to struggle desperately in poverty. He also reevaluates what he calls the West, and criticizes materialism and over-consumption of the USA as examples of the consequences of modernity and modernization emerging in and spreading out from the West. At the end of the book he comes up with this statement: “[t]o travel is to discover that everybody [from the East and the West] is wrong. The philosophies, the civilizations which seem, at a distance, so superior to those current at home, all prove on a close inspection to be in their own way just as hopelessly imperfect” (*Jesting Pilate* 156). His conclusion is that neither the East, which lacked technological and scientific efficiency, nor the West (specifically he had the USA and England in his mind), which misused the outcomes of science and reason, and encouraged social ills like mass behavior, material progress and the rationalization of society, was an ideal society: “[t]he truth is, of course, that neither ‘East’ nor ‘West’ is the password to the future. If there exists such a password, it is the word ‘Man’ [*sic.*]. It is a common word; but the thing for which it stands is exceedingly rare” (Huxley, “A Few Well-Chosen Words” 59). Disappointed by the East’s blind submission to spirituality, Huxley later observes the consequences of the falsification of “standard” values, or in Huxley’s word,

“revaluation”¹⁵ in America, and therefore decides to examine one set of impressions against the other; as Jerome Meckier also states “Huxley juxtaposed Eastern spirituality and Western materialism in order to expose each as half of yet another apparently irresolvable dichotomy” (“Prepping” 237), and therefore Huxley concludes that both are equally problematic.¹⁶

Unlike *Jesting Pilate* in which Huxley is concerned with Eastern spirituality, Western materialism and over-consumption and the dichotomy between east and west, *Proper Studies* (1927) and *Do What You Will* (1929) contain essays which introduce some other ideas that Huxley will deal with in *Point Counter Point* and *Brave New World*. In one of his essays in *Do What You Will*, “One and Many,” Huxley developed his theory of ontological inconsistencies or the chaotic diversity of human nature: refusing the ideal of the perfect human being, Huxley supported the idea of an individual consisting of mind, body and soul, implying that none of these parts should be too powerful and consequently none should overbalance the others. A similarity with D. H. Lawrence’s writings is evident here, and Lawrence’s legacy in Huxley’s writings should be noted at this point. Several characters from Huxley’s fiction are believed to be based upon Lawrence, like Kingham in Huxley’s “Two or Three Graces” (1926) and, most remarkably, Mark Rampion in *Point Counter Point*, since these characters are the embodiment of an ancient idea which one can recurrently find in Lawrence’s works: the necessity of “a balance between body and mind”¹⁷ (Lawrence, “A Propos of *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*” 310). There is also evidence of a direct influence of Lawrence on Huxley from Huxley’s

¹⁵ Although Huxley does not explicitly state what he means by the phrase “revaluation” in *Jesting Pilate*, he seems to refer to a lifestyle and worldview which he describes with words like “egotistical and pragmatist” and which he attaches to the modern American people. To Huxley, the people of America tend to change the meaning or value of something and revalue it to pursue what is in their own best interests.

¹⁶ This major discovery of Huxley constitutes the main framework and theme of *Point Counter Point* and *Brave New World* and it will be explored more in the following chapters.

¹⁷ The ancient saying which influenced D. H. Lawrence is “*mens sana in corpora sana*,” meaning “a sound mind in a healthy body.”

letters, for after he met Lawrence Huxley wrote that “[o]ne can’t help being very much impressed by him” (Sexton, *Selected Letters* 20). Some of Lawrence’s works that influenced Huxley’s ideas are *The Plumed Serpent* (1926) which advocates the philosophy of “life-worshipping,” *Sketches of Etruscan Places* (1927) which praises the Etruscans and their “religion of life,” and *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* (1928) which emphasizes the importance of a search for integrity and wholeness in life. So Huxley, who was “impressed” by Lawrence, proposed the adoption of a new “religion of life” in order to achieve a balance between the diverse natures in a human, and he claims that:

[s]ince life is diverse, the new religion will have to have many Gods. Many; but since the individual man is a unity in his various multiplicity, also one. It will have to be Dionysian and Pan as well as Apollonian; Orphic as well as rational; not only Christian, but Martial and Venerean too; Phallic as well as Minervan or Jehovanistic. It will have to be all, in a word, that human life actually is, not merely the symbolical expression of one of its aspects. (Huxley, “One and Many” 47-51)

Huxley admired the ancient Greeks and Etruscans because, he believed, they developed a polytheistic idea of the universe because they saw themselves as diverse; for them humankind was all at once sensual, pleasure seeking and violent (Dionysian, Pan, Orphic, Phallic, Martial and Venerean) as well as wise, rational and spiritual (Apollonian, Minervan and Christian). According to Huxley, one who can balance body and mind can be called a complete man. In other words, “Huxley had a Hellenic and polytheistic apotheosis of the complete man [which is] in accordance with the idea of man’s natural diversity. “The ‘whole man’ [Huxley, “Pascal” 281], according to Huxley, the offspring of Greek and Etruscan civilization, is the complete opposite of the ‘barbarian’ [Huxley, *Point Counter Point* 144]” (Fietz 155-6). Huxley thought that whereas the ancient Greeks and Etruscans knew how to order the chaotic diversity of human nature and had the idea of the complete man, the following generations of Europeans, during the emergence of monotheism and the modern age, started to impose

priority on “the spirit or the mind” at the cost of “the body,” something regarded as barbarous by Huxley. Therefore, he thought that the modern censure of the body, or attaching importance to one aspect of human life and ignoring others led to an un-desirable lopsidedness. In another essay in *Do What You Will*, “Pascal,” Huxley argues that

[w]ithout contraries is no progression. Attraction and Repulsion, Reason and Energy, Love and Hate are necessary to Man’s Existence. [...] Man has no Body distinct from his Soul; for that call’d body is a portion of the Soul discern’d by the Senses, the chief inlets of spirit in this age. Energy is the only life . . . Energy is Eternal Delight. (277)

What Huxley calls “the whole” or the “life-worshipper,”¹⁸ as he discusses above, consists of energy, and according to Huxley this energy can only exist in a human being as long as s/he takes all parts of existence – spirit, body and mind – equally seriously. Only with the unity and co-existence of these three powers in a human being, can s/he attain “Eternal Delight.”

In Huxley’s writings it is possible to see the traces of Sigmund Freud’s (1856-1939) influence although in an interview he refused to acknowledge any such influence: “I was never intoxicated by Freud as some people were, and I get less intoxicated as I go on” (1960). So it can be argued that Huxley’s attitude to Freud’s theories is ambivalent in that whether or not Freudian elements in Huxley’s works come directly from Huxley’s knowledge of Freud’s work. It is possible that they did not – or that Huxley was influenced by the ideas that were all around at the time.¹⁹ Several scholars elaborate on this issue differently: Baker states that Freudian concepts like “repression and psychological abnormality by and large constitute the heart of Huxley’s criticism of Edwardian and early modern English society” (*The Dark* 117). Baker claims that Huxley made use of Freudian theories to formulate his critique. In other words, Huxley

¹⁸ “Life-worshipper” is a term that appears in *Point Counter Point*.

¹⁹ Like the use of Freudian theories in Huxley’s fiction, Tanpinar’s use of Freudian theories in his fiction is quite contradictory. This parallelism between Huxley’s and Tanpinar’s contradictory attitudes towards Freudian psychoanalysis will be discussed in Chapter 4.

used Freudian psychoanalysis to describe the discomfort of the post-war modernity. Yet, some other scholars like Samantha Vibbert claim that several Freudian theories are on display in Huxley's novels, particularly in his *Brave New World* where they are there to be severely satirized: "Huxley intends the novel [*Brave New World*] to be a satiric disparagement of Freudianism" (133). So in the light of such observations, it can be briefly stated that no matter what Huxley's attitude to Freudian theories is, his fiction is informed by them. In *Brave New World* Huxley uses the name of Freud interchangeably with Ford for one of the world controllers, an unkind character, who is very influential and powerful. This by itself indicates Huxley's mistrust of Freud, while acknowledging the influence of his theories and ideas. To illustrate, Freud's *Civilization and Its Discontents* (1929) is evidently referred to in *Brave New World's* proposal that society is formed at the expense of the individual. Also, the World State in the novel appears to be based on the Freudian theory of the instinct of Eros: the satisfaction of the pleasure principle and wish fulfilments. So seeing the critique of Freudian ideas in *Brave New World*, we can state that Huxley referred to Freudian concepts to describe the discomfort of the post-war modernity. As Brad Buchanan puts it "Huxley seems to have been using [the Freudian theories like] the Oedipus complex [...] as a weapon in his satirical attack on the mores of modern life and on its utopian fantasies" (89).

Apart from D. H. Lawrence and Sigmund Freud, H. G. Wells was another man of letters whose ideas were influential on Huxley and his works between the mid-nineteen twenties and the mid-nineteen thirties. Wells' ideas about eugenics and the possibility of its employment as a humanitarian means of fast-forwarding to a better world caused Huxley to consider the consequences of eugenics as a solution to social deterioration. Huxley believed that the "congenitally insufficient" were reproducing more quickly than "our best stock" ("The Double Crisis" 125-45) and this should be stopped. He therefore argued that eugenics should be applied to preserve

and improve intellectual abilities: “how do they expect democratic institutions to survive in a country where an increasing percentage of the population is mentally defective? Half-wits fairly ask for dictators. Improve the average intelligence of the population and self-governance will become, not only inevitable, but efficient” (“What is Happening to Our Population?” 154). He nevertheless thought that it would be impossible and impractical to spread the expected improvements resulting from eugenics across a whole population.

A state with a population consisting of nothing but these superior people [thanks to the eugenic reform] could not hope to last for a year [because] the socially efficient and intellectually gifted are precisely those who are not content to be ruled [... Thus,] states function as smoothly as they do, because the greater part of the population is not very intelligent, dreads responsibility, and desires nothing better than to be told what to do. Provided the rulers do not interfere with its material comforts and its cherished beliefs, it is perfectly happy to let itself be ruled. (“A Note on Eugenics” 284-5)

Huxley here reveals himself to be an aristocrat at heart with an elitist attitude towards “the greater part of the population,” and expressing his ideas in the same essay about the creation of a superior caste. Huxley presents a contrapuntal bind: there will be either an “increase of the inferior or the unintelligent” or “a perfectly eugenized state” (“A Note on Eugenics” 284); yet, both, according to Huxley, will lead to catastrophe. So, under the influence of Wells’s book, *The Open Conspiracy: Blue Prints for A World Revolution* (1928), Huxley proposed another idea: a hierarchical system of government which would supersede mass democracy. He expresses his idea in the following words:

[t]he ideal state is one in which there is a material democracy controlled by an aristocracy of intellect – a state in which men and women are guaranteed a decent human existence and are given every opportunity to develop such talents as they possess, and where those with the greatest talent rule. The active and intelligent oligarchies of the ideal state do not yet exist. (“The Outlook for American Culture” 192)

As noted above, Huxley favors “an aristocracy of intellect” as an ideal. He supports a program of eugenics which creates an aristocracy of intellect. And he criticizes and parodies the Wellsian approach to eugenics in *Point Counter Point* and *Brave New World* because if the superior-caste consists of mere technocrats who fail to be genuine aristocrats of intellect, the technocratic government will end up providing its citizens with “only” efficiency and comfort, not with the opportunities for individuals’ intellectual and emotional development. In other words, such a government will take individuals’ bodily needs seriously but it will take its citizens’ spiritual and intellectual needs for granted. As Jerome Meckier states, “[t]hat a supervisory intelligence implies its possessor’s enlightenment, not just know-how, would become increasingly clear to Huxley from *Brave New World* on” (“Prepping” 238). Huxley criticizes the optimistic ideas of Wells as he pessimistically believes that “[P]oor H. G. does squeak – but I think he’s right in supposing that, given a little intelligence now, the world could really be made quite decent ... [Yet, I fear] that the necessary intelligence will not be applied, but that stupidity, coupled with cupidity, will prevail, as of old, and plunge us deeper in the mire” (*Letters* 356).

Huxley voiced these ideas about democracy, aristocracy of intellect and eugenics in a moment in British history in which, he believed, society was on the verge of a total collapse and a disastrous ineffectuality. Huxley was not alone in this way of thinking. As David Bradshaw notes, in England “intellectuals from all persuasions more or less despaired of Parliament in the early 1930s, and, whether they championed the corporate state of fascism, the earthly paradise of Soviet communism, the Wellsian World State, or the simply the home-grown gradualism of Political and Economic Planning and the Next Five Years’ Group, few had any real confidence in the House of Commons” (“Introduction” xix). Huxley himself, at this period, favored and attributed great importance to planning and national stability:

[i]ntelligent national planning is dictated by the most rudimentary considerations of self-interest. We must either plan or else go under. Moreover, it is only by planning that we can hope to make England, or any other highly industrialized country, a place in which it will be possible for the majority of men and women to lead anything like the good life. (Huxley, "Abroad in England" 63)

The sentence Huxley repeatedly uses in a majority of his essays written in the late twenties and early thirties and also in *Point Counter Point* and *Brave New World* is that, "one can never have something for nothing" (*Point Counter Point* 215; *Brave New World* 208). This reveals his critical position concerning his attitude to modernity and modernization because, to Huxley, the achievement of some things has been accompanied by a compensating loss of other equally important things. The repetitive use of this sentence reflects Huxley's method of thinking and writing: when he deals with a modern notion he tends to analyze it critically, since he wants to facilitate the reader's entrance into the realm of self-examination and self-criticism; and if there is one theme which comprises a basis for Huxley's work in the early nineteen-thirties, it is the threat to social stability posed by both the unemployed masses and the uncontrolled development of science and technology. The historian Arnold J. Toynbee described 1931 as an *annus terribilis* during the course of which people "were seriously contemplating and frankly discussing the possibility that the Western system of society might break down and cease to work" (1). Accordingly, Huxley's essays in this period focus on the menace of unchecked scientific innovation, the misery of long-term unemployment and the tedium and routine of factory work. Fearing the imminent demise of the Western civilization, Huxley called for social regeneration through coherent planning and intelligent reform. Huxley's interest in the planning and eugenics movements during the early thirties should be seen as a warning about dictatorship to those who Huxley called "half-wits" ("What is Happening to Our Population?" 154). Huxley's essays of the early thirties and his *Brave New World* deal with the threat of totalitarian regimes whose uses of science

and technology never serve society's welfare. In these writings Huxley raised crucial questions concerning the social uses of science.

2.1.2 Mass Culture and Culture Industry

The following section attempts to display parallelisms between Huxley's attitude to the idea of "mass culture" and the notion of "culture industry" coined by Adorno and Horkheimer in their *Dialectic of Enlightenment* (1944). As previously pointed out, Huxley as a writer and a philosopher had a great influence on the theorists of the Frankfurt School. Their fascination with his *Brave New World* was evident, and they approached his dystopian predictions as if they held quasi-evidential status²⁰. Huxley's influence on Adorno and Horkheimer is emphasized by David Garrett Izzo, who finds that "their essay 'The Culture Industry,' is actually influenced by Huxley, as these two German refugees from Hitler acknowledged that their ideas came from Huxley" (87). Izzo bases this claim on his own readings of Adorno and Horkheimer and their readings of Huxley. They all observed that enlightenment was turned into a tool of domination through instrumental reason, and this common observation brought their *Dialectic of Enlightenment* close to the ideas expressed in Huxley's work. Izzo argues that it was in the face of this brave new world of technological progress that the Frankfurt School thinkers re-interpreted the idea of Enlightenment and analyzed whether or not its premises had been realized (86-131).

Adorno and Horkheimer, like Huxley, criticized the Enlightenment in order to rescue it in an increasingly instrumentalized world. In other words, neither Huxley nor Adorno and Horkheimer were intent on reason's

²⁰ "During the summer of 1942 the Institute for Social Research, under Horkheimer's directorship, held five symposia focusing on the problem of needs under advanced capitalism. Papers were presented by 1) Pollock, 2) Ludwig Marcuse 3) Horkheimer and Adorno 4) Günther Anders, and, lastly, 5) an unidentified presenter on Aldous Huxley's novel, *Brave New World*. Also, later Adorno would pen a critique of Huxley in *Prisms*, 'Aldous Huxley and Utopia'" (Wolin, "Introduction to the Discussion of Need and Culture in Nietzsche").

complete destruction but they remained critical of it. Adorno and Horkheimer wanted to reveal the discrepancy between the Enlightenment's promises and the way of the world in the twentieth century by claiming that the human mind and knowledge had been reduced to instruments of domination and enslavement in the twentieth century:

[i]n the most general sense of progressive thought, Enlightenment has always aimed at liberating men from fear and establishing their sovereignty. Yet the fully enlightened earth radiates disaster triumphant. ... [t]he human mind, which overcomes superstition, is to hold sway over a disenchanted nature. Knowledge, which is power, knows no obstacles: neither in the enslavement of men nor in compliance with the world's rulers. (*Dialectic of Enlightenment* 3-4)

Adorno and Horkheimer indicated the "amazing success" of the Enlightenment in liberating people from fear and in banishing myth from the development of modern science and technology, which paradoxically led to the terrifying return of myth in the form of domination, racism and mass culture in the twentieth century. In other words, in their view the twentieth century failed to fulfill the utopian promises of the Enlightenment concerning the promotion of knowledge, freedom and social equality; therefore, they claim that the modern pursuit of progress, because of its ruthless exploitation of human and natural resources, portrays nothing but the bankruptcy of rationality. Adorno and Horkheimer believed that the enlightenment was a discourse of domination in "three forms: the domination of nature by human beings, the domination of nature within human beings, and the domination of some human beings by others" (*Dialectic of Enlightenment* 11).²¹ What motivates such threefold dominion is a senseless fear of the unknown. They therefore state that "enlightenment is mythical fear radicalized" (*Dialectic of Enlightenment* 11). To Adorno and Horkheimer, "the enlightened earth radiates disaster triumphant"

²¹ They claimed that "enlightenment had always been a tool for the 'great manipulators of government (the Imperium Romanum, Napoleon, the Papacy when it had turned to power and not only to the world) ... The way in which the masses are fooled in this respect, for instance in all democracies, is very useful: the reduction and malleability of men are worked for as 'progress'" (*Dialectic of Enlightenment* 44).

because “disaster” is a result of the Enlightenment’s regression to ideology and domination, since the dominant ideologies deliberately misused human beings and nature not only in the post-Enlightenment era but before this period, too. They also argue that today the all-consuming machine controlling “this process is an ever-expanding capitalist economy which is provided by scientific research and the latest technologies” (*Dialectic of Enlightenment* 61).

Working in the shadow of the Great War and prophesying WWII, Huxley puts forward in “Science and Civilization” (1932) that “our civilization, as each one of us is uncomfortably aware, is passing through a time of crisis” (105). He thought that it was “a time of crisis” because he believed that the cause of the crisis was the rationality of the modern individual. In the same essay, Huxley claimed that unlike the past, when the worst enemy of human beings was nature, in the modern age troubles stemmed from human beings’ application of science and technology for their own egotistical purposes. He went even further in his fiction by “turn[ing] science and technology into suspects in a crime against humanity” (O’Har 482). In “On the Charms of History and the Future of the Past” (1931) Huxley discloses the reasons why he lost his faith in progress and democracy as follows:

[f]or our ancestors [...] democracy in those days was not the bedraggled and rather whorish old slut she now is, but young and attractive. Her words persuaded. When she spoke of the native equality and potential perfection of human beings, men believed her. [...] Yet, w]e have had experience of the working of democracy, we have seen the fruits of universal education, and we have come to doubt the premises from which our ancestors started out on their prophetic argument. Psychology and genetics have yielded results which confirm the doubts inspired by practical experience. Nature, we have found, does rather more, nurture rather less, to make us what we are than the earlier humanitarians has supposed. (137)

Huxley believed that in the modern age science, democracy and universal education were likely to be applied by people who pursued more economic than humanitarian ends. Therefore, he believed that inventions, which he

called “art,” not Nature, brought the modern age into chaos: “[t]he very arts and sciences which we have used to conquer Nature have turned on their creators and are now conquering us” (107). What Huxley wanted to emphasize was that pure science in itself is morally neutral; it becomes good or evil depending on its application. Briefly, to Huxley, the modern world became a more deformed, authoritarian and technology-driven society due to a lopsided and partial application of scientific methods; and it was “culture” which was severely injured by the consequences of instrumental rationality: “culture – once a refuge of beauty and truth – was falling prey to tendencies toward rationalization, standardization, and conformity which was interpreted as a consequence of the triumph of the instrumental rationality that was coming to pervade and structure ever more aspects of life” (Kellner 87).

In the same manner, Adorno and Horkheimer produced a well-developed theory of what they call “the culture industry” (*Dialectic of Enlightenment* 95) during their exile in America. In America they had the chance to observe American culture, and as a consequence they came to the conclusion that the cultural industry is a principal tenet of a new formulation of modernity based on capitalism. They argue that capitalist modernity in modern times takes advantage of culture, using advertising and mass communications to manipulate human beings; that is, these modern forms are used as an “apparatus” of social control and contribute to the maintenance of capitalism. Their theory of the culture industry is in fact an analysis of both the fundamental traits of the “totally administered society” (*Dialectic of Enlightenment* 161) and a critique of capitalism. Moreover, their study of the culture industry also elucidates the processes involved in standardization, dehumanization, conformity, homogenization, domination, and regression. In their “Culture Industry: Enlightenment as Mass Deception” (1944) essay, they argue that

[t]he fallen nature of modern man cannot be separated from social progress. On the one hand the growth of economic productivity furnishes the conditions for a world of greater justice; on the other

hand it allows that technical apparatus and the social groups which administer it a disproportionate superiority to the rest of the population. The individual is wholly devalued in relation to the economic powers, which at the same time press the control of society over nature to hitherto unsuspected heights. Even though the individual disappears before the apparatus which he serves, that apparatus provides for him as never before. In an unjust state of life, the impotence and pliability of the masses grow with the quantitative increase in commodities allowed them. (*Dialectic of Enlightenment* xiv-xv)

The quotation clearly indicates how the culture industry renders the individual more dependent on “the apparatus.” These words are an extension of the argument Huxley had used in his “Whither Are We Civilizing?” essay (1928): “[i]t is hardly less clear that the boredom, perversities, neurasthenia, and discontent so common in civilized societies are due to suppression or discouragement, by modern conditions of existence and modern customs, of certain fundamental instinctive and emotional activities” (106). That is, in the late twenties Huxley had already diagnosed the problem of modern societies as a “suppression” of or “discouragement” from “fundamental instinctive and emotional activities,” such as performing intellectual activities and presenting emotional reactions. The Enlightenment rationality that defined itself in opposition to dogma, superstition and authoritarianism, according to Huxley and later the Frankfurt School thinkers, took in the modern age an institutional form as the most organized and systematic means of repression and intolerance in history. Huxley’s work in this period can thus be seen as an articulation of a theory of a stage of capitalism. This stage of capitalism is called “monopoly or organized capitalism” by Rudolf Hilferding because in this era large organizations, states and great corporations manage economy. For others “[t]his period is often described as ‘Fordism’ to designate the system of mass production and the homogenizing regime of capital which wanted to produce mass desires, tastes, and behavior” (Kellner, “The Frankfurt School” 33). In his 1930s essays, Huxley makes the same analogy, likening the ““expansion of Henry Ford’s factories’ throughout the civilized world to the spread of

cancer” (“Wander Birds” 430). In his fiction Huxley explores the implications of “Fordism,” transforming “the ideal of efficiency into a literal nightmare: human beings made to order assembly-line style, ‘produced’ in joyless test tubes according to the needs and dictates of a richly imagined social order. And what is the point of social order? Control and conformity” (O’Har 482). It was in this context that the Frankfurt School thinkers focused their attention on Huxley’s 1932 novel *Brave New World*, because it provided a nightmarish picture of a future world and mass society which would be driven by consumption and materialistic progress and governed by manipulation. Baker states that “Richard Rorty has endorsed the notion that Huxley’s *Brave New World* is the ‘nightmare which haunts the Frankfurt School’ in his ‘Habermas and Lyotard on Postmodernity’ (165)” (“Science and Modernity” 38). Baker also adds that “Huxley’s writings of the 1930s anticipate many of the key ideas of *Dialectic of Enlightenment*. Huxley’s deep mistrust of instrumental reason, the popular culture industry, and technocratic forms of social organization had become, by 1934, his contemporary starting point for a reassessment of Western science” (“Science and Modernity” 38). For Adorno and Horkheimer the novel exemplified a world in which no free will would be allowed to exist. Moreover, they found that in such a world anything that makes us human, such eternal conflicts as reason vs. passion, mind vs. body and love vs. hate, would be forbidden. In retrospect, it seems clear that *Brave New World* had become a criterion for Adorno and Horkheimer’s “diagnosis of the age”: in their eyes, it functioned as a paradigmatic cautionary story about the dangers of “introjected domination” (Marcuse, *One-Dimensional* 9-10) and a “totally administered world” (*Dialectic of Enlightenment* 161). As such, it anticipates the “culture industry” Chapter of *Dialectic of Enlightenment* as well as Marcuse’s theory of “repressive de-sublimation” in *One-Dimensional Man* (1964). The term “repressive de-sublimation,” as experienced in contemporary industrial society, is explained by Marcuse with reference to sexuality, as follows:

[s]exuality is liberated (or rather liberalized) in socially constructive forms. [...] It appears that such repressive desublimation is indeed operative in the sexual sphere, and here, as in the desublimation of higher culture, it operates as the by-product of the social controls of technological reality, which extend liberty while intensifying domination. [...] Technical progress and more comfortable living permit the systematic inclusion of libidinal components into the realm of commodity production and exchange. [...] Freed from the sublimated form, sexuality turns into a vehicle for the bestsellers of oppression. [...] society turns everything it touches into a potential source of progress and of exploitation, of drudgery and satisfaction, of freedom and of oppression. Sexuality is no exception. (Marcuse, *One Dimensional* 77)

According to Marcuse, the commodification of sexuality which is represented as the freedom of sexuality creates a false perception on people. The idea of the repressive de-sublimation is significant since it is exemplified and used as one of the tools to intensify domination carried out in *Brave New World*.

Although several essays of Huxley influenced Adorno, Horkheimer and Marcuse in the shaping of the ideas expressed in *Dialectic of Enlightenment* (1944), *Eros and Civilization* (1955) and *One-Dimensional Man* (1964), Huxley's essay "The Outlook for American Culture: Some Reflections in a Machine Age" (1927) is the one which most explicitly shows his impact on the conceptualization of modernity by this "inner circle of the School" (Honneth 362). At the very beginning of the essay Huxley claims that "studying the good and the evil features in American life, we are studying, in a generally more definite and highly developed form, the good and evil features of the whole world's present and immediately coming civilization" (185). The idea that the future of all civilized societies depends on America indicates his fear of America's influence on Europe, particularly England; he fears "the Americanization of the world" (Huxley, "The Outlook for American Culture" 186). Like Huxley, the Frankfurt School theorists had American culture in mind when they criticized mass culture. In their *Dialectic of Enlightenment* Adorno and Horkheimer suggest that popular culture resembles a factory that produces standardized cultural

goods such as movies, radio programs, magazines, and suchlike, which are used as tools to manipulate mass society into consumption, passivity and contentment. They claim that the culture industry that is particularly powerful in American society creates false needs that can only be satisfied by the products of capitalism (*Dialectic of Enlightenment* 135).

When we have a look at the messages or, in Huxley's term, "prophecies" in his essay "The Outlook for American Culture", we may learn to what extent Huxley influenced the critical theorists' ideas. In this essay Huxley regards the issue from both perspectives of the advantages and the disadvantages of machinery although he focuses more on the severe disadvantages of machinery and abuses of technology. He mentions major benefits conferred by machinery on the human race and then proceeds by focusing on the negative effects of machinery on culture. His main argument is that the leisure brought by machinery "to America and the rest of the world" (187) does not give birth to a corresponding culture because a majority of men and women in European and American cities waste their leisure: "[l]eisure makes culture²² possible; but this possible culture has not in fact become actual" (187). According to Huxley, machines provide the necessary means of controlling the leisure or the progressive movement which they themselves have made possible. Environmental conditions, namely "contemporary urban life, with its jazz bands, its negroid [sic.] dancing, its movies, theatres, football matches, newspapers and the like" (187) all enhance a hatred of what he calls culture. Also, although Huxley was not against modern inventions such as the rotary press or the radio, he protested against the use to which they were put: that is, he criticized the passivity of modern culture and the monetary profit it gained for industrialists. "[A]ll the resources of science are applied in order that imbecility may flourish and vulgarity cover the whole earth" (188). According to Huxley, modern machinery, in theory, has the potential to make culture possible for human beings. Yet, in reality, it is used to create

²² Here, by "culture" Huxley means refinement and cultivation.

and enhance “imbecility,” “vulgarity” and “standardization of ideas” through distractive means, i.e. “popular picture paper, popular films, popular music” (189), which, mass producers hope, prevent human beings from turning into the culture-lovers: “The mere standardization of ideas made possible by modern machinery is in itself another obstacle to culture” (189). By modern machinery, Huxley believes, human beings are deprived of their “play-instinct,”²³ they have become passive consumers.

The environment-related causes of people’s deprivation of culture are significant because the part of Huxley’s essay “The Outlook for American Culture” which discusses them would be re-analyzed and extended seventeen years later by Adorno and Horkheimer in their “Culture Industry” essay (1944). According to Douglas Kellner, Adorno and Horkheimer used the term “‘culture industry’ instead of ‘popular culture’ or ‘mass culture’ because they wanted to resist notions that the products of the culture industry emanated from the masses or from the people. For they saw the culture industry as being administered culture, imposed from above, as instruments of indoctrination and social control” (94). In other words, with this concept Adorno and Horkheimer indicated a method of producing culture that reciprocally enhances industry and the system and, consequently, they took up a similar project to that of Huxley’s and criticized modern society as its product. In their understanding of the culture industry, culture is both the propelling force and the end product of a culture industry; the system in that culture both shapes and is shaped by the system (*Dialectic of Enlightenment* 131-2).

In Adorno’s and Horkheimer’s understanding, those who manufacture culture are powerful and avaricious agents in their role of shaping society. The culture manufacturers see all human beings as customers, not individuals. They aim to produce similar humans, or masses (by means of technology, science and media) who will consume similar

²³ By “play-instinct,” Huxley refers to our innate creativity and capability for thinking and acting freely. This term influenced Marcuse’s ideas about the “free play of the mind, of imagination” (“The Realm of Freedom” 23) as will be shown later in this chapter.

products of the industry; this system of society does not provide a way out for the dissenters, and in this sense the system is like a vicious circle. In such a world art is also seen as a product of the culture industry to be consumed by the masses who are deprived of imagination. Human beings in the system of the culture industry are “taught” (*Dialectic of Enlightenment* 127) what to expect from the culture industry and they readily consume its products, so the system aims to triumph and strives to impose itself on everyone until no resistance is possible.

According to Adorno and Horkheimer, the culture industry is more powerful in modern industrial and capitalist nations because it can infiltrate their media through such channels as movies, radio, and magazines. It is also quite clear that the examples of the channels that are used to manipulate the media (movies, radio and magazines) given by Huxley in his essay and the critical thinkers are the same, thus Huxley criticizes America as negatively influencing other countries; or effecting, in his own words, “the Americanization of the world” (“The Outlook for American Culture” 186). An important feature of the culture industry is thus its power to create and maintain uniformity. Although there is a never-ending talk of new ideas or novelties in such a society, these novelties in fact never create a change, since they never supersede the present system of mechanical production. So it can be claimed that Adorno and Horkheimer criticize the idea of the new in the culture industry, since, it does not promise to create a change in or an alternative to the present system: “[t]empo and dynamics serve this trend. Nothing remains as of old; everything has to run incessantly, to keep moving. For only the universal triumph of the rhythm of mechanical production and reproduction promises that nothing changes” (*Dialectic of Enlightenment* 134). Adorno and Horkheimer emphasize that all units of culture industry are channeled to one purpose which contributes to enhance the totalitarianism of the culture industry by means of rendering society a docile, contented and passive mass. Hence, like Huxley, Adorno and

Horkheimer state that there is the victory of the misused technological reason over truth.

Adorno and Horkheimer also follow Huxley in arguing that the objective of the culture industry is to persuade the modern individual that all his/her needs can be met because these needs are already created by the culture manufacturers to render the individual “an eternal customer.” This, they believe, means fooling people: “...the feeling of being an eternal consumer makes him/her believe that the deception it practices is satisfaction” (*Dialectic of Enlightenment* 142). This is the hypocrisy of the culture industry; it creates the consumer’s needs, deals with them, controls them, and disciplines them. Shortly, according to Adorno and Horkheimer, the culture industry is concerned with people merely as consumers and employees, and it reduces humankind as a whole to beings with the same needs and leisure-activities. As a last point about the resemblances between Huxley’s and Adorno and Horkheimer’s views, it should be noted that like Huxley, Adorno and Horkheimer mention the creativity-killing characteristics of the culture industry: “[t]he products of the culture industry have taught human beings how to react. [...] The culture industry as a whole molded men as a type unfailingly reproduced in every product. So, no scope is left for the imagination” (*Dialectic of Enlightenment* 127). The modern individual is growing increasingly passive because the culture industry codes him/her as a passive receptor or consumer of its products from the day s/he is born. Therefore, the individual who is surrounded by and exposed to the stimuli of the culture industry loses his/her imagination, and his/her potential to think and create or question. The result is a completely controlled and enslaved society. They thus believed the existence of what might be called a bargain that had been made for humankind to surrender freedom, creativity and individuality.

2.1.3 Progress

“Progress” is another concept theorized in a similar way by Huxley, Adorno, Horkheimer and Marcuse. In his essay “Progress” (1928), Huxley holds that progress is “a modern invention [and what] made it possible [was] the enormous expansion of man’s material resources during the age of industrialism” (293). Although, Huxley believed that nature could be controlled by science and technology, that is, by human intelligence, he also had bleak thoughts about the future of the industrialized and “progressed” nations. He believed that material progress does not automatically entail spiritual progress because “there is no necessary relation between quantity and quality of human activity, or between wealth and virtue” (294). Briefly, Huxley’s approach to the notion of progress is hesitant, because although he admits the significance of technological progress, he fears its harmful effects on the “true values” of human existence. His fear comes from his idea that progress turns against its creator, so as to harm and destroy the creator. In other words, he participates in the classical debate about progress by engaging in the question of the relationship between knowledge and moral conduct. In 1934 essay, “Reason Eclipsed,”²⁴ Huxley states that “[p]rogress is not, as some pessimists proclaim, a leap out of the frying pan into the fire; but, alas, it is only too often a passage from one frying pan into another frying-pan” (399).

Huxley’s engagement with the idea of progress is ambivalent also because, like an anti-progressivist thinker, he feared the future-consequences of technological progress and had questions regarding the negative influences of progress on culture and traditional values, while at the same time, like a progressivist thinker, he had leanings towards the idea that all “societies tend to develop in the same sort of the way” (Huxley,

²⁴ It should be mentioned here that the parallelism between Huxley’s and Horkheimer’s works is first signaled by their titles: Huxley’s essay is “Reason Eclipsed” (1934) and Horkheimer’s book is *Eclipse of Reason* (1947). Like Huxley, Horkheimer in this work showed that action in the name of and for the sake of progress instead leads to “social oppression and exploitation [which] threatens at every stage to transform progress into its opposite, complete barbarism” (*Eclipse of Reason* 134).

“Dangers of Diversity” 346) and that all non-Western societies necessarily follow the West.

In the late nineteen-twenties Huxley, then, was an anti-progressivist thinker with what might be called Eurocentric tendencies.²⁵ Ella Shohat and Robert Stam’s definitions of the intellectual and political tendencies underlying Eurocentric discourse are as follows:

1. Eurocentric discourse projects a linear historical trajectory leading from classical Greece (constructed as “pure,” “Western,” and “democratic”) to imperial Rome and then to metropolitan capitals of Europe and the US. It renders history as a sequence of empires. [...] In all cases, Europe, alone and unaided, is seen as the “motor” for progressive historical change: it invents class society, feudalism, capitalism, the industrial revolution.
2. Eurocentrism attributes to the “West” an inherent progress toward democratic institutions.
3. Eurocentrism elides non-European democratic traditions, while obscuring the manipulations embedded in Western formal democracy and masking the West’s part in subverting democracies abroad.
4. Eurocentrism minimizes the West’s oppressive practices by regarding them as contingent, accidental, exceptional.
5. Eurocentrism appropriates the cultural and material production of non-European while denying both their achievements and its own appropriation thus consolidating its sense of self and glorifying its own cultural anthropophagy. (2-3)

As indicated above, the discourse of Eurocentrism is a means of constructing a European history in ways in which Europe’s relationship with the rest of the world throughout history is justified while non-Western cultures are represented in a condescending way in keeping with such a historiography. Huxley’s essay “Dangers of Diversity” (1932) exemplifies the point number 1 in the list above by the statement that “[h]istory shows that societies tend to develop in the same sort of the way. Tribalism gives place to national unification and then to imperialism” (346). Similarly, the point number 2 is illustrated in Huxley’s statement in the same essay that

²⁵ At this point, it should be emphasized that when this study takes a critical attitude to the universalization of Eurocentric norms, it aims to focus on the institutional discourses and historically configured relations of power, and these institutional discourses and power relations are pertinent in this study because it takes that Huxley until *Brave New World* (1932) grounded his understanding of the modern in the historically situated discourse of Eurocentrism.

“[w]e are justified in hoping that, at some not too distant date, *our descendants* will agree to manage their international affairs *peaceably* [...]. But though this happy consummation may be realized in *the West*, is there any reason to believe that it will be simultaneously realized *else-where*? Alas, there is not” (346). In addition, the point number 5 in the list above is exemplified in Huxley’s essay when he claims that “[e]verything indicates that India, China, and the newly conscious peoples of Africa are entering upon that phase of intense nationalism which the European peoples entered at various times between the sixteenth and the nineteenth centuries. [...] As *we* begin to think internationally and disarm, *they* will be bursting with jingoism and spoiling for a fight” (347).

Huxley is biased in assuming that all countries will follow the same historical trends and that non-Western countries are “behind” the Western ones. Moreover, according to this vision of the development of societies within a linear understanding of history, it is also obvious that for Huxley non-Western countries would one day inevitably threaten Western ones which developed before them. His wording reveals that Huxley tends to hierarchize the West and the rest of the world, and he is inclined to universalize Eurocentric norms: he seems to identify “our descendants” with peace, “we” with “the modern,” “the West,” “the superior” and “they” with “the pre-modern” or “non-modern,” “the East,” “the inferior.” Also, the way he sees anti-colonial nationalist movements as depicted in the quotation – “the newly conscious peoples of Africa” and “bursting with jingoism and spoiling for a fight” – reveals his biased attitude towards independence movements in the colonies. His attitude is thus regarded as Eurocentric and it is significant for this study to the extent that his early ideas of the modern are characterized by his Eurocentric tendencies. As mentioned, Huxley’s having Eurocentric tendencies in the twenties is a significant part in this discussion because this part of the study aims to reveal how Huxley’s understanding of the modern in *Point Counter Point* was shaped by his Eurocentric leanings compared to that of Tanpınar’s. Yet, as will be shown,

Huxley constantly had evolving attitudes to the concepts of “the East,” “the West,” modernity and time; therefore, his writings starting from the early nineteen-thirties indicate that he began to grow more critical of his Eurocentric view, which identifies “the West” with the modern and “the East” with the non-modern, and therefore, he started to re-conceptualize his understanding of the modern and modern time.

In his writings starting from *Brave New World* Huxley shows that a linear understanding of time is the very reason for the problems of modernity. A progressive ideology which argues that society will develop until utopia was attained is criticized in this text because, according to him, the means (industrialization) does not justify the end (utopia). On the contrary, *Brave New World* shows that the means makes the end impossible because technology has started to mechanize linear time and dehumanize the individual in the modern age. The progress offered by a linear view of time and progression is denounced because it brings a new kind of slavery. Seeing the loophole in this system, he was concerned with the idea that the mechanization of time has rendered human beings cogs in a machine and sentenced to endless repetition. It is the world view represented by this human-made machine (clocks and watches as the symbols of the mechanization of time) that dominates human beings in the modern age. Therefore, Huxley in his writings of the thirties and afterwards shows a tendency that does not rely on the linear concept of time or a mathematical time that has enslaved thought. To replace mathematical time, he emphasizes “pure time” or an individual perception of time that has the potential to free human beings from social/human-made or mathematical time. In this, it can be argued that his writings from the thirties on exhibit affinities to Tanpınar’s in terms of their approaches to the concept of time.²⁶

²⁶ The transformation which occurred in Huxley’s system of thought in terms of his re-evaluation of the concepts of “the modern” and “time” and the parallelisms between Huxley’s and Tanpınar’s thought will be further elaborated in the *Brave New World* analysis section of Chapter 4.

Like Huxley, Adorno also investigated the concept of progress. He wrote an essay titled “Progress” (1963) in which he drew primarily on Kant and to some extent on Walter Benjamin, Hegel, and Marx. In this essay he claimed that “[h]owever little humanity *tel quel* progresses according to the advertising recipe of ‘new and improved,’ there is still no idea of progress without the idea of humanity” (56). In his view, progress is inextricably linked to “the survival of the species” (57), that is, the existence of progress always depends on the “happiness of unborn generations” (56). A belief in the pessimistic conception of progress brings Huxley, Adorno, Horkheimer and Marcuse closer in their thinking.

Defending “the self-reflection of reason,” Adorno, like Huxley, wanted to point out the necessity of the emergence of a critical attitude towards the instrumentalising and life-negating realities disseminated by capitalist social relations and towards inhumanity. To put it differently, Adorno wanted to attract attention to the importance of the “awakening” (61) of humanity or the necessity of “coming out of the spell,” (“Progress” 134) which would be awarded with progress. Therefore he contends that

[p]rogress means: to step out of the magic spell, even out of the spell of progress, which is itself nature, in that humanity becomes aware of its own inbred nature and brings to a halt the domination it exacts upon nature and through which domination by nature continues. In this way it could be said that progress occurs where it ends. (“Progress” 134)

According to this quotation, we can assume there are two opposite kinds of progress in Adorno’s mind. On the one hand, there is a “false” version of progress: societies which regard material and scientific progress as an instrument to dominate themselves and nature experience “false” progress because their development causes a degeneration and regression of power. “True” progress,²⁷ on the other hand, becomes possible if societies get rid of “the spell of progress” or the false impressions of progress like being

²⁷ “True” progress as used by Huxley (and later by Adorno and Marcuse – as will be explained later in the study) is the one in which human beings improve themselves and achieve goals in life by producing creative work and attaining cultural enlightenment.

rich and powerful by dominating and manipulating others and nature. To Adorno, once societies are released from this self-inflicted “spell of progress,” people in these societies can be closer to their human nature and true progress can take place.

Like Huxley, Marcuse takes progress as the progress of human freedom and creativity to the extent that there would be no place for alienated labor and false needs, or meaningless necessities, produced by advanced industrial society. Progress, as Marcuse predicts, will take place in a period of time when complete automation has occurred and alienated labor is abolished, and leisure can provide an area in which individuals freely actualize their potentialities. Marcuse’s argument about progress is as follows:

“[p]rogress” is not a neutral term; it moves toward specific ends, and these ends are defined by the possibilities of ameliorating the human condition. Advanced industrial society is approaching the stage where continued progress would demand the radical subversion of the prevailing direction and organization of progress. This stage would be reached when material production (including the necessary services) becomes automated to the extent that all vital needs can be satisfied while necessary labor time is reduced to marginal time. From this point on, technical progress would transcend the realm of necessity, where it served as the instrument of domination and exploitation which thereby limited its rationality; technology would become subject to free play of faculties in the struggle for the participation of nature and of society. (*One-Dimensional* 18)

Like Huxley, Marcuse highlights the negative ramifications of some political, economic and social practices which are recognized as progress, in his *One Dimensional Man*. An idea explored by Huxley, and then followed by Adorno and Marcuse in their writings, is as follows: if used for the wellbeing of humankind, technology and science will destroy all evil practices that modern human beings’ ancestors created such as wars, famine and hunger, diseases and indigence. Thus, for Huxley the true application of technology and science has the potential to remove the evils and woes of humanity that have prevented societies from achieving the

“true” progress. Yet, this should not obscure the fact he was aware that true progress is an almost utopic term since he observed that while “man’s control over his environment” (Huxley, “The Reality of Progress” 103) has increased, his sense of spiritual satisfaction or subjective progress has not accompanied this increase. And the nature (or curse) of human beings, that is, their urge to dominate, caused Huxley (and Adorno and Marcuse) to have fears concerning humankind’s probable self-destruction.

2.1.4 Work, Leisure and Pleasure

The concepts of work,²⁸ leisure and pleasure kept Huxley busy. To understand how approached these concepts and how he was influential on the ideas of the Frankfurt School theorists, I will start with an exploration of how he conceptualized them. First of all, it has to be indicated that Huxley dealt with these issues from within the context of his cultural criticism. His literary and non-literary writings all contain material pertaining to these concepts. In other words, Huxley interpreted the idea of work and leisure – and consequently pleasure – and their relations to social and cultural issues as a part of his analysis of modern society which, he thinks, is dominated by mass production and mass consumption.

In his essay “Work and Leisure” (1924) Huxley expresses his doubts about the thoughts of reformers who optimistically yearn for a future when efficiently-working societies and a “true” application of machinery will eliminate the obligation of trouble and toil. In spite of having sympathy with their longing, Huxley thinks these aspirations are too good to be true and predicts more problems even if these aspirations are to be realized. In another essay, “Revolutions” (1929), Huxley mentions the problems he thinks may emerge by analyzing the probable reasons why the Marxist revolution did not take place. Huxley believes that his contemporary society proved wrong Marx’s nineteenth century predictions

²⁸ Huxley used the word “work” interchangeably with the word “labor,” as did Adorno, Horkheimer and Marcuse.

of socialism replacing capitalism, maintaining that things have changed since Marx formulated his predictions. In the essay he argues that

[t]he Proletariat as he [Marx] knew it had ceased – or, if that is too sweeping a statement – is ceasing to exist in America and, to a less extent, industrialized Europe. [...] There is a transformation of the Proletariat. In the most fully industrialized countries the Proletariat is no longer abject; it is prosperous, its way of life approximates to that of the bourgeoisie. (131-2)

Huxley here calls attention to the gradual transformation which the working class has experienced as a consequence of industrialization. In modern capitalism laborers, he claimed, are now paid well, as much as the bourgeoisie, for less working-hours. Unlike reformers like G. B. Shaw, Huxley takes this as something negative, since modern capitalism manages to find ways to deviate the working class from its destined revolution and the promises of socialism. Modern capitalism has created a social re-organization: “[t]hose who are paid well buy well, particularly when hypnotized by the incessant suggestions of modern advertising. The policy of modern capitalism is to teach to the Proletariat to be wasteful, to organize and facilitate its extravagance, and at the same time to make that extravagance possible by paying high wages in return for high productions” (“Revolutions” 132). In other words, the Proletariat who have more money and more leisure are manipulated to make the wheels turn for modern capitalism: “the money circulates and the prosperity of the modern industrial state is assured” (132). Thus, the transformation of the Proletariat has made it “a branch of the bourgeoisie” (132). People who have to work less and have more leisure, Huxley claims, “plunge into a whirlpool of role-playing, hectic, social life and compulsive ‘Good-Timing’” (Huxley, “Recreations” 85). Huxley seems to be certain that the majority of people, not only the Proletariat, but all people in the modern industrial countries waste their time in with this “Good-Timing,” which, he thinks, involves “making drearily barbaric music, jazz, dancing, smoking, chattering, and drinking” (85). Since all of modern leisure culture is described by Huxley

as “the Good Time” (85), he seems to promote a society that provides only infrequent pleasure, not “pleasure which is blunted by constant use” (87).

Huxley believes that the “Good Timers” are voluntarily exposed to stupefying entertainment: “all over the world, in thousands upon thousands of hotels and cabarets, casinos and restaurants and night clubs, an exactly similar Good Time is being supplied, ready-made and standardized, by those whose business is to sell it” (“Recreations” 86).²⁹ Huxley draws a picture of people in a future where they have more leisure time, as follows:

[i]f, tomorrow or a couple of generations hence, it were made possible for all human beings to lead the life of leisure, [...] the results, so far as I can see, would be as follows: There would be an enormous increase in the demand for such time-killers and substitutes for thought as newspapers, films, fiction, cheap means of communication and wireless telephones; to put it in more general terms, there would be an increase in the demand for sport and art. The interest in the fine art of love-making would be widely extended. And enormous numbers of people, hitherto immune from these mental and moral diseases, would be afflicted by ennui, depression and universal dissatisfaction. The fact is that, brought up as they are at present, the majority of human beings can hardly fail to devote their leisure to occupations which, if not positively vicious, are at least stupid, futile and, what is worse, secretly realized to be futile. (*Along the Road* 142)

Here he expresses his fears that through the various means he lists, along with unhappiness the “Good-Time” will deprive humans of their most important faculties: thinking and acting freely. The general atmosphere of the post-War West, Huxley thinks, is dominated by this “Good-Time,” which is a type social engineering enabled by the mechanization of leisure.

Another point Huxley mentions, perhaps in all of his essays on work and leisure, is the emergence of an inverse relationship between leisure and

²⁹ Tanpınar’s approaches to leisure and pleasure in *A Mind at Peace* (1949) differ from Huxley’s ideas because according to Tanpınar, leisure which was associated with dinner parties [*fasıl*] in this novel promised artistic creativity and genuine communication between the characters. Yet, his attitude to leisure and pleasure in *The Time Regulation Institute* (1961) changed and started to resemble negative and critical ideas of Huxley about leisure and pleasure because in *The Time Regulation Institute*, characters who deal with “stupefying” activities are severely criticized. This issue will be further explored in Chapter 3 and 4.

creativity. As mentioned before, reformers like G. B. Shaw and H. G. Wells believed that machinery would make more leisure possible for everybody and they sympathized with the project of a substantial reduction of working hours; and yet, Huxley states:

[one of the] great modern menaces to life, the root of many widely ramifying evils, is the machine. The machine is dangerous because it is not only a labor-saver but also a creation-saver. Creative work, of however humble a kind, is the source of man's most solid, least transitory happiness. The machine robs the majority of human beings of the very possibility of this happiness. Leisure has now been almost as completely mechanized as labor. Men no longer amuse themselves, creatively, but sit and passively amused by mechanical devices. [Leisure is wasted and] machinery condemns one of the most vital needs of humanity to a frustration. ("Spinoza's Worm" 331)

Huxley was not, indeed, against social amusements or labor-saver machines but he was against those amusements which were designed to become habitual and a daily necessity, or, an end in itself, and he wanted to warn people against ready-made activities and machines as distractions which deprive humankind of its most human features like creativity, individual's desire for self-assertion and self-expression. Nevertheless, we cannot call Huxley a "machinery-hater" because he sees that "though harmful, the use of machinery cannot be discontinued. Simple-lifers, like Tolstoy and Gandhi, ignore the most obvious facts. [...] The only remedy is systematic inconsistency. The life-quenching work at machine or desk must be regarded as a necessary evil to be compensated for by the creative labors or amusements of leisure" ("Spinoza's Worm" 331-2). Passivity and subservience to machinery, to Huxley, harm the imaginative and instinctive nature of human beings, but they are naturalized and propagated by those who have a financial interest in providing standardized and creation-saving entertainments for the masses. Huxley wanted to counter this by creating an awareness of the effects of mechanized-leisure and he favored a desire for the de-mechanization of leisure. He prescribed not destruction but consistent counteraction through de-mechanized leisure, and proposed a solution: "[I]n

the existing industrial circumstances he [the modern individual] can only be a man out of business hours. He must live two lives – or rather one life and one automatic simulation of life” (“Spinoza’s Worm” 334). This solution, which requires a modern individual to lead a dualistic life, will be further elaborated in the following chapter, where Huxley’s exemplification of his thought in *Point Counter Point* will be analyzed.

Adorno, Horkheimer and Marcuse had similar approaches to that of Huxley in terms of the concepts of labor, leisure and pleasure, which they thought degraded the state of human beings in the modern age. Adorno and Horkheimer, in their *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, took the concepts of labor and leisure as modes of domination and totalitarianism. Their analysis of labor and leisure in the context of the culture industry offers a version of a society that has been deprived of its role to nourish individuality and true freedom. To Adorno and Horkheimer, the modern culture industry’s production of safe and standardized products has rendered labor tedious, mechanized, alienated and devoid of any creativity. Thus, for Adorno and Horkheimer, cultural production under state control has penetrated into labor and leisure:

[b]y subordinating in the way and to the same end all areas of intellectual creativity, by occupying men’s senses from the time they leave the factory in the evening to the time they clock in again the next morning with matter that bears the impress of the labor process they themselves have to sustain throughout the day, this subsumption mockingly satisfies the concept of a unified culture which the philosophers of personality contrasted with mass culture. (*Dialectic of Enlightenment* 131)

As noted above, the culture industry intends to produce a type of consumer that is controlled whether at work or at leisure. By teaching people what to expect from work and entertainment and how to use their time both at work and at leisure, the culture industry shapes humans’ thoughts and aspirations and reduces them to masses with identical expectations and demands. Adorno and Horkheimer argue that it is particularly through the

entertainment business that the culture industry's influence over the consumer is enhanced.

Adorno and Horkheimer, quite similar to Huxley, emphasize the creativity-lacking or mind-numbing features of labor and entertainment. Thus, they thought that the consequences of rational thinking and scientific applications in the guise of the apparatus of the culture industry paradoxically discourages rationalism and creativity and that it even cheats its consumer of what it perpetually promises: although the average consumer assumes that pleasure is always prolonged, in reality the fulfilment of pleasures is postponed. Therefore, "the culture industry does not sublimate; it represses" (*Dialectic of Enlightenment* 140). They further claim that the culture industry also makes use of laughter and fun: "it makes laughter the instrument of the fraud practiced on happiness [...] in the false society laughter is a disease which has attacked happiness and is drawing it into its worthless totality" (*Dialectic of Enlightenment* 141). Adorno and Horkheimer's descriptions of laughter and fun in a false society seem to be drawn from the false society in Huxley's *Brave New World*: pleasure promised by the culture industry is "flight from, not, as is asserted, flight from a wretched reality, but from the last remaining thought of resistance" (*Dialectic of Enlightenment* 144). The liberation which pleasure promises in the culture industry is freedom from thinking, negation and protest. Briefly, Adorno and Horkheimer's way of thinking in relation to the role of labor, leisure and pleasure in the culture industry is quite similar to that of Huxley since they all had doubts that "with the technological developments, the control mechanism, by surrounding non-working time, free time of people, extends its domination to the whole life of the individual. What is surrounded is no longer only labor time, but also leisure" (*Dialectic of Enlightenment* 127).

Marcuse³⁰ also agreed with the diagnoses of Huxley concerning his analysis of the powerful status of the culture industry to affect and restrict people in the modern capitalist world. Like him, Marcuse claimed that “technology in the contemporary era constitutes an entire mode of organizing and perpetuating social relationships, a manifestation of prevalent thought and behavior patterns, an instrument for control and domination” (Marcuse, “Some Social Implications” 414). Marcuse’s book, *One-Dimensional Man* (1964) dwells on the concepts of labor and leisure, and explicates the reasons for a one-dimensional society and the alienation it brings. Marcuse’s ideas are reminiscent of Huxley’s thoughts concerning mass culture and its influence on individuals. Marcuse believed that advanced industrial society produced mass culture and it demanded individuals’ conformity to the dominant patterns of thought and behavior. According to Marcuse, in the twentieth century technological developments had helped this domination infiltrate into leisure. This means that alienation had become fully extended over the society. He argues that modern individuals are exploited and dominated by the false needs that strip the modern individual of his/her liberation. According to Marcuse, as a result of these false needs, both culture and humankind are in danger. Imposing false needs upon human beings is a strategy applied by modern capitalism in order to indoctrinate and manipulate the ways people think, feel and behave: These false needs and their satisfaction, according to Marcuse, are hindrances to critical thinking, freedom and creativity because these false needs are “products of a society whose dominant interest demands repression” (*One-Dimensional* 5). A wide variety of goods and services supplied by technological progress, as Marcuse claims, maintains and prolongs “social controls over a life of toil and fear,” or sustains alienation (*One-Dimensional* 8). Once “the efficiency of the system blunts the individuals’ recognition that it contains no facts which do not communicate

³⁰ However, unlike Huxley or Adorno and Horkheimer, Marcuse still saw a possibility to undo this process by using the very technological developments that created and strengthened the culture industry.

the repressive power of the whole,” they begin to identify themselves with the system or society that invades their life. Alienation of the modern individuals can be described as a one-dimensional existence. So, what emerges is “a pattern of one-dimensional thought and behavior in which ideas, aspirations, and objectives that, by their content, transcend the established universe of discourse and action are either repelled or reduced to terms of this universe” (*One-Dimensional* 12). Alienation of the modern individual, according to Huxley and Marcuse, is a result of the process of refusal or elimination of ideas, aspirations and objectives that do not concur with the prevailing system.

The exploration of Huxley’s approaches to modernity and modernization in terms of the concepts like mass culture, progress, labor-leisure, culture industry and instrumental rationality and issues like the dichotomy between the West and the East, human diversity, parliamentary democracy and eugenics aims to clarify the outlines of his differing conceptualizations of modernity and modernization. It is argued that Huxley’s approach to modernity went through three phases: first, his fascination with the Western narrative of modernity in the early twenties, then his critique of it from a Eurocentric perspective in the late twenties, and finally, his critical approach to the liberal narrative of modernity and progressivism in the early thirties.

2.2 Conceptualizing Tanpınar’s Approach to the Modern, Modernity and Modernization

This section will begin with a discussion of the ways in which modernity and modernization were experienced and conceptualized in Tanpınar’s Turkey. Specifically, we need to find out what kind of parameters triggered Tanpınar’s discontent with modernization and how they are expressed in his novels. So this part of the chapter will explore modernity and modernization discussions in relation to Turkey to understand whether Tanpınar’s uneasiness arose from the idea of modernity

itself, its dialogue with tradition, its application in Turkish society or from a combination of all of these. The following is a discussion of the outcomes of the Turkish experience of modernity and modernization, and how such notions as imperialism, the past, tradition, modernization, civilizational change, time, art, technology, progress and mass society inform the work of Tanpınar. This discussion will also provide us with an exploration of the interaction between Tanpınar's understanding of modernity and modernization and Huxley's attitude to the same concepts. Furthermore, within the framework of the same discussion, a new dimension concerning Tanpınar's attitude to modernity and modernization will be revealed: the parallelisms between Tanpınar's understanding of modernity and modernization and the idea of Multiple Modernities.

The narratives that give an account of Turkey's modernization can be divided into the following groups: the first are narratives resting on the liberal tradition of modernity, which in the Ottoman Era emerged during the *Tanzimat* [Reorganization] Period (1839-1876).

The perspective on which the liberal tradition of modernity rests is explained by Mirsepassi as follows:

[t]he liberal tradition of modernity (Montesquieu, Hegel, Weber, Durkheim, Orientalism) privileges Western cultural and moral dispositions, defining modernity in terms of Western cultural and historical experiences. The liberal vision of modernity [...] considers Western culture an essential part of modernization, viewing non-Western cultures and traditions as fundamentally hostile to modernity and incompatible with modernization. (1-2)

So the liberal tradition of modernity rests (consciously and non-consciously) on typically Eurocentric thinking, as defined by Shohat and Stam. It relies on the Western other in its construction of the (western) self-definition of modernity; the construction of an imagined "other" endures as a helpful and fundamental tool in this self-defining project in the West and in the process of history-making. Mirsepassi maintains that

[i]n multiple and fundamental discourses, a new identity was seized by means of contrast: a totalizing ideology was constructed upon the

notion of a non-Western Other in the defining moment of modernity itself. Modernist self-understanding established the dialectical presence of this “Other” as a prerequisite for the internal solidarity and durability of its own innermost structure. This is the dark side of modernity, both intellectually and politically. (18)

According to Mirsepassi, the non-West was seen as the culmination of the irrational and automatically defined as its anti-thesis, the West, as the sphere of the emerging spirits of freedom and reason. Furthermore, this discourse was not only influential in encouraging “the Western mind” to define itself as superior but also it persuaded “the Eastern mind” to define itself and everything “within the narrow limits prescribed by Western modernity” (19). The liberal tradition of modernity has, thus, a tendency to universalize Eurocentric norms, since it “denies all other cultures and histories any positive role in the making of modernity in the contemporary world” (20). It presents all non-Western cultures as inherently inert, and as therefore constituting just the opposite of the West.³¹ Although challenged and criticized by many scholars such as Said, Mitchell and Spivak, this Eurocentric narrative has continued to hold noteworthy predominance in the media, popular culture and among academics.

In the Ottoman *Tanzimat* Era and the early years of the Republic in Turkey there emerged a discourse resting on the liberal tradition of modernity described above, and it looked at issues through this particular “modern” lens. Turkish society opted for modernization in the early nineteenth century following the willful efforts of the Ottoman intelligentsia

³¹ As emphasized in Chapter 1, like the thinkers of the liberal tradition of modernity (Hegel, Montesquieu, Weber, and the Orientalists), Huxley (in the nineteen-twenties), and later the Frankfurt School thinkers, tended to define modernity and modernization with concepts and ideas based on Western terms and systems of belief. Because of this they presented a high degree of agreement in their association of modernity with that of the liberal tradition. Both Huxley and the Frankfurt School theorists agreed with the liberal claim that “a scientific effort” is the pre-requisite for modernity and modernization. It can also be argued that they all believed that modernity was a project originally developed in the West, so the West should be the model for the non-Western countries because modernity is “objective, culturally neutral”, and thus “universally applicable to all societies” (Mirsepassi 9). However, Huxley and the Frankfurt School theorists also criticized the liberal tradition of modernity for not taking “culture, values, morality, and religion” as “the first issue.” (Mirsepassi 9)

to become a part of the Western civilization, and this was based on their belief that civilization should be based on material development: “[s]ince the Ottoman elite were inspired by the ideals of the French Revolution and those of the Enlightenment and attributed the decline of their land to its scientific, [economic] and intellectual stagnation, their strongest impulse in the effort to salvage the empire was to import Western ideas and political practices” (Seyhan 25). Azade Seyhan’s critical opinion of the experience of Turkey’s modernization has been shared by such sociologists in Turkey as Şerif Mardin, Nergis Ertürk, M. Orhan Okay, Niyazi Berkes and Nilüfer Göle,³² all of whom claim that the project of Ottoman/Turkish modernization was based on Eurocentric beliefs and motivations which led to the adoption of reforms imported from Western countries, mainly in the fields of the economy and the military. In the nineteenth century some military defeats caused the enactment of the movement and period known as the *Tanzimat* (1839-76) which, as Okay puts forward, officially proved that the Sultan accepted the superiority of “the West” (55). It was the time when the Ottoman Empire was “peripherally integrated into the economic and political sphere of global capitalist modernity” (Ertürk, “Modernity” 42). Later the Imperial Reform Edict [*Islahat Firman*] (1856)³³ enhanced the acceptance of the idea that “the West”/Europe was on a higher level of civilization, to which the Ottoman Empire needed to ascend (Okay 55). Hence, in the nineteenth century, modernization in Turkey meant incorporation into Western civilization (Berkes 28). In his review of the Westernization of Turkey, Boğaç Erozan also claims that “the West was perceived by the Ottoman elite [of the *Tanzimat* Era] as an expanse from which solutions could be derived to the ills of the Ottoman rule” (Erozan 6).

³² For a comprehensive source of their writings, refer to Bibliography.

³³ “The *Islahat Firman* (*The Imperial Islâhat Firmân, The Imperial Reform Edict, or The Rescript of Reform*) was a February 18, 1856 edict of the Ottoman government and part of the *Tanzimat* reforms. The decree from Sultan Abdülmecid I promised equality in education, government appointments, and administration of justice to all regardless of creed” (*Encyclopedia Britannica Online*).

To this end, several reforms were carried out in governmental, military, financial, judicial and educational areas, and in accordance with these reforms, several signs of modernization in the fine arts, music, architecture, literature and philosophy emerged. So it can be stated that reforms in the fields of governmental, military, financial etc. were reinforced by other reforms carried out in artistic and philosophical fields, and therefore these “modernizing” attempts in these fields were to be considered as successful. According to this view of modernization, “following the Western path was a matter of life or death in order not to be left behind the developed nations of the West” (Kaya and Tecmen 7).³⁴

This discourse, which accepted the superiority of “the West,” was produced in the late years of the nineteenth century and the early twentieth century by a generation of intellectuals and bureaucrats who had been educated in secular schools. “Their conception of the West was entwined with superiority, which was believed to be springing not only from the power of material civilization such as science and technology, but also from various cultural elements such as clothes, pet dogs, piano lessons, French lessons, opera, balls, dancing, and novel-writing” (Göçek 128). These social and cultural changes found their most persuasive modes of expression in the literary arena. “From about the middle of the nineteenth century the spread of Western ideas and climatization of Western political and social attitudes among the Turks was greatly accelerated by the rise of a new Turkish literature, differing both in form and content from classical Ottoman writings” (Lewis 136). The novel as a genre was first introduced in the *Tanzimat* via the translations of the novels written in European literatures. The Turkish novels of the period, known as *Servet-i Fünun* (“Wealth of Knowledge”) literature, by writers such as Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil (1866-1945), Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın (1875-1957), Hüseyin Rahmi Gürpınar (1864-1944),

³⁴ See also Bülent Somay’s book titled *The Psychopolitics of the Oriental Father* (2014) which “problematizes the East/West dimorphism. Its main hypothesis is that ‘Modernization’ and ‘Westernization’ are only euphemisms for the advent of capitalism in Asiatic and African societies” (Foreword x).

Ahmet Rasim (1864-1932), and Mehmet Rauf (1875-1931), for instance, often reflected “the clash between the Ottoman and Western cultures,” and usually favored Western culture (Göçek 122).

The dominant discourse of modernization during the foundation of the Turkish Republic (1923) imagined “the West” as a monolithic entity, as well. “They [the founders of the Republic] dismissed the old and tried to ‘modernize’ society’s traditional values, culture, the way of living, language, history, even aesthetical tastes of people in music” (Aydın 40). After the foundation of the Turkish Republic in 1923, the new politically dominant group led by Mustafa Kemal and his followers aimed to “modernize” Turkey through a series of reforms. They adopted the “universal validity of Western modernity” (Keyman and Öniş 12) because, Meltem Ahıska argues, they “internalized the Orientalist notion that Turkey perpetually lacks modernity at its core, and that the modernization project and regulation of its citizens in simulations of Western ideals seeks to bridge this gap” (351).

Ergun Özbudun draws attention to another dynamic underlying the “Kemalist” reforms. He argues that Kemalism³⁵ “[d]id not dream about creating a totally new society or a new type of man, as did totalitarian ideologies. Kemalism was instrumental in the sense that it was closely associated with action... Many Kemalist principles grew out of action and in response to concrete needs and situations” (90). Özbudun emphasizes the temporariness of the solutions that were found for the specific problems that occurred just after the emergence of the Republic, and claims that modernization was utilized as a discourse of national independence to preserve national autonomy. Kemalists longed for a profound cultural

³⁵ Nazım İrem explains Kemalism as follows: “Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu first used the term ‘Kemalism’ on 28 June 1929 to refer to the nation- and state-building ideology that defined the legitimate political vocabulary constituting the basic principles and values of the Turkish path to modernity. Then the term ‘Kemalism’ was used in the mainstream historiography of the Turkish Revolution to refer to a new political stand that interpreted the revolutionary practices that had taken place between 1923 and 1935 within the framework of the tradition of ideological positivism” (“Turkish Conservative Modernism” 87).

change to get closer to the West and wanted to create Turkey in the image of modern Europe; for them Western modernity was an inevitable destiny for Turkey in its path to modernization. In this respect, modernization was regarded as a method of nation-building, and it entailed secularism and industrialism.

Another major discourse concerning modernity and modernization in Turkey is, however, quite different from the narratives that define the modern as Western and modernization as Westernization. It consists of the narratives which foreground the locality and multiplicity of modernities, and this narrative emerged in the Ottoman Empire during the Second Constitutional-Monarchy [*Meşrutiyet*] (1908). This discourse problematized the Eurocentric understanding of modernization. From the Second *Meşrutiyet* (1908) to the declaration of the Republic (1923) some intellectuals and novelists were not content with the *Tanzimat*-period intellectuals' approach to "the West" and they produced literature as a reaction to it. This literature reacts against – not the reforms of the *Tanzimat* but – the inability to build a bridge between these reforms and local traditions and cultural values in Turkey. It criticizes both the groups who denied the modern and present time and thereby are "buried" in the past, and those who welcomed the westernization of Turkey and denied their connection with the past. According to this narrative, representatives of both groups had equally problematic relationships with life and experienced identity crises due to their uneasiness of mind.

In spite of having heterogeneous structures and multiple approaches to modernity,³⁶ the majority of intellectuals writing in this period³⁷ criticized

³⁶ Yahya Kemal Beyatlı and Ahmet Haşim were the leading names in the founding of the literary journal known as "Dergah" meaning "resources," and they were supporters of Henri Bergson and his ideas about time. Concerning this literary journal, Besim Dellaloğlu states that "this journal was a kind of the Turkish Renaissance" (85). The other writers who wrote in the journal were Yakup Kadri Karaosmanoğlu, Nurullah Ataç, A. H. Tanpınar, Mustafa Şekip Tunç, İsmayıl Hakkı Baltacıoğlu, Hasan Ali Yücel and Mehmet Emin Erişgil, On the other hand, Ziya Gökalp was a more nationalist writer whose thoughts rested on Durkheim's theory of solidarity. Gökalp summarized his thought by emphasizing its main concepts: "becoming Turk, becoming Muslim, becoming modern" (Dellaloğlu 18).

the *Tanzimat* period's and the early years of the Republic's relationships with the West/Europe, and they thought that conceptualizing the experiences of modernity in Turkey in the terms created by the West reinforced the Western conviction that "the non-Western world could exist only as modernity's 'other,'" as Mirsepassi noted (15). Some intellectuals of the *Meşrutiyet* period³⁸ thought that as a result of the *Tanzimat*'s understanding of modernity and modernization, which entailed denying several things that were cultural and local in Turkey and replacing them with new realities "imported" from modern Europe, people in Turkey faced the threat of rootlessness and feelings of anxiety. As mentioned before, their reaction was not against the reforms but against the discourse of the *Tanzimat* modernization which posited modernity as something that excluded local cultural heritage and practices. The novelists of the *Meşrutiyet* were frustrated with and critical of the discourse of modernity and modernization produced in their times because the applications of the reforms did not produce the expected results due to historical, cultural, economic and political differences (Ahıska, "Occidentalism" 351).

Meltem Ahıska approaches the problem of Turkish modernity and modernization from a postcolonial perspective and claims that, as a counter to "Orientalism," the narrative relying on the liberal tradition of modernity in Turkey created an "Occidentalism." The imagined Western gaze or the historical fantasy of the modern identified with the West is already inscribed in this conception of modernity:

[j]ust as the West always refers to the notion of the East to assert its hegemony, Turkey [or more specifically the discourse produced by

³⁷ Some novels from the Second *Meşrutiyet*, in a movement known as "National Literature" (1908-1923), are by Ömer Seyfettin (1884-1920) and Ziya Gökalp (1876-1924) and the movement includes the early writings of Yahya Kemal (1884-1958).

³⁸ Some of them were Abdullah Cevdet, Kılıçzade Hakkı, Celal Nuri İleri, Yahya Kemal, Tevfik Fikret, and Ahmet Haşim. As one of the examples of the forerunners of a local modernity, Kılıçzade Hakkı's article "Pek Uyanık Bir Uyku" ("A Rather Awake Sleep" 1912) can be mentioned. It was published in Abdullah Cevdet's journal *İçtihad* (*Opinion*) and talks about a local understanding of modernity (Uçar 16). Also, "Celal Nuri İleri's "Cezri Program" / "Radical Program" (1919) with its 86 articles supports a local idea of modernity" (Uyanık 229).

the elites of the Ottoman *Tanzimat* period and the early years of the Turkish Republic] reproduce[d] the reified images of the West to justify its regime of power in its boundary management of dividing spheres, regions, and people along the axis of East and West. (“Occidentalism” 367-8)

The creation of an imaginary and monolithic idea of the West and referral to the notion of Western modernity provided the founders of the young Turkish Republic with a discourse on which they could rely and upon which to create the modern Turkish national identity. As Ahıska puts it, Turkey has had an ambivalent relationship with both East and West since then:

‘[t]he West’ has either been celebrated as a ‘model’ to be followed or exorcised as a threat to ‘indigenous’ national values. So, the term Occidentalism justified Turkey’s regime of power in its boundary management of dividing spheres, regions as ‘cosmopolitan’ Istanbul and ‘national’ Ankara [and] people [as] ‘the national elite’ and ‘the people’ along the axis of East and West. (Ahıska, “Occidentalism” 368)

While investigating the history of the experience of modernity and modernization in Turkey, our point of view and interest in Turkish affairs should not traditionally and obstinately remain focused only on socioeconomic and political questions. Actually, one may go further and claim, as Besim Dellaloğlu does, that it was always literary figures who produced sound sociological studies in Turkey, before the sociologists (7). Thus, we should also mention Turkish literary figures and their works during the Ottoman *Tanzimat*, *Meşrutiyet* and in the early years of the Republic, because literary texts (which are inclusive of literary memoirs, biographies, and letters) may tell stories that history and sociology have forgotten and these can complement our understanding of the past and the present. Many sociocultural and historical events in Turkey shaped the Turkish novel, and vice versa. This study takes the emergence of the Turkish novel as one of the outcomes of modernity in Turkey as *de facto*. In other words, the novel as a genre emerged in the *Tanzimat* via the translations of some European novels into Turkish. These translated novels also represented the idea of translated lives. That is, it is an expression of a

search for identity in modern contexts and, furthermore “the emergence of the Ottoman Turkish novel coincided with a series of institutional [cultural, political] and educational reforms [...] intended to reduce the widening gap between the fortunes of the declining empire and the advancements of European nations” (Seyhan 23).

As mentioned earlier, in the late years of the nineteenth century and the early twentieth century a generation of *Tanzimat* literary figures, known as *Servet-i Fünun* writers³⁹ wrote novels reflecting “the clash between the Ottoman and Western cultures” (Göçek 122). These novelists felt an urge to write in the manner of Western novelists and experienced the “anxiety about Western influences on their work” because in this genre of literature they wrote under the influence of a feeling of “belatedness” (Gürbilek, *Kör Ayna* 47), and their works were modeled on Western novels in terms of both form and content.

The terms “belatedness,” “lack,” and “originality” which are pertinent in the discussion of Tanpınar’s attitude to modernity and modernization are discussed by Nurdan Gürbilek in her article “Dandies and Originals: Authenticity, Belatedness, and the Turkish Novel” as follows:

[a] whole set of social-economic-cultural reasons are at work here: a society that is ‘belatedly modernized,’⁴⁰ a system of thought that has come to accept its insufficiency [or lack] before a modern one presuming to be superior, and a culture that has adopted an infantile role when confronted by foreign modern ideals. What the Greek scholar Gregory Jusdanis calls ‘belated modernity,’ what the Iranian scholar Daryush Shayegan describes as ‘a consciousness retarded to the idea,’⁴¹ what the Turkish scholar Jale Parla explains by a sense of ‘fatherlessness’⁴² and what the Turkish critic Orhan Koçak discusses

³⁹ Some of them were Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil, Hüseyin Rahmi Gürpınar, Hüseyin Cahit Yalçın, Ahmet Rasim and Mehmet Rauf.

⁴⁰ Gregory Jusdanis, *Belated Modernity and Aesthetic Culture: Inventing National Literature* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1991).

⁴¹ Daryush Shayegan, *Le Regard mutilé: Schizophrénie culturelle: Pays traditionnels face à la modernité* (Paris: Albin Michel, 1989), 83.

⁴² Jale Parla argues that the Turkish novel is born into a fatherlessness, not only because the first Turkish novels were about fatherless boys, but also because the first novelists had to

within the framework of a ‘missed ideal’⁴³ are all related to the traumatic shifting of models generally discussed under the heading Westernization. (599)

As the passage indicates, the sense of belatedness evoked a “lack” in “the people” since, as Ahıska claims, it “represented the Orient in terms of ‘backward’ Islamic and Arabic influences” (“Occidentalism” 365) from the eyes of an Occidentalist fantasy. Gürbilek holds that in the Turkish novel, the problem of the East/the West and of “the Westernization”, that is, the loss of “the Eastern superiority to the West,” is the cause of the feeling of belatedness or “a narcissistic injury” (*Kör Ayna* 11, 13). She states that the discourse of belatedness, which according to Ahıska was created by the members of the national elite to organize “the desire to be modern around the marker of “the West,” which they claimed to possess” (366), is prevalent in Turkey even today, not only in literary but also in cultural and social criticism because, as Gürbilek thinks, all these fields are stuck between two extremes; they are torn between a detached observation criticizing its object for its lack of adequacy and an ardent search for an authentic localness, or between an unconditional admiration of the stranger and an unconditional hostility to it (Gürbilek, “Dandies” 602). The same idea is articulated by Ahıska when she argues that “the virtual viewpoint of the West [...] oscillates between recognition and rejection, leading to a series of splits” (“Occidentalism” 366). The dilemma of the Turkish writers and critics has stemmed from the “traumatic” late-nineteenth-century encounter with the West; on the one hand, they may prefer to write only about daily life in Turkey and are content to get in touch with “the Turkish,” and nothing else, out of the fear of sounding inauthentic, and therefore, their work is bound to “a locality without any universal ideals” (Koçak 118). On the other hand,

assume the role of the father at an early age, being “authoritative children” themselves, to compensate for the lack of political and intellectual power in the society at large. Jale Parla, *Babalar ve Oğullar* (Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1990).

⁴³ Orhan Kocak, “Kaptırılmış İdeal: *Mai ve Siyah* Üzerine Psikanalitik Bir Deneme,” *Toplum ve Bilim*, no. 70 (1996): 94-152.

out of the sense of belatedness, they may attempt to write only about ideals transferred from the West, which is a choice made “under the command of copied fancies and borrowed aspirations” (Koçak 118). In the first case, there is a shallowness of vision while there is a second-hand-ness in the second. And Gürbilek claims that because of the feeling of belatedness “the Turkish novelist [in his/her role of sociologist] is either a snob, a parvenu, a dandy, *alafranga* [European], lacking originality or an unrefined provincialist stuck in the narrow traditional world, *alaturka* [Turkish]” (“Dandies” 603).

Gürbilek believes that for a discussion of Tanpınar’s works one has to problematize and elaborate the term “originality” before it is accepted as a criterion for measuring the value of a work of art. She argues that the overemphasis on originality and the obsessive attempt to create the authentic are themselves parts of the impasse of belatedness. In the domain of literature, she tries to question the underlying reasons between such dualities as the original/the imitation, the authentic/the counterfeit, the self/the other. She states that the reaction of the *Meşrutiyet* period intelligentsia to the *Tanzimat* paved the way for a quest for originality in the *Meşrutiyet* period, because they saw the *Tanzimat* period, with all its market economy and individual consumption, as a threat to traditional society (Gürbilek, “Dandies” 608). So, as mentioned before, Gürbilek also justifies the reason why the novels written in the *Meşrutiyet* period were a response to the shock Western civilization caused in the Ottoman Empire after the *Tanzimat*. In brief, Gürbilek asserts that the term “belatedness” is at the center of not only the Turkish novel but also the modern criticism. The feeling of belatedness caused an ironic opposition between two groups: the first supporting the quest for originality (referring to “the self” or authenticity and “internal”), and the second showing a fascination with “the original” (referring to “the other,” “the external” or “the West”). Both endeavors, according to Gürbilek are a futile and “belated strategy” (“Dandies” 624) leading to cultural anxiety. Thus, it can be claimed that the

feeling of belatedness and anxiety has been a dominant theme in the Turkish novel since the *Tanzimat*; some novels are criticized for their snobbism and lack of authenticity and some others for being superficial and lacking ideals. So, the themes of belatedness and anxiety should be evaluated as an aesthetic of loss /peace-less-ness (Gürbilek, *Kör Ayna* 14).

Like so many others, Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar, who lived and wrote novels in the early twentieth century, considered conceptualizations of the “modern” which rested on the liberal tradition of modernity to be deficient in some respects. Being not against modernity, he was mainly concerned with the logic of the modernization project carried out in Turkey because, for Tanpınar, the project was not a process understood and initiated by the people, so it simply ignored the multiplicity of traditional and cultural values and practices in Turkey. He experienced at first hand social, cultural and political changes and asserted that “the civilization conversion [from East to West], manifests itself undoubtedly as a real crisis...” (“Türk Edebiyatında Cereyanlar” 103)⁴⁴ and he criticized the reformers of the late Ottoman imperial period and the elites of the Turkish Republic who were “influenced by the western positivism, particularly ideas of A. Comte”⁴⁵ (Aydın 90) and treated the country and society like a huge machine that could be adjusted according to an ideology. Besides, Tanpınar believed that the modernization efforts of the late Ottoman Empire and the young Turkish Republic did not reach a “great majority of the population [who] viewed all modernization efforts of the state with apathy or suspicion or both” (Seyhan 81).

According to Tanpınar, Turkish novelists of the *Tanzimat* period and the early Republic were mistaken in their understanding of the changes and

⁴⁴ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 1.

⁴⁵ Nergis Ertürk states that “the Ottoman literary world itself had already been violently transformed during the second half of the nineteenth century, the Ottoman Empire was peripherally integrated into global capitalist modernity and it implemented a range of economic, social, political reforms, which the positivist philosopher Auguste Comte had praised in an 1853 letter written to the leading Ottoman reformer, Grand Vizier Mustafa Reşit Pasha” (*The Oxford Handbook of Global Modernisms* 532).

reforms. To illustrate, Tanpınar criticized Recai Zade Mahmut Ekrem (1847-1914) and his *The Carriage Affair* (1896), arguably the first modern novel in Turkish Literature, for its artificiality. Although Ekrem's novel aims to criticize the Westernization of Turkish people and their pretentious and snobbish ways of life, Tanpınar argues that it fails to do so. He was disappointed by the novel's "excessiveness," the "exaggerated mockery" and the "offensive realism" ("Recai Zade" 248-53) because for Tanpınar the word "novel" or [*roman*] refers to a phenomenon containing the qualities of both uncertainty and reality. This implies that Tanpınar sees Ekrem's novel not only as poor in quality but also as a failed criticism of Westernization. He took this philosophy of the novel from Proust's character Swann, who thinks that "life offers situations that are more interesting, more novelistic than all the novels ever written" (*Swann's Way*, I, 210). Thus, according to Tanpınar, it is because of the novelist's "poor imagination" ("Recai Zade"⁴⁶ 248-53) that Ekrem takes refuge in an exaggerated realism; he grasps the comical, but "since he wildly insists on it, beating the strings violently over and over again instead of just touching them, he breaks the instrument" ("Recai Zade" 248-53). Tanpınar thought this novel itself was just as excessive, exaggerated, and artificial as the thing it criticizes. *The Carriage Affair* is a "novel of rootless shadows" and the characters in the novel "live a shadowy life, a life exterior to themselves," he says ("Recai Zade" 248-53). He also adds that "Recai Zade Ekrem is unable to tell us about inwardly felt emotions" and a spontaneous experience ("Recai Zade" 248-53). As is obvious in his interpretation of Ekrem's novel, Tanpınar favored works of art and, a literature that could be "totally our own" ("Milli Bir Edebiyata Doğru" 91). Gürbilek explains Tanpınar's ideas about the necessity of such a literature, as follows:

[a] literature which is neither 'wretched' nor 'rootless,' neither 'funny' nor 'derivative,' neither 'primitive' nor 'imitative,' which

⁴⁶ The English translation of Tanpınar's comments on Recai Zade Mahmut Ekrem and his novel are taken from Nurdan Gürbilek's article in English titled "Dandies and Originals: Authenticity, Belatedness, and the Turkish Novel" (599-628). See Bibliography.

has both a ‘human warmth’ and a ‘horizon’ will be the result of an original synthesis of native characteristics and European ideals. Tanpınar’s every suggestion toward this objective starts with the word self: We needed to ‘go back to ourselves,’ go back to our own past, go back to our own cultural wealth. In order to create a literature organically ours, we had to ‘be our own selves’ (Tanpınar, “Milli Bir Edebiyata Doğru” 91). [...] Tanpınar is talking about creating a national literature rooted in an authentic national self. (Gürbilek, “Dandies” 602)

Tanpınar’s diction, or to be more specific, his preference for the adjectives mentioned by Gürbilek in the quotation above, indicates his criticism of the artificiality of the Turkish literature which, he thought, developed under the influence of western examples. His criticism also aims to denounce those works of the national literature movement which were filled only with “daily life issues” and which perceived as lacking depth. To Tanpınar, on the one hand, those novels imitating western ones were either rootless, derivative or imitative; on the other hand, those which were the products of the national literature movement in Turkey were either “wretched,” “funny” or “primitive.” Tanpınar’s categories of “external” and “internal” need to be further explored to understand why he categorizes novels in these two ways. First of all, it should be noted that Tanpınar is one of the first Turkish writers who conceived the problem of the “feeling of lack” or “belatedness” as a dilemma for Turkish writers, and who observed that, under the influence of this feeling, the Turkish writers either imitated Western novels or they searched for authenticity and originality. He argues that while those following the former path are trapped in “rootlessness and imitation,” those following the latter are “primitive and funny” because they are “doomed to ‘a local self without an ideal’ when [they] get in touch with daily life” (Gürbilek, “Dandies” 602). He thinks that both of these reactions to the feeling of belatedness are equally problematic and useless, and he presents his ideas regarding his contemporary literature as follows:

I am *discontented because of a feeling of lack* in our contemporary literature. National poetry, folk poetry, and the novel about the national life... all issues – political, economic, and social – are

present and very dominant in our contemporary literature. The national literature has been produced. Yet, the problem remains unsolved... [...] It is related to a duality in our souls (emphasis added, “Milli Bir Edebiyata Doğru” 90-91).⁴⁷

Tanpınar is discontented with these two unproductive reactions of Turkish writers to the problem of the feelings of lack and duality. He offers another option that could solve the problem: his insistence on “going back to ourselves,” or his suggestion of a literature that is “totally our own” (“Milli Bir Edebiyata Doğru” 91). His ideas led to a call “for a ‘substantial return to our own realities’ and to a ‘personal experience genuinely ours’ and was in search of what he called the ‘inner man,’ an organically composed and genuine cultural self (Gürbilek, “Dandies” 607). Tanpınar is thus distinctive for his approach to the problem of the feeling of belatedness. More importantly, and as *A Mind at Peace* (1949) and *The Time Regulation Institute* (1961) show, he accepts the existence and influence of the anxiety of belatedness as a reality, and he uses it as one of the major themes in his novels. By putting Turkish “native characteristics” together with “European ideals” in his novels, he intends to transcend and overcome the problematical categorizations such as “external” and “internal” or “the other” and “self.” Therefore, what he means by “going back to ourselves” has nothing to do with a search for originality or authentic localness. For Tanpınar, facing duality and accepting the co-dependence of the categories “external” and “internal” are “realities” that Turkish people and society should accept.

“The duality in the soul” is further explained by Tanpınar when he argues that “Turkish society had to die or westernize, and understandably it chose westernization out of the instinct of survival. By this means, along with other developments and reforms, Turkish society looked for a new literature. The westernized Turkish literature to some extent fulfilled its responsibilities. Yet, the issue cannot be that easy” (“Milli Bir Edebiyata

⁴⁷ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 2.

Doğru” 91).⁴⁸ Thus Tanpınar regards the emergence of modernity and modernization in twentieth-century Turkey as a regeneration that is both inevitable and also desirable, but it is only desirable on one condition:

[h]ow can one expect a civilization which had its own mature artistic and literary traditions in its past to produce a completely new art and literature immediately? In fact, a society’s literature and art can develop and regenerate only when they rest on their own traditions. The external effects and influences [the interaction between different cultures] enrich, broaden and complete art and literature of a society but only if these influences are implanted on the existing customs and traditions. [...] The opposite of it will only destroy the integrity of life in that society. (“Milli Bir Edebiyata Doğru” 91)⁴⁹

Tanpınar here stresses that, when societies experience modernization, their cultural and social traditions should not be ignored and replaced with a transferred set of values, otherwise problems like the “destruction of the integrity of life” will occur.

2.2.1 Tanpınar, Huxley and the Frankfurt School Theorists

Tanpınar produced a cultural criticism which is embedded in several discussion scenes in his novels. His criticism mainly targets the culture produced by the modernization process in Turkey, and producing a cultural criticism brings him closer to the ideas of Huxley and thus to the thinkers of the Frankfurt School discussed earlier in this chapter.

Tanpınar experienced a civilizational crisis at first-hand, and he diagnosed the cultural problems experienced in Turkey as a violent break from the recent past. Characteristically, Tanpınar’s novels contain cultural criticism related to this. In other words, he criticized the culture created by the modernization project. It can also be asserted that the target of Tanpınar’s criticism in his novels is neither modernity nor the West, but the modernization project in Turkey, which meant Westernization and its top-down reforms.

⁴⁸ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 3.

⁴⁹ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 4.

It can be contended that the most dramatic similarity between Tanpınar and the Frankfurt School theorists is their similar understanding of the Enlightenment as a myth-creating discourse. In *Dialectic of Enlightenment* Adorno and Horkheimer argued that “the Enlightenment views itself most importantly as myth criticism” (*Dialectic of Enlightenment* xviii) and they countered this claim with the arguments that myth and rationality are two similar attempts to explain nature, and that myth and rationality are similar outcomes of the same type of reason, what they call instrumental reason. As a result of “the Enlightenment,” the world is explained “through conceptual thought, and language is abstract, alien, objectified and reified” (Cohen 586), and instrumental rationality is a type of conquest of thought and action by rationality, and this demonstrates that enlightenment does not save us from experiencing myth, but only changes its form. So, they claim “[m]yth is already enlightenment; and enlightenment reverts to mythology’ (*Dialectic of Enlightenment* xviii). This modern myth, the myth of instrumental rationality, presents the world as if it were totally subjugated to human control” (Cohen 586). For Tanpınar, Adorno and Horkheimer’s idea of the displacement of rationality by myth could be used to explain and criticize the modernization process of Turkey: “[b]efore the *Tanzimat* period, there was a self-encapsulated Ottoman Empire whose scientific and scholarly life had stopped, economic and production systems had ceased when it is compared to a Europe which experienced the Renaissance and its physical consequences” (Tanpınar, *19. Asır Türk Edebiyatı* 8).⁵⁰ Relying on Tanpınar’s portrayal of the Ottoman Empire before the modernization/Westernization reforms of the *Tanzimat* period, his understanding of this period can be called a vision of the myth period in the Ottoman Empire. That is, when the *Tanzimat*’s “rootless reforms” (Tanpınar, “Asıl Kaynak” 33) were applied, the narrative relying on the liberal tradition of modernity introduced “rationality” as something which would replace “myth.” However, Tanpınar favored neither the period

⁵⁰ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 5.

before *Tanzimat* (myth) nor that after it (rationality) because according to him if rationality, which is behind the modernization/Westernization of Turkey, is not critical and analytical, then the project of modernization cannot emancipate society from the fetters of myth, and it remains tied to myth even in the age of rationality: “the reforms to modernize/Westernize the *Tanzimat*-period Ottoman Empire and the newly-founded Turkish Republic were not critically thought or examined, [...] they were readily accepted as grand facts” (Tanpınar, “Asıl Kaynak” 41).⁵¹ According to Dellaloğlu, Tanpınar’s work is founded on the idea that “[t]o be modern has nothing to do with changing the alphabet or calendar. Yet, it has much to do with things pertaining to intellect and memory; [...] with a Bergsonian tradition [...] or the idea of Multiple Modernities”⁵² (*Modernleşmenin* 90-1). In this respect, to Tanpınar, what was “brought to our lives from the West” (“Medeniyet Değiştirmesi ve İç İnsan” 24-30), allegedly an attempt of rationalization, was nothing but myth and which could not emancipate the individual intellectually and emotionally. Therefore, as Tanpınar saw it, the problem with the modernization project of Turkey is related to a lack of critical and analytical thinking and to a civilizational crisis:

[p]articularly after the 1850s we can see the influence of the words like “civilization and progress,” [*terakki*] and their magic and charm in our nation and literature. [...] Civilization and progress are the biggest myths of the twentieth century! (“Kelimeler Arasında Elli Yıl” 83)⁵³

Unlike a positivist thinker, Tanpınar did not have faith in myths like civilization and progress. He denounced an idea of progress which failed to pay attention to the morals and aspirations of the individual and society. That is, to Tanpınar, true progress is the one in which human beings improve themselves and achieve goals in life by producing creative work

⁵¹ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 6.

⁵² Tanpınar’s involvement with the Multiple Modernities approach will be dealt with later in this chapter.

⁵³ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 7.

and attaining cultural enlightenment. In the quotation above, Tanpınar describes the period of time that starts from the *Tanzimat* and continues up to the early years of the Republic with one word: crisis (*buhran*) (82). In his novels he explores the theme of crisis and its influences on the individual and society, and his main theme is the crisis of the modern individual due to social, cultural and spiritual conflicts that are experienced as a result of the modernization process. Also, as Tanpınar sees it, when rational progress becomes an irrational and enslaving regress which produces crises, one cannot talk about the existence of the linear understanding of time.⁵⁴ Scientific, technical, economic, and industrial rationality which is devoid of the features of individual and culture is regarded as something oppressing people, destroying nature, and imposing the control of machines. Therefore, in his body of work the themes of alienation, regulation, restriction, and the loss of values, purpose, and meaning are evident.

The problem of the individual's alienation as a result of "the culture industry, totalitarianism and institutionalism", which was formulated and explored by Huxley and later by the Frankfurt School theorists, can also be used in a discussion of Tanpınar's discontent with the modernization project in Turkey. Tanpınar criticized the "superficial" reforms which had been influenced by Western practices and had been carried out by the Ottoman intelligentsia of the *Tanzimat* era, because he regarded these reforms (which merely tried to change how Turkish people dressed, ate and spent their free time) as the source of a civilizational crisis and of "a duality in souls" (Tanpınar, "Milli Bir Edebiyata Doğru" 90-91). Later, "the state-building engineers" of the early years of the Turkish Republic "launched industrialization projects whose priority was the mechanization of manufacture and farming. The machine therefore signified progress" (Parla, "Car Narratives" 539). The relationship of the individual to the machine is one of the significant themes in Tanpınar's fiction. Tanpınar thought these superficial reforms and regulations, which are represented by the clock

⁵⁴ Tanpınar's ideas about the concept of time will be elaborated more in this chapter.

symbol in his fiction,⁵⁵ were imposed by the government and authorities, and that they led towards the homogenization of the Turkish society: his clocks are allegories of the concept of regulation, manipulation and homogenization. Tanpınar also thought that because of the modernization project carried out in Turkey (characterized by instrumental rationality and the obsession with material progress) the whole nation had been suffering from a psychological complex: “[i]f I could dare I would say that since the *Tanzimat*, we have been living in a state of Oedipus complex, that is, the complex of a man who killed his father” (“Medeniyet Değiştirmesi ve İç İnsan” 38).⁵⁶ The Oedipus complex, according to Tanpınar, explains the feeling of rootlessness and he implies that the people in Turkey constantly feel the pangs of conscience due to the erasing of the bond between the past and the present.

As a part of the same discussion, that is, concerning the “destruction of the integrity of life”, Tanpınar focuses on the terms “society” and “mass,” as follows:

[t]here is a huge difference between society and the mass. Society is the integrity or balance of life. Yet, the mass comes in to existence when society becomes rotten. A good leader is a man of society who feels the balance in the depth of his heart. Yet, a man of the mass owes his power to the classes, and he rules by means of these classes. The former is constructive while the latter is destructive. (“Mussolini’ye Dair” 74)⁵⁷

As indicated above, Tanpınar wants to show the importance of society, and when he emphasizes the balance of life in society he refers to heterogeneity which he takes as the peaceful co-existence of differences. Yet, compared to society, the mass is seen as dangerous since it does not tolerate any differences. Jale Parla maintains that the clock image that Tanpınar used in

⁵⁵ Tanpınar uses the clock symbol in his novels such as *The Time Regulation Institute* (1961) and *Mahur Beste* (1944). Also, the clock becomes an indispensable symbol in his short stories such as “Acıbadem’deki Köşk” (1949) and “Abdullah Efendi’nin Rüyaları” (1943).

⁵⁶ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 8.

⁵⁷ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 9.

his novels and stories to represent the feeling of the individual's alienation, as an outcome of being a machine-like human,⁵⁸ is one of the threats in "mass" society: "[b]y the same token, one who allows oneself to become the clock will suffer [a sameness] from which one cannot free oneself but will sink into further automation by giving up creativity" ("Car Narratives" 542-3).

In a society, lack of creativity, lack of maturity, lack of artistic production and lack of self-realization as negative dimensions of automation⁵⁹ are among the results of an unchecked and unplanned modernization process according to Huxley and Tanpınar, as well as the Frankfurt School thinkers. Keeping in mind what Huxley, Adorno, Horkheimer and Marcuse held about the negative effects of fully-automated alienating labor and commodity-fetishism, we can find similar comments in Tanpınar: "only intellectually emancipated human beings can organically create a society, culture and civilization [...] if the opposite case happens, which involves the production of uniform individuals by the media, the state and automation, there will be a crisis⁶⁰" ("İnsan ve Cemiyet" 22).⁶¹ Preserving the notions of privacy, individuality, subjectivity, creativity and

⁵⁸ It can also be seen as a reference to the movie "Modern Times" (1936) in which characters are turned into machine-like creatures struggling to survive in the modern, industrialized world.

⁵⁹ Tanpınar should not be misinterpreted and judged on the basis of his hesitations concerning fully-automated labor in Turkey because he was not completely against modernity, the automation of labor or industrialization in general. He observed that a large majority of the Turkish people were poor and uneducated in the first half of the twentieth century, and therefore, he believed that Turkey needed industrialization and betterment in the people's standards of living. Still, like Huxley and the afore-mentioned Frankfurt School thinkers, he wanted to warn Turkish people against the passion for commodity-fetishism, the reification reinforced by global capitalism, and the hegemony of the machine which could destroy the artistic and aesthetic features of the individual: "[w]hen will all people in Turkey really progress? They will progress when they [...] get used to the machine and industry and when they start reading novels" (Tanpınar, *Yaşadığım Gibi* 328).

⁶⁰ On Tanpınar's engagement with labor, work and alienation, Berna Moran claims that "Tanpınar sensed that cultural problems of 'the superstructure' have much to do with 'the base' [in Marxist terms]. Yet, he cannot be called a socialist because he employed a general idea of production instead of the idea of 'mode of production,' and an abstract term like society instead of 'a class society'" (*Türk Romanına* 286).

⁶¹ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 10.

defending them against the several intrusions of the totalitarian state and the mass- or herd-mentality are elements Tanpınar wants to encourage in his fiction. Furthermore, as will be elaborated further in Chapter 3 and 4, like Huxley, Tanpınar touches upon the problem of institutionalization, which is linked to “American-style advertising” (Feldman 44), American movies, and propaganda-like statements in his fiction. By implication, he draws readers’ attention to the threat and problem of Pan-Americanism. Also, related to mass society and instrumental rationality, bureaucratization and materialism are other major elements in Tanpınar’s social criticism.

2.2.2 Tanpınar’s Approach to the Modern

The following presents an exploration of how Tanpınar as a novelist and thinker differs from Huxley the novelist and thinker and from the Frankfurt School thinkers, with regard to their approaches to modernity; it goes on to outline the central themes of Multiple Modernities and the relationship between Tanpınar’s idea of modernity and the Multiple Modernities approach by referring to Henri Bergson’s influence on Tanpınar’s ideas and to parallels between Walter Benjamin and Tanpınar.

We should firstly state that although Tanpınar and Huxley are taken as two figures who are discontented with modernity and modernization, there are several differences between them. The first and foremost difference is related to their understanding of the modern. As mentioned before, Huxley, whose fictional and non-fictional work of the late twenties, expresses his discontent with modernity and the modernization experienced in the West, referring to Europe and America, understands the modern as a Western way of thinking and defines the notion of modernity by opposing it to the East. In this sense, modernity, as Huxley understood it in the nineteen-twenties, is closely related to imperialist ideology; that is, it

situates the West/the modern and the “others”/the non-modern in a hierarchy, and thus creates a basis for the so-called civilizing mission.⁶²

After his journeys around the world – India, Burma, Malaya, Japan, China, America and England – Huxley concluded that the East should be modernized in the way that modernity was interpreted in the West; that is, the East, by which he particularly means India, should take the West as a model for its modernization. Yet, it should be re-emphasized here that Huxley was critical of modernity’s practices in the West, too. In his essays in *Jesting Pilate* (1928) we can see Huxley’s fallacy of reading Eastern experiences through ideological filters provided by a Eurocentric discourse. In addition, as a result of his travels in America he witnessed how men and women were manipulated and stripped of their individuality, creativity and values by the tools of applied science, the ideology of technocracy and the popular culture industry; and this perception energized and thematically informed his satirical novels and discursive writings. Huxley was deeply concerned with the bleak future of humans. Yet, Huxley, who criticizes the East’s “pre-modern” ways and the West’s modern tendency to devalue “the established values” (*Jesting Pilate* 207), at this point of his career defines the modern in Eurocentric terms. In other words, although he finds some aspects in Western modernity “problematic” and condemns them in his work, he mainly targets Eastern nations and criticizes them by relying on hegemonic and “universal” discourses of modernity. Briefly, it can be claimed that Huxley cannot think of a mode of modernity that is non-Western. Besides, as mentioned before, Huxley takes modernity as an inevitable outcome of historical progress. Modernity, in this sense, is regarded as one of the grand narratives and an outcome of history resulting from the interaction between the West and the non-West. In fact, in the same manner, Mitchell argues that “[i]f modernity had its origins in reticulations of exchange and production encircling the world, then it was a

⁶² Yet, as mentioned earlier in this chapter and will be explored more in Chapter 4, from the nineteen-thirties on Huxley’s system of thought in his conceptualization of modernity exhibited another phase of change.

creation not of the West but of an interaction between West and non-West. The sites of this interaction were as likely to lie in the East Indies, the Ottoman Empire, or the Caribbean as in England, the Netherlands, or France” (2). Clearly in this conceptualization of history, Huxley’s understanding of historical time in those years was linear: “[t]he future passes into the past through an ever-disappearing present” (Grossberg 269).

Tanpınar’s understanding of the modern differs from that of Huxley. Tanpınar, as will be further explained in this chapter, takes the modern in terms of locality, multiplicity or polycentrism. He challenged the idea that modernity and modernization in Turkey should be a variation on a universal model of euro-modernities. In addition to criticizing the modernization/Westernization project of Turkey, Tanpınar was able to imagine a different theory of modernity. His idea of the coexistence of evolution and preservation of the past traditions (*terkip*) can be seen as an early theoretical concept in his intellectual attempts of configuring the modern. In this sense, Tanpınar is one of the early novelists in Turkey who tried to disrupt the equation between modernity/modernization and Westernization, which reminds us of the notion of Multiple Modernities. Hence, relying on his non-fiction, we can argue that Tanpınar defines modernity and modernization in terms which can contain multiple versions of life. Besides, Tanpınar’s understanding of the modern is related to an idea of time different from that of Huxley’s. Instead of a linear understanding of time in which the future surpasses the past, Tanpınar takes time as a monolithic phenomenon emphasizing a notion of a present that is unending; it is a formulation of time that is similar to Bergsonian “pure time” or “*durée*” (2). Thus it can be claimed that Tanpınar criticizes the vision of the modern that functions as a break/breach which separates the past and the future. For these reasons, the theoretical framework constructed in order to explore Tanpınar’s discontent with modernity and modernization needs to be larger than the theories and ideas of Huxley. The notion of Multiple

Modernities and the ideas of Henri Bergson and Walter Benjamin⁶³ prove useful for an explanation of Tanpınar’s idea of modernity and modernization.

2.2.2.1 Tanpınar and the Multiple Modernities Approach

Before pinpointing the parallels between Tanpınar’s idea of the modern and the notion of Multiple Modernities, it will be useful to have a look at the early traces of the idea of Multiple Modernities which emerged in Turkey in the work of *Meşrutiyet* writers, because one of them, Yahya Kemal, was Tanpınar’s mentor and his intellectual influence on Tanpınar can be seen in his literary work several decades later. The discourses on modernity and modernization produced by the intellectuals of the *Meşrutiyet* differ from those of both the *Tanzimat* and early Republic, and approaches to modernity and modernization in the *Meşrutiyet* carry many resemblances to the notion of “Multiple Modernities,” although the *Meşrutiyet* writers were not familiar with the term because “the notion of Multiple Modernities emerged and has often been used after World War II” (Eisenstadt 1). Here, what is attempted is not to put forward an anachronistic claim but to point out an interesting similarity of ideas between some writers of the *Meşrutiyet* and the idea of Multiple Modernities. In order to draw connections between the *Meşrutiyet* period intellectuals’ understanding of the modern and of Multiple Modernities, we first have to have a look at the work of scholars like Shmuel Noah Eisenstadt, and later we can define the *Meşrutiyet* period intellectuals’ ideas as an early form of the idea.

Eisenstadt explains that the idea of Multiple Modernities emerged as a reaction to or a critique of the discourse produced by the liberal tradition of modernity. The Multiple Modernities approach criticizes the hegemonic discourse of the liberal tradition of modernity; it is hegemonic because the liberal tradition of modernity assumes that “modernity developed in modern

⁶³ The similarities between Tanpınar’s and Benjamin’s ideas have already been emphasized in Turkish by Oğuz Demiralp, Nurdan Gürbilek and Besim Dellaloğlu. See Bibliography.

Europe” and that this was the only path of modernity that the non-Western parts of the world should follow. Therefore, the notion of Multiple Modernities holds a highly confrontational attitude to the hegemonizing and homogenizing arguments of Marx, Durkheim, and Weber. Also, Eisenstadt argues that “the reality after World War II” (1) proved the hegemonic and homogenizing assumptions wrong. By this “reality” he means the “actual developments taking place in modernizing societies,” (1) and in modernizing societies these development processes took place in different periods, and consequently “multiple institutional and ideological patterns” (2) emerged in these societies. “These patterns,” Eisenstadt contends, “all developed distinctively modern dynamics and modes of interpretation, for which the original Western project constituted the crucial (and usually ambivalent) reference point” (2). On the grounds of his last argument, the existence of “the crucial and ambivalent” relationship between “the original Western project of modernity” and the one developed in non-Western societies, we can point out the existence of a similar relationship between “the West” and Turkey. As mentioned before, Ottoman-Turkey regarded the West as a “reference point,” (2) and due to this attitude, two opposite reactions emerged that are still prevalent in contemporary Turkey: the West is either regarded as an “object of desire” (a pro-Western view) or as “a point of animosity”/a challenge to Turkey’s authenticity (an anti-Western view). Both of these attitudes, though they are contradictory, are regarded as “modern patterns” in the notion of Multiple Modernities: “many of the movements that developed in non-Western societies articulated strong anti-Western or even antimodern themes, yet all were distinctively modern” (Eisenstadt 2). Hence, these two different and oppositional attitudes of Turkey’s relationship with the West and “the Western patterns of modernity,” as Eisenstadt indicates, consolidate the fallacy of the assumptions which claim that “modernity as it developed in modern Europe would ultimately take over in all modernizing and modern societies; with the expansion of modernity, [it] would prevail throughout the world” (1).

The most significant assertion introduced by the term “Multiple Modernities” is that “modernity and Westernization are not identical; [and] Western patterns of modernity are not the only ‘authentic’ modernities, though they enjoy historical precedence and continue to be a basic reference point for others” (Eisenstadt 3). Within a linear understanding of history, the “historical precedence” of the development of some societies is given great importance and credibility. It can even be argued that the West started to see itself as the center of modernity and the non-West occupied the periphery because “the civilization of modernity developed first in the West” (Eisenstadt 7). Yet, the Multiple Modernities approach aims to dismantle this linear understanding of history and it thus breaks the equation of modernity/modernization with Westernization, and it blurs the distinctions between concepts like center and periphery.

Eisenstadt claims that Western patterns of modernity reached the non-Western world through “military and economic imperialism and colonialism [...] economic, military, and communication technologies” (14). Later with “the recent intensification of forces of globalization,” (16) modernity as it developed in modern Europe did not take over although it “undermined the cultural premises and institutional cores of these ancient societies” (14). “Elites and intellectuals”, Eisenstadt adds, “incorporated some of the Western universalistic elements of modernity in the construction of their own new collective identities, without necessarily giving up specific components of their traditional identities (often couched [...] in universalistic, especially religious terms)” (15). In fact it can be maintained that because the concept of modernity moves to different settings and “new historical contexts,” (Eisenstadt 21) it is prone to transformation and appropriation. As Göle similarly notes, “one of the most important characteristics of modernity is simply its potential capacity for continual self-correction” (“Snapshots” 129). Because modernity bears the idea of transformation inherent in it, in different settings, it is adopted in reconstructed ways, foregrounding “‘subdued’ identities” such as “ethnic,

local, regional, and transnational” (Eisenstadt 18), and it is used to oppose the hegemony of older ideologies and programs. Within this logic, all these, formerly recognized as “peripheral” settings see themselves as multiple centers of modernity which “deny the Western monopoly on modernity, reject the Western cultural program as the epitome of modernity” (22) and “attempt to re-appropriate and redefine modernity on their own terms” (19).

From the perspective provided by what we today call the notion of Multiple Modernities, it can be held that *Meşrutiyet* intellectuals re-evaluated Western modernity and decentered it. This made two significant things possible for them: firstly, unlike their predecessors in the *Tanzimat*, the *Meşrutiyet* intellectuals made a critical reading of Western modernity by reading the work of Western writers who were similarly discontented with the experience of modernity – such as Mallarmé, Baudelaire, Rimbaud, Bergson, Nietzsche, Kafka, Eliot and Joyce; so, they started to develop a different understanding of the West. Besides, Ertürk claims that Turkish writers of the *Meşrutiyet* and early Republic turned to the modernist spiritualism of Western thought and took it “as a critical alternative at a time when Western Enlightenment rationalism and positivism were dominant intellectual currents shaping the Ottoman imperial [*Tanzimat* period] and [the early years of] the Turkish Republican modernization projects” (Ertürk, “Modernism Disfigured” 530). Tanpınar and some other writers such as Tanpınar’s mentor Yahya Kemal, Mehmet Emin Erişirgil, İsmail Hakkı Baltacıoğlu and Ahmet Haşim, constituted the core of the group who felt close to the modernist spiritualism of Western thought which they called the “Other West” (Ertürk, “Modernism Disfigured” 531). Dellaloğlu and Ertürk regard these writers as the voice of the other-West with whom *Meşrutiyet* thinkers formed allegiances in their engagement with modernity and modernization: they wanted to restore history, and preserve the cultural heritage and at the same time adapt to the present changes. They became the first intellectuals who gave voice to the idea of a non-Western experience of modernity in Turkey (Dellaloğlu 88). They were intellectually inspired to

produce an alternative mode of modern experiences in a country like Turkey, commonly referred to as non-Western.

Before analyzing Tanpınar's understanding of the modern in the light of the notion of Multiple Modernities, we should have a look at the present-day views of modernity and modernization in Turkey because it will help us firstly construct a chronological understanding of the approaches to modernity and modernization and secondly understand the conflicting voices around the discussions of modernity and modernization in Turkey today. To begin with, it can be claimed that the contemporary views of modernity and modernization in Turkey in their plural forms are intertwined with a multiple set of interpretations. The debate concerning Multiple Modernities is carried through in the works of several scholars of various ideological and political orientations. Although some discourses of modernization in Turkey use the terms and ideas of modernization and Westernization interchangeably as before, today some others, like some intellectuals of the *Meşrutiyet* period in the Ottoman Empire, do not see 'the West' as "some monolithic entity but one from which different and contradictory discourses [emanate]" (Kandiyoti 274). Accordingly, the latter group of discourses has problematized Turkey's modernization project to understand its hegemonizing and homogenizing nature. This group of scholars aims to discuss the nature of Western modernities and to talk about alternative models for Turkey's engagement with modernity.

To read the present-day views of modernity and modernization in Turkey contributes to the Tanpınar discussion in that it helps clarify the conflicting ideas and critical studies on his literature. Although some scholars of modernity and modernization in Turkey are critical of the equation between modernization and Westernization, their departure points are radically different. The issue of the modernization project in Turkey has become a platform for severe oppositions and conflicts between thinkers and scholars. Their alternative readings of Turkish history, which are shaped according to their positions in relation to Islamism, secularism, and the

contemporary political regime in Turkey, challenge Turkey's official history in order to question and explain the multiple societal transformations of contemporary Turkey. Because there are different institutional and ideological patterns that constitute different forms of modernities and modernization in Turkey, various subjects such as traditionalism, conservatism, political Islam, ethnic identities, and secular nationalism are brought under scrutiny to explore their position and role in modernization in Turkey. By looking at their definitions of modernity one can identify ideological or political alliances and oppositions between these scholars. Scholars like Nilüfer Göle and E. Fuat Keyman write from an Islamist/conservative stance. Göle states that "an authoritarian modernism" re-shaped the foundation of "the public sphere" in the Turkish context of "voluntary modernization" ("Islam in Public" 176). She criticizes that religious practices have been ignored by the modern public sphere. In addition, Keyman argues that "Islamic identity" does not pose a threat to the idea of the modern; it simply demands recognition within modernity. He also states that today there is a "change in the nature of Turkish modernity" ("Modernity, Secularism" 217) in which it is impossible to think of "Turkish secularism as uncontested," (217) and it is also impossible to think of Turkish modernity without mentioning Islam.

Another group of scholars such as Çağlar Keyder, Sibel Bozdoğan, and Reşat Kasaba, whose ideas concerning the idea of modernity date back to the *Meşrutiyet*, have similarly explored Turkey's engagement with modernity from the Multiple Modernities perspective. Their interpretation of modernity in Turkey entails the emergence of a society which is a combination of both traditional and modern ideas and practices. For these scholars, this type of society, in which both traditional and modern ideas and practices can co-exist, can develop an understanding of modernity and, at the same time, keep its own locality and singularity in a globalized world:

In Turkey and around the world today, we are witnessing the eclipse of the progressive and emancipatory discourse of modernity. [...] it has produced a remarkably lively and pluralist climate in which new

voices are being heard and deeply entrenched assumptions are being radically and, we believe, irreversibly challenged. ... Scholars in many disciplines are looking for new ways of critically engaging with the modern project and exploring options beyond it without falling back on an antimodern “return to tradition” or getting lost in the postmodern “global theme park”. [...] we did not want to reduce the debate to essentialized and mutually exclusive oppositions, especially between Kemalists and Islamists. Writers in Turkey should try not to align themselves according to their ideologies when they study the real histories of modernization in Turkey. (Bozdoğan and Kasaba 3-8)

As this quotation states, these scholars recommend Turkish writers not to limit the notion of Turkey’s engagement with modernity within the boundaries of their individual ideologies of Kemalism and Islamist politics. As a last point it can be claimed that what lies under the Multiple Modernities approach is an idea of globalization, yet – ironically – the idea of Multiple Modernities turns itself against the universalist claims of the “classical”/liberal approach to modernity and foregrounds instead the diversity of what can be called modern practices.

Tanpınar’s approach to Turkish literature reveals his ideas about how “a Turkish modernity” should be created and experienced: as we have seen, he supports the idea of a change which does not lose touch with the specificities of its culture. Ertürk argues that “[t]he problem presented by the idea of ‘Turkish modernism’ is not merely that of the recovery of an excluded object [the past]. Rather, it involves the very possibility of addressing the absence of an “authentic” Turkish modernism within national-critical discourse itself” (“Modernism Disfigured” 529). Tanpınar, although he was not familiar with the concept of Multiple Modernities, wished for an experience of a modernity with roots in Turkey, that is, a Turkish modernity that possesses “the unity of soul and mind” (Tanpınar, “Milli Bir Edebiyata Doğru” 90-91) that was distinctively born in Turkey. By “the unity of soul and mind” Tanpınar refers to a new configuration of modernity which has both material (mind) qualities – economic, industrial, social developments – and extra-material (soul) qualities – aesthetic

pleasure, creative excitement to struggle with despair associated with living in a disenchanted world. Particularly, his emphasis on “soul” as an indispensable element of his understanding of the modern entails an aesthetic dimension in the individual requiring intelligence and personal initiative. “Soul” for Tanpınar in this sense comes closer to what Huxley phrased as “passion” in *Point Counter Point*.

“As an astute literary critic as well as a gifted poet and novelist, Tanpınar ... offer[ed] a culturally specific approach” (Seyhan 16) to the modernization process in Turkey. It was an experience of Turkish modernity that Tanpınar longed for, not Turkish westernization. Therefore, he wanted to “explore his society in moments of its major transformations and recorded lived history in alternately journalistic and symbolic registers, as ... [he] tried to make sense of [his] people’s peculiar destiny” (Seyhan 5). Tanpınar wanted to bring light to lost and indigenous cultural legacies in his land that should not be terminated at one point in history and, at the same time, could participate in and interact with other cultures and the present time.

Before continuing with Tanpınar’s ideas on time and history, we need to explore the effects of his comments on the past and try to understand why he has been called a conservative writer until recently. There is currently a struggle between “conservative” and “liberal” discourses in Turkey over Tanpınar as a writer. This is connected to a discussion about the political/ideological differences between the voices in contemporary Turkey that commonly criticize Eurocentric approaches to modernity and modernization. Tanpınar’s engagement with the social, cultural and political changes which were carried out as a part of Turkey’s modernization project and his depiction of these issues from a critical position have long attracted Turkish conservative thinkers’ and scholars’ attention, and they have taken Tanpınar and his writings as a reference point to support and justify their own conservative ideas. They have reinforced their argument by putting forward Tanpınar’s wish for “wholeness,” his idea of “continuity in change”

and insistence on the past as indicators of his conservatism (Gürbilek 121). He was regarded as a conservative writer also by some supporters of Turkey's modernization/Westernization just because he cared for the past and people's cultural heritage. Unlike the supporters of Turkey's modernization/Westernization in the *Tanzimat* period and in the early Republic, who insistently ignored the past and wanted to adopt "the new" without considering the in/compatibility of the new with the cultural wealth in Turkey, Tanpınar wanted to make the bond between the past and the present stronger; in other words, he was not a defender of the past for its own sake.

He was also claimed to be a literary and political conservative on the basis of the firm which published his work:⁶⁴ some other intellectuals who have also been considered conservative wrote for "*Dergah*."⁶⁵

The idea that Tanpınar is a conservative writer has been challenged by many critics in the last few decades. Some of these are Nurdan Gürbilek, Berna Moran, Besim Dellaloğlu, Mehmet Aydın, Oğuz Demiralp, M. Orhan Okay, Orhan Koçak, İnci Enginün, Zeynep Kerman, and Orhan Pamuk.

⁶⁴ "Some writers in Turkey are called "conservative" according to the publishing houses which published their work. And if one writer is called so, then people prefer to be interested in what [the writer's political stance is] rather than understanding what he wrote about, what he discussed and from which perspectives he approached the issue. After the judgment, the writer is generally either ignored or despised" (Besim Dellaloğlu, *Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar* 25, my translation). Dellaloğlu explains that a writer's political stance does not have to be necessarily identical with what he writes about. And being able to address people from several worldviews is what makes a writer "an intellectual" (29). He also aims to emphasize that the perception of Tanpınar in Turkey does not always depend on his novels but on the publishing house by which his works have been published (27).

⁶⁵ "*Dergah*" is a Turkish publishing house which is claimed to have a conservative inclination. "*Dergah*" is also the name of the publishing house's monthly literary journal. Also, all rights for publishing Tanpınar's work belong to Dergah. However, between 2000 and 2003, when another publishing house, YKY, famous for its liberal status, published Tanpınar's works, liberal and left-leaning readers in Turkey also read Tanpınar's work. So, a change in the profile of Tanpınar's readers has taken place. Today, Tanpınar is widely read by those people who do define themselves as liberal and "modern." Orhan Pamuk states that "today his [Tanpınar's] work is foremost among the classics of modern Turkish literature. Not only leftists, modernists, and Occidentalists, but conservatives, traditionalists, and nationalists acknowledge this status, and all frequently exploit Tanpınar's reputation and prestige" ("A Private Reading" 680).

Pamuk explains why he thinks Tanpınar cannot be reduced to the spokesperson of a single worldview, as follows:

[i]n fact, Tanpınar, who remained indecisive between two worlds [East and West] but transformed this indecisiveness into a writing style and determinately adopted it, behaved in a cleverer and more determinant way than all his contemporaries since he knew the possibilities in the geography he lived in and how to make use of them. Positioning himself between the two worlds, he was able to cherish these worlds by selecting things from them carefully. The key that makes us understand Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar is the distinctive style he used in order to bring these selections together in his work. (Pamuk, “Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar ve Türk Modernizmi” 23)⁶⁶

Tanpınar himself also emphasized his peculiar position: “The leftists are mysterious, stubborn and ignorant. The rightists, who believe they are nationalists, are all ignorant and arid. The ones in the middle are disheveled. Almost all are dull and hard to be tolerated. Those who have taste and understanding are jealous. Alas, how lonely I am” (Tanpınar, *Günlüklerin Işığında* 203).⁶⁷ His peculiarity or “loneliness” stems from his state of belonging nowhere and to no specific ideology. Tanpınar equated his ideological “loneliness” as a sign of being a true intellectual: “I’m an intellectual. I believe in love, life, human, and thought. But I do not think I have to understand these in any case according to some fashions. I am responsible to myself as much as I am responsible to the community” (Tanpınar, *Günlüklerin Işığında* 260).⁶⁸ Gürbilek believes that before arriving at hasty and generalized conclusions about Tanpınar’s conservatism we should have a look at the symbolic language used in his work: those who

⁶⁶ “İki dünya arasında kararsız kalan, ama bu kararsızlığı bir üsluba çevirerek kararlılıkla benimseyen Tanpınar, aslında yaşadığı çevre ve bu çevrenin imkânları konusunda çağdaşlarının çoğundan daha akıllı ve kararlı davranmıştır. İki dünyanın arasına kendini yerleştirerek, her iki dünyadan seçmeli bir şekilde yararlanabilmiştir. Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar’ı anlamamıza yol açacak anahtar, bu seçtiklerini yan yana getirmesindeki özel üsluptur” (Pamuk, “Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar ve Türk Modernizmi” 23, my translation.)

⁶⁷ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 11.

⁶⁸ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 12.

take Tanpınar as a conservative writer miss the messages underlying the symbolic language (*Kör Ayna* 129-131).

A waste land, a dry spring, a blurred mirror, a lost East or a dead mother. Tanpınar was well aware of a sense of loss and the impossibility of regaining what was lost, so he was not a conservative writer. What put a distance between Tanpınar and the idea of political conservatism or the dream of regaining the lost past was his confrontation with the loss ... He situated the loss in the reality of nation-building and he also situated the national reality in the center of his literature... Tanpınar is one of those writers who can clearly explain that magic which once influenced our lives is not effective any more, the old house is a ruin now, we are tenants in the new house ... finally the notion of “our own” is now an old fairy tale. Tanpınar’s power stems from both his wish for wholeness and his awareness of the impossibility of this wish. (Gürbilek, *Kör Ayna* 133-135)

We can now turn back to the issue of “belatedness” and explore Tanpınar’s position in this discussion. To begin with, Gürbilek does not regard Tanpınar as a writer who wrote under the influence of belatedness because Tanpınar had no problems with the notion of being belated, for two reasons: firstly, as Gürbilek and Seyhan note, the novel as a genre is already belated in Turkey, especially when compared to the classical genres of epic, poetry and drama. Secondly, according to Gürbilek, Tanpınar unlike his predecessors or contemporaries, acknowledged the feelings of anxiety and belatedness and used these concepts as his themes (such as the loss of the empire, of the wholeness, or the dead “East” etc.) in his novels (Gürbilek, *Kör Ayna* 14). Again according to Gürbilek, Tanpınar uses the term “past” to refer to two opposite meanings. It is first taken as a repertory for cultural heritage that can make the present richer, and it also connotes the ideas of “loss,” “waste,” and “death” that haunt the present. These last concepts are impossible to undo: what is lost, wasted and dead is gone; one cannot bring it back to life or the present time. This meaning of the past is always prevalent in Tanpınar’s work. Those who regard Tanpınar as a conservative or nostalgic writer, Gürbilek claims, cannot understand this second

dimension of his aesthetics; it is an aesthetics of loss.⁶⁹ What renders Tanpınar difficult to categorize is perhaps his ambivalent approach to modernity/tradition, past/present and East/West. That is, as a writer who embraced belatedness he emphasized that his approach to modernity constitutes a conflict between an aspiration to and a disdain of modernity. That is to say, he approached modernity in terms of a combination of contempt and admiration, or repugnance and attraction. He had admiration for modernity accompanied by prickings of conscience. It is an experience or description of a kind of identity crisis that Tanpınar repeated several times in his discursive and literary writings (“Türk Edebiyatında Cereyanlar” 103; “Kelimeler Arasında Elli Yıl” 82; “İnsan ve Cemiyet” 22; *A Mind at Peace* 153; *The Time Regulation Institute* 165).

Berna Moran argues that “[u]nlike other Turkish literary figures such as Halide Edip Adivar and Peyami Safa, who thought that modernity was equal to degeneration” (*Türk Romanına* 290), and that the contrast between modernity and conservatism stood for a contrast between material and unworldly values, “for Tanpınar modernity is not something that is against traditionalism or something that lacks spiritual values ... the old, according to Tanpınar, should willy-nilly change and should be transcended” (290). He saw modernity as a natural process born out of the past traditions in every culture. When Tanpınar lived and wrote his novels, Turkey was going through a modernization/Westernization process, and as a novelist experiencing this process, Tanpınar had a difficult task: he wanted to criticize Turkey’s modernization/Westernization, but this task was risky since he could be regarded as a backward-looking writer. According to Dellaloğlu, “Tanpınar was the first modernist in Turkey; a true modernist who understood what modernity meant in its plural form, when modernization/Westernization was the most accepted way of thinking in Turkey” (180). And Dellaloğlu also claims that it was only in the nineteen

⁶⁹ I will return to Tanpınar’s “aesthetics of loss” in this chapter to show its similarities with Walter Benjamin’s ideas of time and past.

eighties that Tanpınar's way of thinking was started to be understood better without any prejudice (180). Since then Tanpınar has been accepted as a modernist novelist who, via his fiction, endeavored to create the idea of Turkish modernity in a society which adopted modernization/Westernization. Therefore today, with the idea of Multiple Modernities, we can make a better reading of Tanpınar in that by means of the Multiple Modernities theory, Tanpınar's insistence on tradition's, culture's and the past's place in the present can be understood better because this theory argues that

diverse civilizational legacies give rise to multiple forms of modernity and stresses the constitutive role of cultural orientations and structures of consciousness. And against all forms of cultural determinism, it insists on the autonomy of culture and the openness of cultural frameworks to reinterpretation in changing social and historical contexts. (emphasis original, Ballantyne 3)

One of the primary theories of the new approach is the capacity and function of non-Western traditions in the formulation of diverse forms of modernity. In other words, today it can be clearly seen that Tanpınar's efforts to criticize the modernization/Westernization process in Turkey had nothing to do with being nostalgic, conservative or reactionary. On the contrary, when he criticized Turkish modernization/Westernization, he wanted to suggest that Turkey could be modernized by keeping its memory or by "settling accounts with the past" (*Günlüklerin Işığında* 301) with an all-inclusive attitude to all forms of contemporary experiences and possibilities.⁷⁰ His novels were literary registers in which he discussed his life-long intellectual question: is there a possibility of an expression of modernity born in Turkey?

This brings us to Tanpınar's use of "time" and "the past" in his work. As mentioned before, the past, with its two dimensional and oppositional meanings, is quite significant in Tanpınar because it constitutes

⁷⁰ Today we can understand better that Tanpınar's purpose was getting rid of the conflict/disharmony caused by binary oppositions (east-west, old-new, left-right, progressive-conservative etc.).

the necessary components that have evolved in time and that make groups of people a society. At the same time, he believed that the past is compatible with the idea of change: it is open to changes and interior/exterior influences. In fact, to Tanpınar, these changes and influences happening in the course of time make the past a significant notion. “The past is a totality of conversational dynamics and influences that make a society what it is in the present” (Tanpınar, “Milli Bir Edebiyata Doğru” 92).⁷¹ So, the past is a notion which is open to changes imposed and carried out by the present. Also, he thinks that the present could be richer and stronger if it includes tradition. He knew how to interpret tradition according to the present. Therefore he claimed that

[i]t is certain that the past time has always been in conflict with the understanding we created about it in our minds. We create our reality with the help of our own understanding of things, and in the same way, we create or shape the past [tradition] according to our own thoughts, feelings, and set of values and we change it according to these. (*Beş Şehir* 100)⁷²

As this quotation clearly notes, “the past,” according to Tanpınar, is a narrative/construct which is created/written in “the present.” And what constitutes the past is the present. So, the present is the time period to which Tanpınar attaches a great deal of importance. Almost all of his works emphasize this philosophy: “[t]o change by continuing and to continue by changing.”⁷³ By this, Tanpınar emphasizes the importance of capturing and understanding the present moment as a product and a producer of one’s past. To change by continuing is a notion which brings Tanpınar closer to Walter Benjamin in terms of their parallel ideas on time, past and memory.

Both Benjamin and Tanpınar used the past as a lost time period in the critique of the present. In this sense, neither of them supported the idea of revitalizing past time. The past, which is accepted as irretrievably lost, is

⁷¹ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 13.

⁷² For Turkish see Appendix A, note 14.

⁷³ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 15.

set against the present in order to criticize the present time and the concept of historical progress. In relation to the issue of the lost past, Gürbilek emphasizes the importance of the theme of “a last glance at a dead past” in Tanpınar and its parallels in the thought of Benjamin: “[t]he theme of the last glimpse together with the last sentence of Tanpınar’s poem, ‘Istanbul’ which is ‘we have to surrender to the present wind of change,’ is reminiscent of Benjamin’s angel of history which fixes his eyes on the past but is about to be dragged into the future by the wind coming from Paradise” (*Kör Ayna* 132). Benjamin in his “Ninth Thesis on the Philosophy of History” describes his emotions and opinions of history and progress, which are inspired by a Klee drawing, as follows:

[a] Klee drawing named “Angelus Novus” shows an angel looking as though he is about to move away from something he is fixedly contemplating. His eyes are staring, his mouth is open, his wings are spread. This is how one pictures the angel of history. His face is turned toward the past. Where we perceive a chain of events, he sees one single catastrophe that keeps piling ruin upon ruin and hurls it in front of his feet. The angel would like to stay, awaken the dead, and make whole what has been smashed. But a storm is blowing from Paradise; it has got caught in his wings with such violence that the angel can no longer close them. The storm irresistibly propels him into the future to which his back is turned, while the pile of debris before him grows skyward. This storm is what we call progress. (259-260)

Benjamin’s interpretation of this drawing points out his pessimistic ideas concerning progressivism. Benjamin argues that what we perceive as “a chain of [progressivist] events” is “one single catastrophe” of the past for the angel of history and the idea of “paradise” is negated with this concept of “catastrophe.” Considering the date of Benjamin’s essay (1940), this “catastrophe” indicates the disasters of World War II. Yet, “progress,” which is likened to a violent “storm [that] propels him [the angel] into the future”, destroys all hope for redemption of humankind as the angel is not a guardian of human kind; the angel of history is desperate and helpless. Benjamin aims to emphasize that a blind commitment to progressivism prevents one from remembering the past and the catastrophe which “keeps

piling ruin upon ruin.” For Benjamin, the future as a narrative of the progress of humankind is also unbelievable. It can be stated that his critique of “progress” is in line with the ideas of Adorno and Horkheimer. Also, the angel’s desire for “making what has been smashed whole” is an idea which is similar to the insistence on “wholeness” in Tanpınar’s thought.⁷⁴

Both Tanpınar and Benjamin have the dream of rescuing and saving the “things old and lost” or things which seized to exist in the present. Before going deep into this discussion, we can talk about Henri Bergson’s influence on both Tanpınar and Benjamin in terms of shaping their ideas on continuity and change through the concepts of the qualitative multiplicity of duration or “pure time”/*durée* in *Time and Free Will* (1889) and remembrance and memory in his *Matter and Memory* (1896). Tanpınar in one of his writings emphasizes the Bergsonian influence on *Meşrutiyet*-period writers and on some early-Republican Turkish writers, like himself, as follows,

[w]ith some studies of Rıza Tevfik and especially Şekip in *Dergah* Bergson gained a significant deal of importance compared to that of Durkheim. [...] Once Yahya Kemal said to Şekip Bey, ‘Şekip, we are all followers of Bergson.’[...] We read Bergson not only via those who studied his philosophy but also through those writers who have been influenced by him [referring to Proust]. (Tanpınar, *Mücevherlerin Sırrı* 134-5)⁷⁵

After the nineteen twenties, writers like Yahya Kemal and Tanpınar, by means of Bergsonism, wanted to formulate the idea of an eastern Renaissance which both relied on the past and was open to the modern. Influenced by Bergson, Tanpınar formulated a new sense of time which would enable the present to have a dialogue with the past. Tanpınar was influenced by Bergson’s idea of the accumulation of time and the notion of *durée*, or duration, in his *Time and Free Will* (1889). Unlike physical-worldly time, *durée* is neither finite/divisible, nor does it flow or pass.

⁷⁴ Tanpınar’s idea of “wholeness” will be discussed along with his idea of “to change by continuing.”

⁷⁵ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 16.

Dellaloğlu claims that Bergson produced the concept of duration as opposed to the positivist idea of time, (76) which tends to define time spatially.

Durée is the basis and the most important argument of Bergson's philosophy which influenced Tanpınar's ideas; therefore, it should be explained more. In Bergsonism, there are two kinds of "multiplicity:" "a quantitative and a qualitative multiplicity" (*Time and Free Will* 87). Unlike quantitative multiplicity, which is "homogeneous," "spatial" and can be "represented" with a symbol, qualitative multiplicity is "heterogeneous," "temporal" and "inexpressible." To explain qualitative multiplicity, in *The Creative Mind* (1934) Bergson talks about three images which exemplify the notion of duration, none of which are able exactly to refer to it due to its inexpressibility: the first is the image of "two spools with a tape running from one to the other" (137), the second is "an elastic band being stretched" (138) and his third image is "the color spectrum" (158). Each image represents a different characteristic of duration: the tape running from one spool to the other represents "the continuity and mobility" (5) of experiences and implies "the preservation of the past" (128); the elastic band represents "the duration's indivisibility" (129), and the color spectrum displays the constant "difference and heterogeneity" (110) of duration. Also, in his *The Creative Mind*, Bergson states that there are two modes of time: "the mathematical and the pure time" (2) or *durée*. According to him, the mathematical time is divisible and is calculated by hours or days, but the pure time does not rely on "objectively measurable clock time" (169), so the flow of time as pure time, or *durée*, can be experienced with "intuition." Thus, this brings us to another major concept in Bergsonism: "intuition." Bergson regards intuition as "a mode of reflection" (88) or a method of "thinking in duration" (126) which foregrounds the fact of the constant change of reality and flow of time. As opposed to reason or intellect, which can help one obtain knowledge of scientific principles, Bergson argues, intuition can provide us with "knowledge of metaphysical principles" (159) by going beyond the limits of reality.

Bergson's exploration of the notions of duration and intuition entails an analysis of "memory." To begin with, Bergson argues that duration is "the uninterrupted prolongation of the past into a present which is already blending into the future" (*The Creative Mind* 20). So, according to Bergson, memory is linked to duration and it entails a synthesis of the past and present. Relying on his understanding of durational time, it can be argued that pure time has an indivisible continuity; the past and the present must be seen as linked to each other. Bergson also distinguishes between two different forms of memory which are "habit memory" and "pure or true memory," and he explains them as follows:

the past appears indeed to be stored up, as we had surmised, under two extreme forms: on the one hand, motor mechanisms which make use of it; on the other, personal memory-images which picture all past events with their outline, their color and their place in time. Of these two memories the first follows the direction of nature; the second, left to itself, would rather go the contrary way. The first, conquered by effort, remains dependent upon our will; the second, entirely spontaneous, is as capricious in reproducing as it is faithful in preserving. (*Matter and Memory* 102-3)

According to this categorization of memory, habit memories are acquired by means of repetition or "effort" and they are "dependent upon our will." To exemplify habit memory, Bergson mentions how we learn a poem and store the poem in our memory for the purpose of the present action. It is a "learnt recollection" (*Matter* 95) which becomes in time more "impersonal" and "more and more foreign to our past life" (95). On the other hand, pure memory entails the preservation of personal memories unconsciously. Also, unlike habit memory, parts of pure memory come forward "spontaneously and capriciously". To illustrate this mode of memory, Bergson, following the same example, talks about "the remembrance of the lesson of learning that poem." Unlike learnt recollection, "spontaneous recollection, which is essentially incapable of being repeated, [...] retains in memory its place and date" (96). Briefly, in Bergsonian philosophy, one can argue that memory is consciousness and it is never universal or objective. He states that we

perceive the present world by relying on our “pure memory” or records of the past (*Matter* 68).

The two novels of Tanpınar which are explored in this study are structured around the Bergsonian concept of time. As mentioned before, Tanpınar and some other intellectuals of his time read Bergson, along with the thinkers of the “other West,” during the intellectually free atmosphere of the period and they admired Mallarmé’s pure poetics, Rimbaud’s figure of the *voyant* or soothsayer, Bergson’s *durée* or duration, Proust’s and Eliot’s stream of consciousness, and Joyce’s one-day narration; so, it can be said that the “other West” encouraged them, perhaps, to imagine an alternative experience of modernity. Tanpınar, who was motivated by Bergsonian ideas, started to explore the possibility of experiencing modernity by preserving the past and formulated his idea of “changing by continuing,” or (*terkip*). Bergson disassociated *durée* from spatial definitions and in doing so inspired Tanpınar to consider past and future events without experiencing an internal separation from the present. To Tanpınar, Bergson’s descriptions of consciousness and memory were inspirational because they showed him how to consider overlapping moments as heterogeneous in his fiction.

This brings us to the question why Turkish writers like Tanpınar, Yahya Kemal and others from *Dergah* found Bergsonian philosophy and his conceptualization of time appealing. As mentioned before, Bergson in his philosophy isolates duration from space to enquire into the multiplicity of perceived experiences as they unfold in pure duration. The idea of isolating duration from space and consequently attaining pure time resembles the teachings of some non-Western philosophies and religions like *Mevlevi Sufism*⁷⁶ and Buddhism.⁷⁷ One of the reasons why Bergsonian philosophy attracted Tanpınar and the writers of *Dergah*’s attention might be such

⁷⁶ See Levent Bayraktar’s article, “Mevlana ve Bergson’da Ruh Kavramı” (“The Concept of Spirit in *Mevlana* and Bergson”).

⁷⁷ Some studies about this issue are Bernard Faure’s *Double Exposure: Cutting across Buddhist and Western Discourses* (2004) and T. R. V. Murti’s *The Central Philosophy of Buddhism* (1955).

similarity they observed between Sufism, the Sufi music and Bergson's concepts. Particularly in Tanpınar's fiction the music of Sufism is a significant element in understanding Turkish cultural history. Like Bergsonian philosophy that foregrounds the experience of *durée* and pure time, Sufism in Tanpınar's fiction enables characters to experience pure time. The Bergsonian perception of time is freed from spatial limitations and the same experience, as Tanpınar emphasizes, is attained via *Mevlevi* music that defies spatial boundaries and categories like the past, the present and the future. That is, Sufi music for him is intuitive, poetical and involves mystical perception. That Bergsonian philosophy foregrounds the intuitive experience of reality through duration makes it similar to Sufism, and thereby perhaps more appealing to Tanpınar.

If we go back to the issue of the parallelisms between Benjamin and Tanpınar, we can say that the common point between the two stems from Bergson's work *Creative Evolution* (1907), which was translated into Turkish as *Yaratıcı Tekâmül* by Mustafa Şekip Tunç in 1946. *Tekâmül* means "evolution" and at the same time "maturation." Considering this two-dimensional meaning of the word *tekâmül*, we can assert that Tanpınar's notion of "changing by continuing" is an equivalent term for this philosophy of *tekâmül* (Dellaloğlu 91). Benjamin argues that "[t]he true picture of the past flits by. The past can be seized only as an image which flashes up at the instant when it can be recognized and is never seen again" ("Fifth Thesis" 230) So, Benjamin draws attention to the necessity of recollection of past things which have already disappeared or are about to disappear. He argues that "perhaps, what renders the past and forgotten things so grand and attractive to us is the traces of our habits that have gone for good and that we can no more attain" (Benjamin, *Berlin Childhood around 1900* 61). Like Benjamin, Tanpınar also shows a concern with recollecting things past. He states that "the past attracts us to itself exactly because it is past and because we cannot find the things in their places. Whether their trace exists there [in the past] or not; in the past we still look for our missing part which, we

think, we lost in our inner quarrel” (“İstanbul” 111).⁷⁸ Also, he emphasizes this concern about recollecting things past with the last-glimpse image in his aestheticism, and he believes that recollection of the things past is only possible with art; therefore, he refers to the Orpheus myth to explain his point (Gürbilek, *Benden Önce* 102; *Kör Ayna* 133). Like Orpheus, who led his dead wife, Eurydice, out of the world of the dead with his music, (but lost her forever as he should not have looked back during their ascent to the upper world) Tanpınar uses his art to “call back all cultural and aesthetic traditions from the past” (Tanpınar, “Şiire Dair” 24). Therefore, he wants to grasp a sense of “whole” time or “monolithic large time” in which the boundaries between past, present and future are blurred or completely vanish, and this quest for a “whole” time is very much like Benjamin’s angel of history who “would like to stay, awaken the dead, and make whole what has been smashed.”

Time in Tanpınar’s world is not linear; it does not “progress.” On the contrary, his understanding of time is built on refusing to assume a categorical superiority of the future to the past; so, he takes time as a wide and infinite present which contains both past and future. To him, time has no “before” or “after,” but it is an infinite and monolithic totality. One of the most striking depictions of his perception of time is illustrated in his poem “Neither Am I inside Time” (1961):

Neither am I inside time,
Nor altogether without;
In the unbroken flow of
An instant singular and vast.⁷⁹

The poetic persona feels that s/he exists both within and without time. That is, s/he perceives and lives in both what Bergson calls “mathematical time” and “pure time” (*Creative Mind* 2). Like Bergson, Tanpınar prioritizes pure time or *durée* over mathematical time. Therefore, the feeling of being

⁷⁸ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 17.

⁷⁹ “Neither Am I Inside Time” (“*Ne İçindeyim Zamanın*” 1961) Trans. Erdağ Göknaar. *Northwest Review*; 2010, Vol. 48 Issue 2, p102. For Turkish see Appendix A, note 18.

alienated from the present time (mathematical time) is one of the major themes of his poems and novels. According to Tanpınar, pure time or in his words, “fugitive time,” [*firari zaman*], “time devoid of state” [*halsiz zaman*] or “monolithic time in an unbroken flow” is a method and a style of his art (*Mahur Beste* 150).

In another picturesque poem, “Bursa’da Zaman” (1961), Tanpınar again stresses the idea of “change by continuing.” The poem reads as follows:

Every word here is a sign of triumph:
as if day, hour, season lives
the magic of the past at the same moment.
The dream is still smiling on these stones.
Even the pigeon-glanced silence
echoes with the illusion of the infinite continuity.

...
Every night Bursa dreams this,
Every dawn wakes with it, laugh
cypresses at silver sunlight, roses
with the cool daydreams of its fountains.
As if I am nearby a miracle,
with the sound of water and clatter of wings
Time in Bursa is a crystal chandelier.⁸⁰

In this poem, Tanpınar foregrounds Bergson’s *durée* which does not rely on “objectively measurable clock time” (*Creative Mind* 169). “Bursa’da Zaman” is an experience of *durée*, an infinite and indivisible continuity. *Durée* is the flow of time as pure time, and can be understood intuitively. Intuition can provide the poetic persona with “a miracle” by going beyond the limits of “reality.”

Although there are parallelisms between Tanpınar and Benjamin’s ideas about the past and its continuation, since “their ideas were nourished by the same thinkers and writers (Proust, Baudelaire, Bergson, Freud, Dostoevsky, Valéry)” (Gürbilek, *Benden Önce* 113), there are significant differences between them as well. Unlike Tanpınar, Benjamin with his Marxist determinism regards the past as “one single catastrophe that keeps

⁸⁰ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 19.

piling ruin upon ruin;” also, Benjamin aims to find and preserve the images of the past in things which have no material value or which have been reified by the hegemonic cultures in the past (Gürbilek, *Kör Ayna* 132).

To articulate the past historically does not mean to recognize it ‘the way it really was’ (Ranke). It means to seize hold of a memory as it flashes up at a moment of danger. Historical materialism wishes to retain that image of the past. [...] In every era the attempt must be made anew to wrest tradition away from a conformism that is about to overpower it. (Benjamin, “Sixth Thesis” 255)

As this quotation indicates, according to Benjamin, official history is written by and in favor of the victor to strengthen the status quo. In societies which are founded on the philosophy of progress and a linear understanding of time, “conformism” itself becomes an end that maintains itself by suppressing and marginalizing every “other” which opposes the dominant ideology. The problem is between “the periphery” and “the center:” “[a] historical materialist views [what the victors] call cultural treasures with cautious detachment. For without exception the cultural treasures he surveys have an origin which he cannot contemplate without horror. [...] There is no document of civilization which is not at the same time a document of barbarism” (Benjamin, “Seventh Thesis” 256). Benjamin, on the one hand, as a critical theorist has in his mind the threats posed by the culture industry and capitalism; thus he urges people to read the past carefully and “brush history against the grain” (“Seventh Thesis” 256). As Benjamin sees it, culture, as it is in the present, was a representation of terror in the past. For him, “retrieving the past” (Benjamin, “Fifth Thesis” 255) is an idea of rescuing the discourses of the suppressed and marginalized. So, in these respects, Benjamin seems closer to Huxley. Tanpınar, on the other hand, who has no Marxist tendencies sees the past as a “resource,” “treasure,” or “magnificence” that should be transmitted to the next generations. “As much as the importance of tradition, those who will inherit it are important” (*The Arcade Project* 57) argues Benjamin, bringing an insight which is missing in Tanpınar’s approach to tradition. Tanpınar does not pay attention

to the idea that history or the cultural past could be used as a project for social or political manipulation for the dominant groups of present or in the next generations.

Tanpınar's engagement with the past has, nevertheless, much to do with his attempt to understand the present cultural lives in Turkey as a part of his conceptualization of modernity and to connect them with the past and the future, which is a part of his idea of completeness or continuity. His understanding of the modern embraces the "traditional." What he could not accept was the disharmony that resulted from intolerance and discontinuity between the past and the present: "[t]he modernization project in Turkey, for Tanpınar, did not respect other life styles" (Moran, "Time Regulation" 286). Moran maintains that "Tanpınar was constantly searching for harmony and tolerance both in life and literary works" (287). Thus, in his novels he depicted a sense of either discontent or anxiety and even sarcasm towards the modernization project in Turkey, starting with the *Tanzimat* and increasing after the foundation of the Republic. So, what he emphasized is a new outlook on modernity, which he called a new harmony or *terkip*, which favors evolution and preservation of the past traditions. Although the word *terkip* is translated into English as "synthesis," (in the translation of *A Mind at Peace* by Erdağ Göknaar) I believe Tanpınar meant by *terkip* was "harmony," coexistence without merging of the parts into a single unity, or "a composition" in Seyhan's term (141). Besim Dellaloğlu and Ali Yıldız also agree that by *terkip* Tanpınar did not mean a synthesis: what Tanpınar longed for was not a synthesis of East and West. He rather wanted to "be himself[;] being himself is definitely not a synthesis" (Dellaloğlu 138). Yıldız holds that "synthesis means a combination of two different things to obtain something new. Yet, in Tanpınar's synthesis, there are no two different things at the center of his idea. Tanpınar took the national and cultural life as the center of his thinking and idea of *terkip*, not the Eastern or Western civilizations" (424). Ideas, concepts and practices which can, in spite of their differences, harmoniously coexist in Turkey and which are

genuinely adopted by the present national and cultural life constitute Tanpınar's *terkip*.

According to Tanpınar, the only solution for the problem of the Turkish modernization crisis is to create a Turkish version of modernity or *terkip*; a modern life enhanced and enriched by multiple traditional and cultural values and practices. Tanpınar reflected on Turkey's modernization project with caution and expressed it with the metaphor of a threshold in his poetry and fiction. His poem "Eşik" (1961) in fact conveys the main structure of his understanding:

And a woman white, calm and magical
a rose of time bleeding in her bosom
listens with gloomy glances in the depths
on the thresholds of being or not being⁸¹

Tanpınar's notion of a threshold can be taken as an early suggestion or a precursor of contemporary narratives that emphasize the necessity to create an alternative mode of modernization in Turkey because the threshold refers to not giving up on traditions but to an urge to change, a state of in-between-ness⁸² or "purgatory" (Yıldız 413).

Lastly, I would like to introduce a different dimension of the discussion on Tanpınar's perception of Turkish modernity or his state of in-between-ness: Tanpınar mainly supported the idea of *terkip* in his literary and non-literary work. His search for a *terkip* is in fact related to the Multiple Modernities approach because he wanted to solve the problem of being stuck between the East and the West by introducing this idea. Tanpınar's *terkip* informs, by and large, all his writings, and we could trace what Tanpınar really meant by *terkip* by exploring his writings, including his major novels. "After 1932 I have lived in an 'East' which I interpreted for myself. I believe such a climate will be our own living climate. *Beş Şehir* (1946) and *A Mind at Peace* (1949) are two preliminary research

⁸¹ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 20.

⁸² See the etymological connection with "liminal."

studies for such a [coexistence of the traditional and the modern]. And also this is the nucleus of all the work I will write” (qtd. in Akün “A. H. Tanpınar” 11), states Tanpınar. Sometimes *terkip* stands for nature, a life philosophy, a character, the whole society, sometimes it is a central theme represented by a symbol. He emphasizes the necessity of having a new outlook on life as the previous one collapsed with the disappearance of the Ottoman Empire. “Geography, culture and everything expect us to create a new [outlook on life or *terkip*], yet we are not aware of our responsibilities. We are living other nations’ experiences” (*A Mind at Peace* 228).⁸³ Moreover he argues that “I am devoted neither to East [or *şark*] nor the past [or *mazi*]; I am devoted to and occupied with the life of my native land” (*Mahur Beste* [1944] 108); and he repeats, “I am devoted neither to East nor West, or things like that; I am devoted to us, to life which has not died” (Tanpınar, *Mahur Beste* 111).⁸⁴ This is a very brief description of his idea of *terkip*. The close relationship Tanpınar sees between locality, the significance of the past ages and modernity is articulated by one of Tanpınar’s protagonists, Mümtaz, in *A Mind at Peace* as follows: “In order to leap forward or to reach new horizons, one still has to stand on some solid ground. A sense of identity is necessary... Every nation appropriates this identity from its golden age” (198).⁸⁵ Again Mümtaz, speaking on behalf of his creator, states that the past is not an entity that should be adopted blindly today “I am not an aesthete of a collapse. Maybe I am looking for things alive in this debris. I value them” (*A Mind at Peace* 156).⁸⁶ The change does not have to be disconnected from the cultural/traditional/local realities of the people.

⁸³ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 21.

⁸⁴ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 22.

⁸⁵ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 23.

⁸⁶ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 24

As a conclusion, relying on the implicit definitions of the modern, modernity and modernization that inform their novels, we can summarize the similarities and differences between the work of Huxley and Tanpınar as follows: on the one hand, both Huxley and Tanpınar were discontented with modernity and modernization because they detected the cultural and civilizational crisis in their societies caused by the destabilizing effects of modernity and modernization. They produced a critique of instrumental rationality and mass culture, which they regarded as the results of the mis-interpretations and mis-use of the Enlightenment ideals. Besides, both Huxley and Tanpınar emphasized the threats posed by conformist and authoritarian ideologies and wanted to prevent cultural values and traditions, human creativity, science, technology and scientific progress from being devalued or abused in the modern age. Another similarity between Huxley and Tanpınar is their awareness of a multiplicity of world-views and their careful reflection on this principle in their novels. There are nevertheless some striking differences between them in their approaches to the modern. Until the early nineteen thirties Huxley identified the modern with the West due to his reliance on a narrative that rests on the liberal tradition of modernity. For Tanpınar, however, the modern does not mean Europe or West. His understanding of the modern is more heterogeneous and he defines it in pluralistic terms that respect various cultural values and localities.

CHAPTER 3

THE DIFFERING FORMULATIONS OF THE MODERN IN *POINT COUNTER POINT* AND *A MIND AT PEACE*

This chapter aims to explore to what extent *A Mind at Peace* (1949) engages with and/or is in conflict with *Point Counter Point* (1928) in terms of each writer's discontent with modernity and modernization. This part of the dissertation is a comparative study of two novels embedded in different contexts, but having similar concerns. The chapter argues that Huxley's and Tanpınar's novels demonstrate their writers' critical perspectives in the matters of modernity and modernization. An analysis of the formal and thematic similarities and differences between these novels reveals the ways in which these two texts make a criticism of modernity and modernization. The chapter argues that Huxley's *Point Counter Point* is structured around an understanding of modernity which equates the modern with the West. Tanpınar's formulation of modernity in *A Mind at Peace*, however, is quite different from that of Huxley's novel in that Tanpınar's philosophy of the "modern," which shapes *A Mind at Peace*, is founded on a vision of modernity that is local and polycentric. As a last note, the chapter emphasizes that despite the difference between the two novels as regards the conceptualization of the modern, both Huxley's and Tanpınar's discontent with modernity arises from their similar diagnosis of the lack of harmony and completeness in modern life which, for Huxley, corresponds to the Western world and, for Tanpınar, to his country, Turkey.

The following analysis will explore both the similarities and differences between the novels. Although there are, as we will see, a number of similarities, both in terms of content and form, between *Point Counter Point* and *A Mind at Peace*, I would like to make it clear at the outset that I will not try to formulate a case for these resemblances. Tanpınar was

acquainted with Huxley's work before he wrote his novel,⁸⁷ and he deliberately highlights it when he talks about his protagonist's (Mümtaz) fondness for Huxley (*A Mind at Peace* 319). This explicit reference to *Point Counter Point* is as follows:

[h]ow did he [Mümtaz] feel when listening to other musicians? Did he feel the same while listening to Bach and Beethoven? Aldous Huxley had written,⁸⁸ "God exists and is apparent, but only when violins play..." The novelist [Huxley], whom he [Mümtaz] quite admired, had written this about the Quartet in A minor. Mümtaz had listened to this quartet long before he'd read the book [Huxley's *Point Counter Point*]. (*A Mind at Peace* 320)⁸⁹

Tanpınar reveals his admiration for Huxley through Mümtaz who has been considered a character representing the text's message (Moran, *Türk Romanına* 320). Also, another explicit resemblance between Huxley's and Tanpınar's novels is the use of the same music, Beethoven's opus 132 String Quartet in A minor. In both *Point Counter Point* and *A Mind at Peace* Spandrell and Suad respectively commits suicide while playing this music in the background. A reason for this interesting similarity will be offered towards the end of this chapter. Relying on these explicit references to Huxley's *Point Counter Point* in Tanpınar's *A Mind at Peace*, it can be argued that Huxley was a significant writer for Tanpınar.

3.1 The Novel of Ideas

It should be firstly stated that both Huxley and Tanpınar used the sub-genre known as the novel of ideas because it provided them with the necessary tools for the exploration and problematization of social, cultural, political issues and an analysis of the idea of the modern. Therefore, this

⁸⁷ "Tanpınar read Huxley's *Point Counter Point* either in English or in French" (Berksoy 50). Also, Hilmi Yavuz states that "in his library, Tanpınar had six novels of Huxley" (http://www.zaman.com.tr/hilmi-yavuz/tanpinarin-kitaplariyla-bas-basa_1302736.html).

⁸⁸ "The music was a proof; God existed. But only so long as the violins were playing" (Huxley, *Point Counter Point* 292-3).

⁸⁹ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 25.

section will first explore some definitional questions concerning the novel of ideas and then demonstrate the features that make *Point Counter Point* and *A Mind at Peace* two examples of this sub-genre.

The novel of ideas is a sub-genre of the novel, and according to Peter E. Firchow, it “is, in a very fundamental sense, a misnomer because there are no novels without ideas” (“Mental Music” 62). However, not all novels are classified as novels of ideas because what makes us classify a novel as a novel of ideas is connected to degree, not kind. In other words, “the novel of ideas is first and foremost and finally a novel, but it is a novel in which the intellectual content is either more overt or more stressed, or both, than is the case with other species of the novel” (Firchow, “Mental Music” 62). Also, what makes a novel of ideas different from “the social novel” should be discussed. “The central concern of the social novel is the impact of the socioeconomic and political environment on the course of characters’ lives. Ideas [...] obviously play an important part in the social novel, but they tend to be subordinate to the characters’ experience of their immediate material conditions and personal relationships” (Grosvenor 10). Observed from this angle, it can be claimed that *Point Counter Point* and *A Mind at Peace* fit better into the category of the novel of ideas “in which the author’s central objective is the exploration of contrasting and contending modes of thought” (Grosvenor 11). Samuel Johnson’s *The History of Rasselas* (1759), Voltaire’s *Candide* (1759), Orwell’s *Animal Farm* (1945), and several of Dostoevsky’s novels are examples of the novel of ideas given by Peter Grosvenor. The novel of ideas uses ideas “in default of characterization and other qualities of the traditional narrative” (Hoffman 129). According to this definition, we can see that Huxley and Tanpınar often demonstrated in their novels the fact that ideas may have qualities which are comparable with those which animate persons. That is, ideas, as they are used in Huxley and Tanpınar, possess dramatic features. And the most fundamental generic quality employed by the novelist of ideas is the counterpoint technique. The use of this technique in *Point Counter Point* is evident, and will be

explained later in this chapter. As for Tanpınar's case, it should be stated that although several Turkish literary critics (Berna Moran, Mehmet Kaplan, and Zeynep Bayramoğlu) have identified such generic qualities of the novel of ideas as the counterpoint technique and characters as ideas in Tanpınar's novel, it is only Seyhan who explicitly refers to *A Mind at Peace* as a novel of ideas:

A Mind at Peace is a novel of ideas, wrapped in a love story that runs its tragic course against the background of a time of acute anxiety, as Turkey stands on the brink of the Second World War, which it desperately tries to stay out of. While the story is told in a straightforward manner, without the intrusion of postmodern riddles, its questions only raise more questions, and the polyphonic structure of the novel creates a complex web that suspends issues and postpones answers. The dialectic of ideas and ideals that move the narrative resists closure and signals that the search will go on. (140-1)

As mentioned in the quotation, *A Mind at Peace* is a novel of ideas that foregrounds ideas which are in dialogue with others, and the characters are either specimens, or demonstrations of abstract ideas that raise "complex questions" (140). In *A Mind at Peace* there is a fictitious world of characters who are sent to test the (in)validity of ideas by comparing and contrasting them with those of others.

Before proceeding, we need to introduce briefly the characters and the ideas they represent in *Point Counter Point* first and after that, those in *A Mind at Peace* will be pointed out. Philip Quarles is the novelist character and he is married to Elinor. Theirs is a problematic marriage due to Philip's desiccated and isolated intellectual life. His mother claims that he is an introvert because of his club-foot. Elinor's father is John Bidlake, a formerly-renowned artist who has had many romantic affairs and led a sensual life. Bidlake's other child is Walter who is a writer like Philip. Walter has had an affair with a married woman, Marjorie, and impregnated her; yet he is in love with another woman, Lucy Tantamount. Walter's boss is Dennis Burlap who is a womanizer who nevertheless tries to create a pious image of himself in society. Lucy is the daughter of Lord and Lady

Tantamount. Lady Hilda Tantamount is presented as a member of the upper class in society who likes throwing parties and having guests around her. Her husband Lord Edward Tantamount⁹⁰ represents a certain type of scientist whose work offers nothing to contribute to the well-being of humankind. In other words, he is the personification of the socially-disengaged scientist. Illidge, Lord Edward's laboratory assistant, represents the socialist world-view, yet his socialism stems from not philosophical reasons but from his physical features: he feels belittled by the rich and has inferiority complex. One of Lucy's friends is Maurice Spandrell, who is the representative of nihilism in the novel. His nihilism arises from a traumatic experience he had at an early age: his mother's marriage to a soldier. Nihilism's antithesis, vitalism is represented by another character, Mark Rampion. Rampion and his wife Mary are the only two characters who manage to have a healthy and happy relationship in marriage. Throughout the novel these major characters come together in social leisure activities such as house parties, dinners and tea parties, and they exchange ideas about various subjects.

Who/what are the characters/ideas employed by Tanpınar in *A Mind at Peace*? As mentioned before, Mümtaz is the protagonist of Tanpınar's novel, and is also claimed to be Tanpınar's literary representative. Like Quarles, Mümtaz is a writer but fails to negotiate his personal life with his intellectual/social life. To be more specific, he feels trapped between these two experiences. After the loss of his parents, he goes to İstanbul to live with his cousin, İhsan and his family. Mümtaz owes much to İhsan because

⁹⁰ Lord Edward Tantamount is a representation of the scientist, the recurring figure of the Western scientist as a satirical type in Huxley's novels. By means of Lord Tantamount, Huxley's increasing tendency to criticize the mis-application of science and technology is emphasized, and Baker states that "ashamed of the body and crippled by shyness, for Lord Tantamount science is both an escape as well as a compensatory form of power. [...] He is, as Quarles calls, 'the lop-sided man of science'" ("Science and Modernity" 42) so, for him science is simply another form of pleasure, "a variation of the amusements of the Marquis de Sade" (*Point Counter Point* 162) as Huxley puts it. Lord Tantamount also prefigures the more menacing scientists and rationalists representing the idea of science as a form of dominance presented in his *Brave New World*. The figure of scientist in the context of "systematic sadism" and "industrialized totalitarianism" (Huxley, *Themes* 52; 85) will be further discussed in the following chapter.

İhsan has acted as both a father and a mentor to Mümtaz and nurtured Mümtaz's intellectual life in literature, history and social events. İhsan symbolizes the notion of harmony and "completeness" in the novel. At the beginning of the novel, the reader learns that Mümtaz is melancholic due to two reasons: İhsan's grave illness and the loss of his lover, Nuran. Through a flashback, we learn that Mümtaz has fallen in love with Nuran, a woman/mother who just divorced her husband for infidelity. Their love affair is depicted like a sweet dream from which Mümtaz has never wanted to wake up. Their relationship and love intensifies more through descriptions of scenes in Istanbul and music. Mümtaz's rival for Nuran's love, Suad is introduced in the novel. Although he is married, he confesses his love for Nuran with a love letter. He is described as an egoist, atheist, anarchist and a hedonistic character; an equal of Spandrell. He symbolizes just the opposite of whatever İhsan and Mümtaz represent in the novel. He negates the idea of harmony/*terkip* introduced and supported by İhsan in several intellectual discussions reported in the novel. Through another flashback, we learn that Suad's sudden suicide ended Mümtaz and Nuran's love affair and it becomes an eye-opener for Mümtaz to see the social and economic problems Turkey suffers from in those years.

3.1.1 The Counterpoint Technique and the Musicalization of Fiction

Before having a close and thorough look at the idea of using characters as ideas in the novel of ideas, in this section I would like to proceed with the technique of counterpoint or the musicalization of fiction and the importance of setting in the novel of ideas because starting with an introduction of generic and technical quality will provide my analysis with a framework, and it will also leave more space for my exploration and discussion of "ideas" represented by characters in the rest of the chapter.

As one of the fundamental parallelisms between Huxley's and Tanpınar's novels, we can talk about their similar generic qualities, and the most distinctive generic quality of the novel of ideas is its narrative style

which can be described as “the point-counter-point technique.” This literary technique was inspired by theories and artistic techniques emerging in twentieth-century music (counterpoint⁹¹/cacophony), film (montage), painting (collage) and physics (theory of relativity): “[l]ike others [in music, painting, narrative fiction, film, and physics] Huxley was learning to cope with the relativism of viewpoint implicit in the twentieth century and the challenge it posed to the traditional more unified approach” (Roston 49). However, we can claim that particularly the innovative techniques used in music are influential on Huxley and Tanpinar who employed them in the art of fiction. That is, the counterpoint technique used in these two writers’ narrative fiction was, perhaps, more than anything else, inspired by music.

Before exploring the term the counterpoint technique or the musicalization of fiction, we need to first talk about polyphony as another narrative technique borrowed from music because it is a very similar term to counterpoint. Since so many features of a polyphonic novel and those of a novel which has a contrapuntal style are similar, explaining one of them can help us understand the other.⁹² Both are musical terms, and Michael David Lukas states that “just as polyphonic music combines melodies to create texture and tension, the polyphonic novel collects a multiplicity of distinct, often conflicting voices around a single place, family, object, or idea” (1). Like novels using the counterpoint technique, polyphonic novels sometimes produce meaning at the convergence of seemingly random plot lines. Harmonies are discovered in the accumulation of contrasting and opposing voices. As the Russian literary critic Mikhail Bakhtin, who characterizes Dostoevsky’s novels as polyphonic and dialogic, puts it:

[a] plurality of independent and unmerged voices and consciousnesses, a genuine polyphony of fully valid voices is in fact the chief characteristic of Dostoevsky’s novels. What unfolds in his

⁹¹ “Counterpoint in music occurs when a melody is added to a given tune until plurality results; that is, a melody not single but attended by one or more related but independent melodies” (Meckier, “Satire and Structure” 21).

⁹² Yet, neither Huxley nor Tanpinar called their novels polyphonic. Instead, they used the word “counterpoint” to describe them.

works is not a multitude of characters and fates in a single objective world, illuminated by a single authorial consciousness; rather a plurality of consciousnesses, with equal rights and each with its own world, combine but are not merged in the unity of the event. (*Problem 9*)

Polyphonic novels rely on “a plurality of independent and unmerged voices,” their simultaneity and contradiction. In other words, there is a system of thought which is based on the interactions of equally-important and autonomous ideas. Besides, another significant aspect of the polyphonic novels is the position of the implied author: the novelist’s standpoint/ideology does not dominate the novel; rather, it is simply one of the multiple and independent consciousnesses within the novel:

[a]longside and in front of itself it [the novelist’s consciousness] senses others’ equally valid consciousnesses, just as infinite and open-ended as itself. It reflects and re-creates not a world of objects, but precisely these other consciousnesses with their worlds, recreates them in their authentic unfinalizability (which is, after all, their essence). . . . The author of a polyphonic novel is not required to renounce himself. (Bakhtin, *Problem 68*)

The novelist of a polyphonic novel achieves an aesthetic distance and provides characters with an opportunity to create their own free “consciousnesses”. Also, in the quotation above, Bakhtin mentions the idea of “unfinalizability” and its unfinalizability is the third important aspect of the polyphonic novel, along with a dialogic view of truth and the independent relationship of the author to the viewpoints of his/her characters. The independent consciousnesses represented in the novel are never finalized into one unified, grand idea. In Bakhtin’s words, “nothing conclusive has yet taken place in the world, the ultimate word of the world and about the world has not yet been spoken, the world is open and free, everything is still in the future and will always be in the future” (*Problem 166*). The idea “the world is open and free” makes it possible for all ideas to exist in a constant dialogue with each other in a work. Thus it can be stated that these three features of the polyphonic novel – dialogism, a deliberate decentralization of the standpoint of the implied author, and the idea that

one's consciousness is never final – can also be found in a novel which has a point-counter-point technique. So, what distinguishes a contrapuntal novel from a polyphonic novel perhaps lies in the idea that in a polyphonic novel ideas are not necessarily placed against each other; yet in a contrapuntal one, there is a formula which presents one idea as contrary to the other. In a contrapuntal novel, these contrary ideas complement each other and they constitute a sense of wholeness and harmony.

As the title of Huxley's novel clearly indicates, its main theme is a constant play of one point countered by a different point.⁹³ A French musicologist, Jean-Louis Cupers states that "Huxley, who started to write musical fiction in 1926, produced his best work in this style with *Point Counter Point*. This novel is evidently inspired by a fugue as it consists of the main movements of a fugue, like *exposition, development and strette*⁹⁴" (13). This close relationship between Huxley's work and music can also be found in his essay called "Water Music" (1920) in which he wrote of the sound of water dripping from a tap as a kind of music:

[d]rip drop, drip drap drep drop. So it goes on, this water melody forever without an end ... Perhaps for those who have ears to hear, this endless dribbling is as pregnant with thought and emotion, as significant as a piece of Bach. Drip-Drop, di-drap, di-drep. So little would suffice to turn the incoherence into meaning. The music of the drops is a symbol and type for the whole universe; it is forever, as it were, asymptotic to sense, infinitely close to significance but never touching it. Never, unless the human mind comes and pulls it forcibly over the dividing space. (243)

This quotation is one of the earliest examples of Huxley's interest in expressing the experience of music in literary works. He wanted his narrative to mirror the polyphony of music rather than the linearity of prose,

⁹³ *Point Counter Point* was translated into Turkish by Mina Urgan, an English Literature Professor, in 1961 and the title of her translation emphasizes Huxley's literary technique which puts one idea/sound against the other: *Point Counter Point* is translated into Turkish as *Ses Sese Karşı* (Sound Counter Sound). So, with her Turkish title, Urgan also attracts attention to the "sound" and "the musicality of the novel."

⁹⁴ *Strette* or *Stretto* (in Italian) means overlapping of the subjects in music and often found near the end of a fugue, as a means of building to a climax, but may occur anywhere, usually after the exposition and development (*Encyclopedia Britannica*).

and viewed from the perspective of literary devices, Huxley formulated the most suitable form for this novel. Like a fugue, *Point Counter Point* accommodates numerous contradictory, inconsistent and opposite ideas. It is this quality of the novel that makes it an exercise in “the musicalization of fiction,” specifically the contrapuntal apposition of fundamentally contrasting worldviews. In the novel the existence of each idea depends on the existence of its opposite; that is, each standpoint is put under scrutiny with the introduction of its counter point. Huxley’s novelist character in *Point Counter Point*, allegedly his fictional representation, Philip Quarles, also calls this feature of his own novel “the musicalization of fiction” and explains it as follows:

[t]he musicalization of fiction. Not in the symbolist way, by subordinating sense to sound. (*Pleuvent les bleus baisers des astres taciturnes*. Mere glossolalia). But on a large scale, in the construction. Meditate on Beethoven. The changes of moods, the abrupt transitions. ... Get this into a novel. How? [...] All you need is a sufficiency of characters and parallel, contrapuntal plots. [...] The novelist can assume the god-like creative privilege and simply elect to consider the events of the story in their various aspects – emotional, scientific, economic, religious, metaphysical, etc. He will modulate from one to the other – as from the aesthetic to the physico-chemical aspect of things, from the religious to the physiological or financial. (350)

Thus Huxley, as Philip explains in this quotation, uses his “god-like creative privilege” to display various ideas/figures and their various reactions to the same topics. Huxley employs an analogy from music to structure his narrative; his models are Bach and Beethoven.⁹⁵ To illustrate, we can talk

⁹⁵ As a music critic, Huxley wrote articles for *The Weekly Westminster Gazette* between 18 February 1922 and 2 June 1923. His music criticism offers material for tracing the evolution of his ideas. John Aplin states that Huxley thought “the music of Bach, Mozart and Beethoven is capable of a mysterious unity with the human spirit; it is thus a heritage against which it is only reasonable to measure the success, the worth, even the worthwhileness, of new works” (28). It can also be stated that Huxley had a special, devout regard for Beethoven (1770-1827): “Beethoven made it possible to give direct and poignant expression to thoughts and feelings which were inexpressible by even the most highly gifted of his predecessors” (Huxley, *Beyond the Mexique Bay* 276). To Huxley, “Beethoven was transcendental in the direction of heroism, of the soul, of infinity” (Hogarth 1080). Thus, Huxley’s appraisal of Beethoven can also be regarded as a sign of his sympathy for neo-classicism.

about two musical scenes that frame his novel: the first a performance of J. S. Bach's Suite No. 2 in B minor, BWV 1067, and the second a phonograph recording of Beethoven's String Quartet No. 15 in A minor, Op. 132. The first performance is heard at the beginning of the novel at a musical party at the Tantamount house, where aristocratic intellectuals, writers, and artists have gathered. Bach's music, contrapuntal in nature, is performed as Huxley gives the attendees' thoughts and affective responses to the music. This scene helps define the characters and context of the book. The narrator comments on the multiplicity of viewpoints:

[t]he parts [referring to characters as musical instruments] live their separate lives; they touch, their paths cross, they combine for a moment to create a seemingly final and perfected harmony, only to break apart again. Each is always alone and separate and individual. 'I am I,' asserts the violin; 'the world revolves round me.' 'Round me,' calls the cello. 'Round me,' the flute insists. And all are equally right and equally wrong; and none of them will listen to the others. In the *human fugue* there are eighteen hundred million parts. The resultant noise means something perhaps to the statistician, nothing to the artist. It is only by considering one or two parts at a time that the artist can understand anything. (emphasis added, 27-28)

The narrator celebrates the use of counterpoint in Bach. As it is obvious in the quotation above, Huxley, like each musical instrument that claims its own superiority, presents us with an orchestra or a "human fugue" in which each character insists on his/her own individual tune. The novel "contains full orchestras of characters, but with no conductor" (Firchow, "Mental Music" 70). This idea can also be supported by a frequently-quoted passage from the novel: a "living being [... is] a member of the universal concert of things. It's all like music; harmonies and counterpoint and modulations" (*Point Counter Point* 34). Not prioritizing any of these ideas/characters, or in other words, not having a "hero" in the traditional sense, also renders Huxley's novel different; it is like a concert of ideas. By using music as a means for structuring his novel, Huxley both introduces and relativizes each idea as a separate being. Once ideas combine for a short while, they create a "seemingly final and perfected harmony." Huxley aims to foreground the

significance of the idea of harmony and wholeness: he believes that a perfected harmony consists of “diverse laws” and multitudes of voices which complement each other. According to him, a perfected harmony can be the only solution for the present problems of discontent and disharmony. The second musical performance, as mentioned before, takes place towards the book’s end, at the apartment of Maurice Spandrell, a shadowy figure obsessed with vengeance and with performing a preposterous act which will end his life. The musical theme of counterpoint both forms the structural frame of *Point Counter Point* and contributes to the central theme of the work. The theme Huxley underscores in the novel is the unending struggle between “reason” and “passion” and a quest for finding “harmony” or “balance” between mind, body and soul. The idea of the multiplicity of ideas or viewpoints and people is emphasized through Huxley’s experimentation with form. In this respect, it can be claimed that there is a recognizable link between the ideas Huxley wanted to express and the literary medium and technique through which he pursued to convey them. As seen before, in *Jesting Pilate*, Huxley mentions his convictions about the multiplicity of human beings and perspectives, and in his next novel, that is, in *Point Counter Point* written just after this travel book, he intends to reveal this discovery to emphasize the idea of the diversity of world views. It could be stated that counterpoint as practiced by Huxley proves to be wholly dissonant or a kind of “noise” (*Point Counter Point* 28) because of the diversity of ideas and their conversational duels. In the novel, when Philip Quarles and his wife, Elinor, are on the ship travelling back to England from India, Philip catches some parts of conversations from other passengers walking near them, and it occurs to him that a new way of structuring a novel, the musicalization of fiction is possible. In the musicalization of fiction, according to Philip, there is emphasis either on the similarity in plot with its fugue-like narrative of parallel situations or on the suggestions of the musical imagery of the novel. This new novel, Philip

believes, reveals the “essence of the new way of looking [which] is multiplicity” (*Point Counter Point* 228), and it is more true to life.

‘Multiplicity of eyes and multiplicity of aspects seen. For instance, one person interprets events in terms of bishops; another in terms of the price of flannel camisoles; [...] And then there's the biologist, the chemist, the physicist, the historian. Each sees, professionally, a different aspect of the event, a different layer of reality. What I want to do is look with all those eyes at once. With religious eyes, scientific eyes, economic eyes, *homme moyen sensuel* eyes.’ (*Point Counter Point* 228)

As noted in the quotation, Huxley wanted to make use of the idea of multiplicity of viewpoints since this approach could enable him to explore the idea of the impossibility of any settled or all-controlling view. He wants to present a world in which each character/idea assumes that his/hers is the only true statement and, as that truth slides away and is replaced by another, it leaves the reader confused by the complexity and variety of such supposed truths. In other words, he believed that when he showed how people’s perceptions and interpretations of events vary, he could portray the fact that no one could talk about the existence of one “all-unifying truth” anymore. Murray Roston also reveals the same idea by stating that “the multiplicity of viewpoints emerges not as an entertaining trick but as an artistic tool for exploring the contradictory and diverse truths of the new era” (53). So, this modern age, Huxley believed, urged everyone to accept the existence of people’s varying truths and the conflicts caused by these multiple truths. To the shared predicament of the age, each character in *Point Counter Point* responds differently or represents a different set of viewpoints. At this stage music plays a very important role in the novel. In the second musical scene, towards the end of the novel, at Spandrell’s apartment, music is used to reflect the contending ideas of Spandrell and Rampion. Spandrell thinks that if the slow movement of the Beethoven A Minor Quartet cannot prove the existence of God, nothing can, so he invites Rampion and his wife, Maria to be there to witness that moment when he

will prove God's existence. The narrator underscores the power of music as follows:

[t]he archaic Lydian harmonies hung on the air. It was an unimpassioned music, transparent, pure and crystalline, like a tropical sea, an Alpine lake. Water on water, calm sliding over calm; the according of level horizons and waveless expanses, a counterpoint of serenities. And everything clear and bright; no mists, no vague twilights. It was the calm of still and rapturous contemplation, not of drowsiness or sleep. It was the serenity of the convalescent who wakes from fever and finds himself born again into the realm of beauty. [...] the beauty was unearthly, [...] The interweaving of Lydian melodies was heaven. (*Point Counter Point* 507)

Beethoven's composition is likened to a musical description of heaven which is too good to be in this world, so the beauty is sensed only when the music is played. Yet, it is also set against one of the most desperate scenes of the novel: Spandrell's planned suicide. Here, Huxley in his search for "harmony" aims to state that only music, an extra-lingual means of communication, can convey the perception of wholeness and satisfaction. And Spandrell who realizes that "this unearthly beauty" is something missing in his world decides to commit suicide. Huxley ends the novel with Spandrell's suicide because Spandrell is presented as a man who is unable to be a "complete man" (*Point Counter Point* 358) creating harmony between mind, body and soul; he is represented as one of the examples of a "split-individual" in B. L. Chakoo's term (50).

In Tanpınar's case too, one of the most impressive achievements of *A Mind at Peace* lies within the idea of experimentation with form and its close integration with the central theme of the novel: the various ideas that fail to achieve any integrity of viewpoint cause a crisis or uneasiness of mind. As is alluded to in Huxley's novel, the structure of Tanpınar's book tries to emulate that of a musical pattern, weaving contradicting themes, plots and ideas into one large whole. Tanpınar elaborates on an idea while creating a character, then introduces an opposite character emphasizing the distorted reflections between these two characters. So, Tanpınar's concern

with the dichotomies between senses and mind, language and music, east and west – as well as the question of how a young man, Mümtaz, can “bridge” diverse aspects of experience – is fully expressed both thematically and formally in his novel. Moran also draws attention to the same point:

Tanpınar was a novelist who had questions to raise and ideas to reveal in his novels, and he used the most suitable literary techniques to emphasize the novel’s ideas and questions. Tanpınar wanted to find the most appropriate technique to unravel the ideas and questions in *A Mind at Peace*. That’s why, to be able to analyze *A Mind at Peace*, one first needs to comprehend the ideas and questions discussed in the novel, then the technique Tanpınar devised to reveal these ideas and questions. (*Türk Romanına* 269)

Unlike Huxley, Tanpınar did not foreground his narrative technique by getting one of his writer characters to give a definition of the counterpoint technique, even though Tanpınar was aware of this technique in music and tried to experiment with it: some of the writers whose work Tanpınar read – Valéry, Dostoevsky, Mann and Huxley – had already used the counterpoint technique, and this narrative technique used by “his favorite writers attracted Tanpınar’s attention” (Berksoy 35). The idea of “counterpoint” provides Tanpınar’s novel with a kind of dynamism. Like his novel, Tanpınar does not insistently see things from a stable/frozen point of view. Like Huxley, Tanpınar uses the style of a musical composition to create the literary structure of the novel. In this respect, *A Mind at Peace* can be read as an example of musicalization of fiction. Kaplan contends that “Tanpınar was inspired by the concepts like ‘variation’, ‘movement’ and *contre-point* in music when he wrote *A Mind at Peace*. His emphases on rhythm and music in his work also prove it. Therefore, rhythm and music can be taken as key concepts to understand his work” (415). The same idea is emphasized by Moran (*Türk Romanına* 274) and Seyhan: “[t]he narrative composition of his novel resembles the movements of a symphony, where the combination of themes in one chapter is repeated on modified scales or defied in other chapters” (Seyhan 144-5). In some chapters Tanpınar introduces the themes of eastern culture, music, love, passion, hope,

possibility of harmony; then he counters these in other chapters with such themes as the western cultural influence, mind, war, separation, despair and death. Also, as in *Point Counter Point*, one character/idea is countered by another throughout *A Mind at Peace*. Tanpınar's novel uses the counterpoint technique and it becomes obvious when several characters come together and reveal their own ideas in order to "explain" their own version of truth. Besides, like Huxley, Tanpınar believed that each character in *A Mind at Peace* should act like a musical instrument with its own unique sound and each of them should contribute to the general orchestra of the novel or the orchestra of life: "this reed stalk known as human..." (*A Mind at Peace* 10)⁹⁶ should listen to one another and the sound/music they create.

Like the four instruments of a quartet, *A Mind at Peace* consists of four chapters each titled as a character in the novel and representing a set of ideas or emotions: the first part, "İhsan" is very sad, and in this part the story takes place in the present; it is followed by a joyful section "Nuran" and it is presented as a flashback to the events of the previous year; then a third melancholy-dominated section about the past incidents, also presented in the form of flashback, is called "Suad" and the last section is "Mümtaz" in which the feeling of uneasiness of mind is prevalent, and "like a symphony, it picks up the form and themes of the first chapter" (Moran, *Türk Romanına* 291).

A Mind at Peace is about a society whose members have opposing ideas and this clash of ideas leads to a crisis in society. Tanpınar's use of a counterpoint technique also reinforces the central theme of the novel, which is the dramatic civilizational change and modernization crisis that accompanied the transformation of the Islamic Ottoman Empire into the secular Republic of Turkey and its effects in creating an instability of identities. Furthermore, the novel emphasizes that human beings live under the pressure of the contrasting ideas and according to various systems of

⁹⁶ Here, it should be clarified that in *Mevlevi* (the teachings of Rumi, a 13th-century Persian poet), the reed stalk is a synonym for the instrument, the reed flute, so the musicality of the word is emphasized again. For Turkish see Appendix A, note 26.

thoughts. In *A Mind at Peace*, as mentioned before, the main narrative is about the romantic love affair between Mümtaz and Nuran; however, this layer of the novel also contains other layers that are about political, economic, cultural and psychological changes in Turkey. Also, the conflicting and complementing interaction of these layers is presented like a game of ideas in the novel by means of the counterpoint technique. Tanpınar used this technique⁹⁷ to reflect the impossibility of an all-encompassing truth/idea. Instead, he suggested the idea of truth-in-flux or the unfinalizable feature of thoughts.

The reader observes the same idea of multiplicity of viewpoints throughout *A Mind at Peace*, especially in the third episode called “Suad” in which a friendly gathering is arranged by İhsan, Suad and others. İhsan starts the conversation by claiming:

‘if you ask me, our lack of a notion of original sin in Islam, our lack of attention to this matter of the fall from the paradise, as in Christianity, affects every field of knowledge from theology to aesthetics. We’ve given short shrift to spiritual conversation. We should interpret our context intrinsically, as it is.’ He’d lost track of how he’d begun. He spoke hastily to avoid giving Suad an opening. ‘There isn’t even a foundation for dialogue and debate between these two worldviews. Religion and social constitution diverge. Note that in Western civilization everything is predicated on notions of salvation and liberation. ... In contrast, from the beginning we’re already considered free by Muslim tradition.’ Suad, having finished his third glass, glared at İhsan. ‘Or forsaken...’ [İhsan counters] ‘No, first of all free. Free despite even the presence of slaves in the social body. *Fıkıh*, Islamic jurisprudence, insists upon human liberty.’ Suad persisted: ‘The East has never been free. It’s always been mired in anarchic individualism restricted by despotic groups. We’re predisposed to forgo freedom as quickly as possible...and by all means.’ (*A Mind at Peace* 324)⁹⁸

⁹⁷ Berkiz Berksoy and Beşir Ayvazoğlu also assert that Tanpınar’s last (unfinished) novel *Aydaki Kadın* was written with a structure based on the counterpoint technique. This novel was later completed by Güler Güven in 1987 with the help of Tanpınar’s notes about the novel.

⁹⁸ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 27.

This lengthy quotation above is just one of the examples of the multiplicity of viewpoints reflected in the novel. Here, Tanpınar juxtaposes Suad's and İhsan's ideas about the Islamic tradition, Turkish civilization and the feeling of rootlessness. Although the subject discussed here is only relevant within the context of the novel, Tanpınar's use of multiplicity of views makes itself evident when a historicist's, İhsan's, interpretation of the events differs from the way how Suad interprets the same events in terms of his nihilistic viewpoint. In other words, this is one of the examples of conversational duels between "liberal" and "conservative" viewpoints.

The idea of the musicalization of fiction can be found in *A Mind at Peace*. As in *Point Counter Point*, Tanpınar's novel too has direct references to music (both western and eastern) some of which are the Song in *Mahur*, Song in *Ferahfeza*⁹⁹ and the Beethoven String Quartet (*A Mind at Peace* 319). Tanpınar wrote in one of his letters that "at the beginning of my each work, even the shortest poem, I use a piece of music either from the west or from ours. And maybe, it is music which makes me who I am and takes me to places about which we only have ideas when we go. As for writing, my technique and muse is music¹⁰⁰" ("Yaşar Nabi" 63).¹⁰¹ Tanpınar's use of the western music along with the classical Turkish music functions more than just revealing Tanpınar's musical taste because it also pinpoints Tanpınar's longing for harmony between what is "ours" and what is not without the threat of assimilation. And also it is his yearning for creating a fresh start for Turkey's today and tomorrow. This idea is explicitly emphasized in *A Mind at Peace* by İhsan:

[w]e're currently living through reactionary times. We despise ourselves. Our heads are full of comparisons and contrasts: We don't appreciate Dede because he's no Wagner; Yunus Emre, because we

⁹⁹ *Mahur* and *Ferahfeza* are tones or *makams* in classical Turkish music.

¹⁰⁰ A. H. Tanpınar was a poet as well and the most recurrently-used subjects in his poems are the concepts of dream and music (Mehmet Kaplan 34; Berna Moran 274; İbrahim Şahin 250).

¹⁰¹ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 28.

haven't been able to cast him as a Verlaine; Bâkî, because he can't be a Goethe or a Gide. Despite being the most well-appointed country nestled amid the opulence of immeasurable Asia, we're living naked and exposed. Geography, culture, and all the rest expect a *new synthesis* from us, and we're not even aware of our historic mission. Instead, we're trying to relive the experiences of other countries. (emphasis added, *A Mind at Peace* 289)¹⁰²

Here, İhsan emphasizes the necessity of “a new synthesis” that Turkey must build in these reactionary times. He calls the times “reactionary” because he believes that some people in Turkey think modernization means Westernization so they tend to imitate the past experiences of European countries, particularly France. So, according to İhsan, “reliving the experiences of other countries” from Europe is both living in the past of others and being reactionary in this context. According to İhsan, what is not reactionary is not despising oneself and not comparing/contrasting two or more very different things. For him, the issue has nothing to do with the old or the new or being from the West or the East. It is about the problem of creating an authentic version of life and individual which should rely on both a cultural identity which has been enhanced by “the opulence of immeasurable Asia” for centuries and technological and economic progress of Europe. To İhsan, Turkey is like a “bridge” geographically and culturally and it needs “to change by continuing and to continue by changing.” In this new harmony or *terkip*, according to Tanpınar, Turkey should not close itself to modernity, of course, but this does not mean that it needs to abandon its own cultural heritage.¹⁰³ His work reveals a strong desire for cultural harmony in the face of disintegration and an imperative to formulate new perspectives for Turkish modernity. The best example of this idea of a new harmony was stated by the narrator in *A Mind at Peace*: “[t]o admire Debussy and Wagner yet to live the ‘Song in *Mahur*’ was the fate

¹⁰² Here, Tanpınar's original text states “Biz misyonlarımızın farkında değiliz” (*Huzur* 252). Yet the translation does not exactly suggest what Tanpınar wrote in the novel, so my explanation is provided above. For Turkish see Appendix A, note 29.

¹⁰³ The word *terkip* will be analyzed more in relation to Tanpınar's formulation of the idea of the modern.

[advantage/chance] of being Turk”¹⁰⁴ (161). Tanpınar also states that “Bach can be a brother for a soul which is nourished (educated) by Dede Efendi” (Tanpınar, *Yaşadığım Gibi* 352).¹⁰⁵ Tanpınar uses musical analogies to describe two different understandings of the modern held by two different groups of people in Turkey: by the statement “to admire Debussy and Wagner yet to live in Song in *Mahur*,” Tanpınar emphasizes his critical position to those in Turkey who prioritize and idealize western civilizations over the east. To Tanpınar, this state of mind is problematic since it is shaped by some sort of inferiority complex. Thus, to counter this way of understanding of the modern, Tanpınar brings the two seemingly different parties, the west and the east embodied in Bach and Dede Efendi, into “equal” levels by stating that “Bach can be a brother for one who is educated by Dede Efendi.” He idealizes neither of them; rather, in his understanding, both Bach and Dede Efendi become two equally-significant means to help attain one’s ultimate end of life, that is, a “harmonious and complete” existence. Accordingly, Tanpınar uses music to explain what *terkip* means to him. It can be stated that Tanpınar used Dede’s Song in *Ferahfeza*¹⁰⁶ along with Western music in order to emphasize the urgency of creating an idea of a new harmony that undermines the dichotomies such as the Western/non-Western, and the local/the global. As Huxley, Mann, Joyce and Proust did in their work, Tanpınar also appealed to music and evoked its sensual and aesthetic charms in a similar fashion, presenting fictitious listeners whose musical experiences reveal their experience of consciousness and time. That is, presenting fictitious listeners who recollect musical phrases, Huxley’s and Tanpınar’s texts place surrogate readers

¹⁰⁴ Here, it should be clarified that Tanpınar does not talk about the Turkish ethnicity in his novel as opposed to what translation suggests. By “we,” Tanpınar indeed refers to “people” living in Turkey. For Turkish see Appendix A, note 30.

¹⁰⁵ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 31.

¹⁰⁶ Also, it should be stated that Dede Efendi who composed his Song in *Ferahfeza* in 1839 was a contemporary of Beethoven who composed opus 132 String Quartet in A minor (String Quartet No. 15) in 1825.

functioning as the implied reader in the text, like the musical party guests in Lady Tantamount's party and *fasıl*¹⁰⁷ listeners at Nuran's manor, helping the reader feel similar experiences. Consequently, music in both of the novels serves "a dual purpose of recalling the reader's attention to the musical elements in the structure of the novel and of adding richness or resonance – to important themes" (Firchow, "Mental" 70) such as love, disease, death and civilizational collapse.

Music is thus a very significant part of both Huxley's and Tanpınar's work in terms of both constructing their novels and conveying their messages. With music or with the counterpoint technique, Huxley demonstrates the idea of multiple viewpoints/characters and their ridiculous, hypocritical and often absurd encounters. In a similar way, Tanpınar also uses music to construct his novel's form and content: within a contrapuntal style, each character neutralizes the others' philosophy of life by rendering it as neither "true" nor "false." From this perspective, I can state that Huxley's and Tanpınar's novels are formally similar to musical compositions, and music also helps them pinpoint their theme of "the quest for harmony or completeness" which is a shared pursuit at the times and places where both writers produced their novels.

3.1.2 The Role of Setting in the Discussion of Leisure and Pleasure

The setting is another important component for the novelist of ideas because s/he needs to gather the characters in the book in one place and in this place, circumstances should be favorable for an expression of intellectual diversity. An exploration of the setting and its role in both novels contributes to the main argument of this study in that the differing employments of setting in the novels demonstrate the writers' different attitudes to leisure and pleasure as a part of their critique of the modern.

¹⁰⁷ *Fasıl* is a kind of musical entertainment in which singers and instrument players perform classical Turkish music together and the audience accompanies them generally by drinking alcohol. These classical Turkish songs are also called *fasıl*. These *fasıls* are named according to the tone they are composed such as *peşrev*, *kâr*, *beste*, *ağır semai*, *şarkı*, *yörük semai* and *saz semai*.

Roston states that “[t]here, presented in a natural setting with various people apparently engaged in interweaving social, marital, and amorous activities, we are in fact provided with a spectrum of the various responses to one central problem, the shared predicament of the age” (51). Characters in the novel of ideas are presented as engaged in various social, and political concerns and activities in a specific location. Sbisa’s restaurant in *Point Counter Point*, which is a gathering place for London’s aristocratic intelligentsia, and *fasıl* scenes in *A Mind at Peace* are examples of such places where intellectual diversity and multiple simultaneous perspectives about the major philosophical, political and scientific strands of the age can emerge.

It is not a coincidence that in both novels scenes of leisure are the highlighted moments, that is, the major characters are presented when they do more than simple entertainment during their meetings at Sbisa’s or in the *fasıl* gatherings. The characters are placed in such settings, and then set to talking about the world from their various and often opposing viewpoints. In these scenes they find an opportunity to express their ideas about very significant issues like the social collapse in the modern age, industrialization, materialistic progress, war, civilization crisis, the existence of God and so on. The representation of a discussion of such social matters in places where characters are expected to have pleasurable time is reminiscent of Marcuse’s ideas about the modern individual’s engagement with labor and leisure, which was discussed in the preceding chapter. Both Huxley and Tanpınar present their characters in their free time to highlight its importance in offering self-actualization for the individuals.

Although both Huxley and Tanpınar portray the importance of free time in terms of its quality of offering the characters a possibility to express their ideas and increase their creativity, it is only Huxley who attracts attention to the threats of misused modern leisure as manifested in “house parties” in *Point Counter Point*. In other words, whereas Huxley was engaged with the issue of “false or mind-numbing leisure” (*Point Counter*

Point 57) as a problem stemming from modernity, Tanpınar did not regard leisure as false pleasure. Before dealing with Tanpınar's deliberate exclusion of a critical attitude to the idea of leisure and pleasure in his novel, we need to understand how Huxley approaches "pleasure." Huxley stated in one of his essays called "Pleasures" that "of all the various poisons which modern civilization, by a process of auto-intoxication, brews quietly up within its own bowels, few are more deadly ... than that curious and appalling thing that is technically known as 'pleasure'" (Huxley 355). His use of inverted commas around the word and his description of pleasure as something "curious and appalling" can only mean something other than simple enjoyment, and his understanding of pleasure can only be fully understood when it is considered in relation to his sense of corruption of pleasure by the forces of modernity as he perceived them in the early twenties. Also, one can see the parallelisms between Huxley's idea of corrupted pleasure and Marcuse's idea of "alienated leisure" due to the forces of modernity. As mentioned before, Marcuse maintains that domination in the guise of leisure or pleasure extends to all spheres of human existence and leaves no alternatives for the modern individual except keeping a one-dimensional mode of existence. Likewise, Huxley in the same essay, "Pleasures", states that pleasure has become something other than the "real thing", has become "organized distraction" ("Pleasures" 355), and he bemoans the emergence of "vast organizations that provide us with ready-made distractions" ("Pleasures" 356). Huxley is not against pleasure or leisure *per se*; he criticizes those forms of leisure which have nothing to do with meaningful and sensible activity: "[l]eisure is only profitable to those who desire, even without compulsion, to do mental work" (Huxley, *Along the Road* 242). He also states that "In place of the old pleasures demanding intelligence and personal initiative, we have vast organizations that provide us with ready-made distractions – distractions which demand from pleasure-seekers no personal participation and no intellectual effort of any sort" ("Pleasures" 356). Pleasure thus, for Huxley, appears to become

not simply negative, but something other than itself (not real), and an experience that is both inauthentic and slightly sinister (“organized” and “ready-made”) that has nothing to do with doing “mental or creative work.”

So from the angle provided by Huxley and Marcuse concerning their ideas on “pleasure and leisure,” an analysis of the structural and thematic role of the “party” in Huxley’s fiction as a mode of leisure offers a particularly rich opportunity for a reconsideration of the broader arguments within his novel about the defining characteristics of modernity. In *Point Counter Point* Huxley presents the reader with a group of characters who try to numb the pain of lacking meaning and purpose in life, because he believes that “[n]ow that ready-made, creation-saving amusements are spreading an ever increasing boredom through ever wider spheres, existence has become pointless and intolerable” (*Do What You Will* 225). Therefore, he demonstrates his characters when they dive into maelstrom of “role-playing,” “hectic social life” and “compulsive good-timing” (Huxley, *Do What You Will* 225). An exploration of the role of “the house party” in *Point Counter Point* reveals that Huxley takes the house party as a fictional laboratory to experiment on characters as representatives of the modern individual and to demonstrate how they try to fill the void with organized activities and ready-made distractions. As mentioned before, at the beginning of the novel, the reader is presented with the musical party at Lady and Lord Edward’s house. One example of the way in which Huxley depicts the foolishness of the repeated and monotonous behavior in such house parties is one of the house-party guests, John Bidlake’s teasing of a late comer:

[h]e [John Bidlake] was looking in the direction of the door, where the latest of the late-comers was still standing, torn between the desire to disappear unobtrusively into the silent crowd and the social duty of making her arrival known to her hostess. ... Bidlake was in ecstasies of merriment. He had echoed the poor lady’s [the late comer’s] every gesture as she made it. [...] He had repeated her gesture of regret, grotesquely magnifying it until it expressed a ludicrous despair. ... He turned to Lady Edward in triumph. ‘I told you so,’ he whispered, [...] ‘It’s like being in a deaf and dumb

asylum. Or talking to pygmies in Central Africa.’ (*Point Counter Point* 26-7)

John Bidlake, who was once Lady Edwards’s lover and is a famous painter makes fun of the other guests and calls the whole event a “pantomime” (*Point Counter Point* 22). Huxley here emphasizes that a house party as a form of “effortless pleasure” induces passivity and uniformity; therefore John Bidlake calls it a “deaf and dumb asylum.” Interestingly, Bidlake likens all other guests to “pygmies in Central Africa.” He uses the word “pygmy” as an insult. Here, then, the underlying tone of Bidlake’s words suggests his Eurocentric perspective. Also it is possible to pinpoint another problem of his use of this word: he uses the name of some ethnic groups of Central Africa in order to humiliate and insult a group of Westerners, that is, the party guests are positioned as Africans, which is a means of criticizing them. Also, Huxley highlights his negative ideas about modern pleasure manifested in such parties by stating that “the horrors of modern ‘pleasure’ arise from the fact that every kind of organized distraction tends to become progressively more and more imbecile” (“Pleasures” 356). In addition to that, Lord Edward’s assistant, Illidge as another mouthpiece of the writer, mentions “[g]luttony, sloth, sensuality and all the less comely products of leisure” (*Point Counter Point* 70). The most explicit criticism targeting such gatherings is supplied by the narrator when he conveys, John Bidlake’s son, Walter Bidlake’s ideas:

[a] jungle of innumerable trees and dangling creepers - it was in this form that parties always presented themselves to Walter Bidlake’s imagination. A jumble of noise; and he was lost in the jungle, he was trying to clear a path for himself through its tangled luxuriance. The people were the roots of the trees and their voices were the stems and waving branches and festooned lianas - yes, and the parrots and the chattering monkeys as well. [...] And all these voices (what were they saying? ‘... made an excellent speech ...’; ‘... no idea how comfortable those rubber reducing belts are till you’ve tried them ...’; ‘... such a bore ...’; ‘... eloped with the chauffeur ...’), all these voices are [...] here, in the jungle.... Oh, loud, stupid, vulgar, fatuous. (*Point Counter Point* 60)

There is the idea of atavism¹⁰⁸ here – reversal of the evolutionary process. As in the old Bidlake's narration, this criticism is raised in a way in which images from Africa are used in a derogatory way.¹⁰⁹ Aiming to portray the traumatized effects of the enforced sociability on Walter, the narrator uses the jungle imagery to emphasize these parties' superficiality and imbecility because, in the narrator's understanding, the "jungle with its animals" has negative associations like "savagery," "noise," "stupidity" and "vulgarity." He opposes the notion of "jungle" to civilization, organization, and intellectuality. In other words, when jungle is concerned, the implied author seems to have strong reservations against wild nature in the form of jungle. The text privileges cultivated and domesticated nature.

In addition, a longing for destructive forms of pleasure, which is revealed with particular intensity in the party scene of the novel, is criticized in Huxley's novel. An important manifestation of one-dimensionality and pleasure-seeking attitude is presented through Lucy and her dialogue with an elderly party guest, Mrs. Betterton. When Lucy says that she began going to the theatre at the age of six, Mrs. Betterton is surprised by the negative consequences of such an early encounter with theatrical pleasure and she quotes Shakespeare:

‘Therefore are feasts so solemn and so rare,
Since seldom coming in the long year set,
Like stones of worth they thinly placed are...’

‘They're a row of pearls nowadays.’ ‘And false ones at that,’ said Lucy. Mrs. Betterton was triumphant. ‘False ones – you see? But for us they were genuine, because they were rare. We didn't ‘blunt the fine point of seldom pleasure’ by daily wear. ... A pleasure too often repeated produces numbness; it's no more felt as a pleasure. (*Point Counter Point* 57)

¹⁰⁸ The idea of atavism will be mentioned later in this chapter.

¹⁰⁹ Although this point is about very long-held and well-attested prejudices, it is worth mentioning here because, as will be indicated, it helps us see how Huxley in the twenties formed his understanding of the modern and of the dichotomy between “the West” and “the East.”

The discrepancy of ideas between Mrs. Betterton, the old generation, and Lucy, the “modern” young generation stems from their different experiences of pleasure. When Mrs. Betterton advises fewer parties, Lucy counters her argument suggesting that the parties “must be stronger – progressively” (57). Where, Mrs. Betterton asks, would that end: ““In bull fighting? ...Or the amusements of the Marquis de Sade?¹¹⁰ Where?” Lucy shrugged her shoulders ‘Who knows?’” (57). Lucy is the incorrigible party-goer, “the more the merrier was her principle; or if ‘merrier’ were too strong a word at least the noisier and more tumultuously distracting” (*Point Counter Point* 145). So, Lucy is represented as “frivolous, morally vacuous, and constantly searching the momentary annihilation she derives from the intoxication of repeated but unsatisfactory sexual encounters” (Shiach 11). Her affair with Walter is an example of her unsatisfactory sexual attempts. For characters who live “modernly,” as Lucy says it (*Point Counter Point* 242), leisure becomes like an addiction; after a while the number of doses should be increased in order to achieve the same satisfaction. Briefly, it can be stated that according to Huxley, enforced sociability manifested through parties became a representation of the alienation of the individual from the social, which stripped the individual from the whole potential of being more creative or having different “dimensions;” thus, everyone started to be like the other.

Tanpınar’s *A Mind at Peace* does not treat leisure or pleasure as in the way Huxley’s novel does; that is to say, Tanpınar takes a far more positive view of leisure in the Turkish context because he thinks that leisure has a potential to create an aesthetic dimension in the individual soul, “demanding intelligence and personal initiative” (Huxley, “Pleasures” 356).¹¹¹ Leisure can unravel this dimension by means of imaginative ingenuity and mental work; and in this way, Tanpınar thinks, the characters

¹¹⁰ The figure of Marquis de Sade and the importance of sadism in the context of Huxley’s novels will be explained more in Chapter 4.

¹¹¹ Yet, as mentioned previously, Tanpınar’s *The Time Regulation Institute* criticizes the idea of leisure and pleasure as manifested by the home parties in the novel. See Chapter 4.

in *A Mind at Peace* can experience genuine pleasure. Leisure activities are thus displayed in two ways in *A Mind at Peace*: *fasıls* and wanderings in the city, Istanbul.

As opposed to parties in *Point Counter Point*,¹¹² we find *fasıls* in *A Mind at Peace* where characters are represented as experiencing pleasure. Modern forms of pleasure, in Huxley's satirical novels, as we have seen, are associated with destroying people's sensitivities and aesthetic taste. However, in Tanpınar's novel, an affirmative understanding of pleasure is presented as a means of an escape from the boredom and enslavement of life. It is also a means of distraction; the novel does not criticize characters' fondness of *fasıl* because it is emphasized that human beings' mental and psychological self-induced enslavement as a consequence of the modernization project in Turkey can be lessened through such meetings. Therefore, in the novel, *fasıl* is demonstrated either as a means of escapism or a place for passionate political and philosophical discussions. In this sense, it can be claimed that with the *fasıl* scenes in his novel, Tanpınar departs from the derogatory ideas of pleasure demonstrated in Huxley's novel.

What is more, for Tanpınar the *fasıl*, which is called "the dinner party" by Seyhan (145), is a door to transcendence or ecstasy: "In *A Mind at Peace* the gatherings where alcohol is drunk [*fasıls*] are Dionysian experiences" (Demiralp 161). Nietzsche placed Dionysus against Apollo as the symbol of the essential, uncontrolled aesthetic principle of force, music and intoxication (*The Birth of Tragedy* 12). In Tanpınar's *fasıl* scenes characters who drink alcohol and listen to classical Turkish music have a chance to glimpse a life of contentment: "In trepidation she [Nuran] looked at Suad's glass, which he'd again emptied. [...] But it's an awkward situation [...] But I [Nuran thinks to herself] so need to drink... this music

¹¹² Here, I would like to remind that Huxley was not completely against the idea of entertainment. On the contrary, he approved such gatherings of characters at Sbisá's and making much of their free time by having philosophical and intellectual conversations. Yet, he was against the types of leisure-activities, like house parties, which do not help characters be artistically, philosophically and intellectually creative.

has kneaded me for hours. At times I felt like I'd taken on the form of divine clay... She wanted the alchemy of alcohol" (323).¹¹³ In this quotation, Nuran, with the help of alcohol and music, feels as if she has some kind of contact with the divine power who she believes tells her "I can easily soften thoughts and make them resemble my essence. I am the *efendi* [master] of life. Where I am there can be neither despair nor depression. I am the elation of wine and the sweetness of honey" (*A Mind at Peace* 32).¹¹⁴

Although there is a significant difference between Huxley's and Tanpınar's approach to the use of the party and *fasıl* scenes in their novels, the uses of "music" in both novels have quite similar positive undertones and meanings. The following quotation exemplifies the importance of music in *Point Counter Point*:

[t]he music began again. But something new and marvelous had happened in its Lydian heaven. The speed of the slow melody was doubled; its outlines became clearer and more definite; an inner part began to harp insistently on a throbbing phrase. It was as though heaven had suddenly and impossibly become more heavenly, had passed from achieved perfection into perfection yet more deeper [sic.] and more absolute. The ineffable peace persisted; but it was no longer the peace of convalescence and passivity. It quivered, it was alive, it seemed to grow and intensify itself, it became an active calm, an almost passionate serenity. The miraculous paradox of eternal life and eternal repose was musically realized. (510-511)

The narrator, as mentioned before, depicts classical music by attaching unearthly/heavenly features to it. Here, the narrator invokes a part of Beethoven; "*heilige Dankgesang*" ("Sacred Song of Thanks") as a metaphor for "the paradox of eternal life and eternal repose" and explains the music's influence on Spandrell. He feels God's existence through music, through harmony, and experiences "an active calm, an almost passionate serenity" that he looks for and fails to attain in this world. When music stops, the rest, the narrator suggests, is silence: "and then suddenly there was no more music; only the scratching of the needle on the revolving disc" (*Point*

¹¹³ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 32.

¹¹⁴ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 33.

Counter Point 512). Tanpınar's use of music presents several similarities with that of Huxley's. When music plays in *A Mind at Peace*, a new dimension of life unfolds in front of Tanpınar's characters, and they manage to transcend the life of objects and start to come in touch with "the realm of dreams." This world of dreams signifies an experience of the sublime, including the quality of greatness or completeness. As mentioned in the previous chapter, Tanpınar was influenced by Bergsonism; that is, his idea of intuition and duration. Tanpınar states that with music which, he believes, intensifies human beings' power of intuition, he attempted to achieve "the dream aestheticism" which he describes as follows:

[a]rt is people's reality, but works of art need the state of soul which accompanies our dreams. My dream aestheticism influenced my fiction; [...] In this aestheticism music is the foundation [...] because music creates a new realm inside us by constantly changing and evolving. I can describe it like contacting a kind of temporality other than the one we live in. A sense of temporality with its unique rhythm, genuinely merging with space and object. (*Edebiyat Üzerine Makaleler* 30)¹¹⁵

Tanpınar himself thus emphasizes, in his aestheticism of dream, that music plays a very significant role because music makes him intuitively communicate with "a realm inside" human beings. Musical scenes, as manifested in *fasıls* in *A Mind at Peace*, open up new worlds of thought and feeling for its characters; music provides both characters and the reader with infinite and heterogeneous connotations. Several characters who attend these musical gatherings in *A Mind at Peace* live through emotions that could also be called epiphanies.¹¹⁶ Furthermore, music in Tanpınar's novel brings him closer to Bergsonism in showing that music breaks boundaries between the past and the present. Tanpınar displays a monolithic understanding of time by emphasizing an unending or frozen present. With music characters feel the possibility of "change by continuing" (Tanpınar, *Yaşadığım Gibi* 16-35) because it is music that changes their sense of

¹¹⁵ For Turkish see Appendix A, note .

¹¹⁶ Joycean epiphanies.

time.¹¹⁷ In the world of dreams, characters experience a sense of time that defies spatiality and causality, and they contact and perceive their most intimate human feelings like love, anger and anguish. The general tone of the novel, the despair, is transmitted to the reader by creating a world of dreams for which music acts like a vessel which channels both the characters and the reader into the depths of dream realms. To illustrate, in one of the *fasıl* scenes in the novel, Tevfik Bey, the virtuoso, declares that he wants to sing the Rose Devotional Hymn and at that moment the reader is informed that Mümtaz, the character who is often presented as a “sleepwalker” (*A Mind at Peace* 69) or daydreamer is seized by a train of thoughts and memories:

Mümtaz was cast into a world that recalled Fra Filippo Lippi’s fifteenth century Renaissance *Nativity* of the Christ child amid flowers; the roses scattered by the *Ferahfeza*’s tempest of desire were gathered up again in this ancient hymn:

A bazaar of roses
Roses bartered, roses sold
A hand-held scale of roses
Patrons, roses, merchants, roses, too. (*A Mind at Peace*
346)¹¹⁸

Influenced by Bergson, Tanpınar shows Mümtaz sensing time in different dimensions; that is, the objectivity of time is dismantled during the experience of the *fasıl* and he starts to experience condensed moments. Here, with Tevfik Bey’s music, Mümtaz feels disconnected from temporality and feels the storm of roses mentioned both in the remembered painting and in the heard song. That is, the flow of time becomes subjective for him; his interior monologues are presented by the narrator. To create such transcendent experiences, or epiphanic moments, Tanpınar often uses

¹¹⁷ The use of music as a catalyst to feel “the idea of change by continuing” (Tanpınar, *Yaşadığım Gibi* 16-35) will be dealt with in a more detailed manner later in this chapter.

¹¹⁸ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 35.

music in his novels and poems¹¹⁹ as one of the key elements of his aestheticism – along with the two others: time and dreams. Susan Langer claims that “music makes time audible, granting an intuitive knowledge of time, one that conforms to the experience of time (*kairos*) but does not correspond to clock time (*chromo*)” (110). She focuses on the way we experience time, the “intuitive knowledge of time – that is not recognized as ‘true’ because it is not formalized and presented in any symbolic mode” (*Feeling and Form* 111). Langer explains how our awareness of time depends on the experiences that we have concurrently and intuitively, and that it makes the notion of time “multi-dimensional” for us:

time exists for us because we undergo tensions and their resolutions. Their peculiar building-up, and their ways of breaking or diminishing or merging into longer and greater tensions, make for a vast variety of temporal forms. If we could experience only singly, successive, organic strains, perhaps subjective time would be one-dimensional like the time ticked off by clocks. But life is always a dense fabric of concurrent tensions, and as each of them is a measure of time, the measurements themselves do not coincide. This causes our temporal experience to fall apart into incommensurate elements which cannot be all perceived together as clear forms. When one is taken as parameter, others become “irrational,” out of logical focus, ineffable. Some tensions, therefore, always sink into the background; some drive and some drag, but for perception they give *quality* rather than form to the passage of time, which unfolds in the pattern of the dominant and distinct strains whereby we are measuring it. (*Feeling and Form* 113)

Langer describes the affective experience listeners have when following music’s carefully constructed systems of tensions and resolutions. She argues that duration cannot be grasped with analytical methods, that time can be grasped only intuitively, and as she points out, “what, then, the thinking process and the musical experience have in common is their aloofness from chronologically measurable time” (53). While a musical

¹¹⁹ Music plays a very important role in his novels like *Mahur Beste* [serialized in 1944] (published in 1975) and *A Mind at Peace* (1949). Music is also a major element in Tanpınar’s essay-collection, *Beş Şehir* (1946) and in his poems such as “Bursa’da Zaman,” “Neither am I inside Time” and “Raks” (1961) because music creates an interface within Tanpınar’s texts and this interface allows one to attain a reintegration of body, mind and soul.

experience lies outside of the strict, imposed order that forms chronological time, two dimensions of time are integral to the study of music and literature. The first is rhythm: how musical movement is ordered in time and how a performer gives shape, structure, intonation, articulation, and voice to music. The second is recollection and repetition: how musical performers bring back the intuitive past in immediate proximity and also create coherence in the present. Like English modernist writers such as Forster, Eliot, Joyce, Huxley and Woolf, Tanpınar draws upon both of these aspects of time in music, asking readers to perform an intuitive grasping of their struggle in the world of change – their struggle to turn back the hands of time while creating an immediate, felt experience of time. According to Tanpınar, the time spent during the social gatherings in his novel does not lose its magical-healing influence on characters; therefore, throughout *A Mind at Peace* the *fasıl* is represented as a pastime full of creativity, inventiveness and imagination, not as “stupefying” or “mind-numbing” in Huxley’s terms (“Recreations” 86).

In addition, as another difference between Huxley’s presentation of leisure and Tanpınar’s understanding of leisure, it can be stated that the *fasıl* is represented as a means of making one’s bond with the past stronger. The dialogue between Mümtaz and Nuran about traditional music and *fasıls* foregrounds this point:

[Mümtaz:] ‘You’re also fond of it [traditional music], aren’t you?’
 [Nuran:] ‘Exceptionally so... In our family traditional music is something of an heirloom, [...] we belong to the *Mevlevî* tradition on my father’s side and to the *Bektashi*¹²⁰ on my mother’s side. [...] When I was a little girl, every night there were musical gatherings [*fasıls*] and lots of entertainment.’ [...] Nuran never imagined that this memory would transport her clear back to those days. She pictured her father holding a *ney*¹²¹ and sitting on the *divan* [couch]. (136-7)¹²²

¹²⁰ The *Bektashi* Order or the ideology of *Bektashism* is an Islamic *Sufi* order (*tariqat*) founded in the 13th century by the *Wali* (saint) Haji Bektash Veli, Iran. It acquired a definitive form in the 16th century in Anatolia (Turkey) and spread to the Ottoman Balkans, particularly Albania (*Encyclopedia Britannica Online*).

¹²¹ *Ney* is a reed flute which is often used to play *Mevlevi* music.

Fasıls are significant in the novel's context because they are presented as the instruments through which the characters remember their past and re-engage with the idea of a monolithic time. Nuran, here, tries to underline the fact that her concept of time can be described as a monolithic unity by postulating how her present identity has been in a constant interaction with the past experiences, and this approach to time was learned from her parents through their *Mevlevi* background. Her parents' involvement in Sufism which entails musical rituals accompanied with the sound of *ney* has enabled her to build an identity which is tightly connected to a perception of time transcending "objectively measurable clock time" (Bergson, *The Creative Mind* 169). From this perspective, as mentioned before, there is a sense of resemblance between the Sufi understanding of time and the Bergsonian conceptualization of time in that both emphasize the intuitive awareness of reality as a flow and the transcendence of spatial boundaries by means of time and music. Also, *Mevlevi* Sufism makes use of musical trance to comprehend *durée* and to cross the border of reality. Tanpinar strengthens his idea of *terkip* – the coexistence of both evolution and preservation of the past traditions – by writing about a modern philosophy, Bergsonian conceptualization of time along with a non-Western philosophy, the Sufi understanding of time in *A Mind at Peace*.

Nuran gets in touch with her authentic self through the memories of her parents listening to *fasıl* and this music reactivates the memories. In other words, at this point of the novel, the implied author uses Nuran's words to contrast "voluntary memory" with "involuntary memory."¹²³ The latter takes place when events encountered in everyday life summon remembrances of the past without making any conscious effort. Without any effort to remember the things in the past, Nuran's involuntary memory is

¹²² For Turkish see Appendix A, note 36.

¹²³ See *Memory: A contribution to experimental psychology* (1913) written by Hermann Ebbinghaus (1885-1964).

triggered by sensory experiences, mainly by music, and thus she is flooded with recollections of her childhood and her father's playing of *ney*. Therefore, she emphasizes that for her traditional music is like a family possession which is handed down to her from ancestors and exceeds the classical categorization of time as the past, present and future. In a sense it can be claimed that these rituals provide Nuran with a genuine sense of pleasure within the monolithic conception of time.

The *fasıl*, as discussed before, also turns into a platform for philosophical and aesthetic debate for the attendees. İhsan, the historian and the teacher, is often presented as giving long lectures and presenting his monologues and reflections on the overwhelming difficulties facing Turkey. These characters at *fasıls* respond to "İhsan's comments by raising questions, and suggesting complementary arguments or counterarguments. In the conversation and the discussions articulated by this dinner party company Tanpınar's novel shows how people should make much of their free time with their friends by discussing important issues concerning philosophy, economics, literature, politics; briefly life.

Unlike Huxley's novel, Tanpınar's emphasizes the importance of the city where his characters live as a very influential factor on their understanding of leisure. In this sense, Mümtaz and Nuran's wanderings along the streets of Istanbul can be taken as another way to make much of leisure in *A Mind at Peace*. The descriptions of Istanbul play an indispensable role in the novel, in that these descriptions reveal how a place can influence characters' interpretations of historical transition and of their existence in the modern age. In other words, Istanbul is functional in the novel as it enables characters to be intellectually and emotionally more creative and artistic. They are engaged with the city in terms of Bergsonian memory and time. At the very beginning of the novel, under the title of the first part, "İhsan", there is a piece of parenthetical information about the setting of the novel: "(City of two continents, August 1939)" (*A Mind at Peace* 9). In fact, "Tanpınar's vast knowledge of Istanbul's cultural history

informs all his writing and is integral to the solid foundation of his social and aesthetic criticism. In his poetic and critical work, Istanbul embodies both the trauma of separation from a long-standing heritage and the recuperative potential of the residue of that heritage” (Seyhan 136). Mümtaz and Nuran are often presented while walking in Istanbul, and through these presentations and an in-depth portrayal of Istanbul, we can understand that Tanpınar wants to offer a comprehensive analysis of historical transition, cultural loss, and a crisis of values. In other words, Istanbul helps him articulate his major questions of cultural legacy and civilizational conflict. Tanpınar himself in his *Beş Şehir* states that

[f]or our generation, Istanbul is something very different from what it was for our grandfathers or even our fathers. It does not enter our imagination in the gold embroidered caftans of the sultan, nor do we see it in a religious framework. The light that bursts out from this word [Istanbul] is for us the light of memories and yearnings shaped by our state of mind. (41)¹²⁴

As this quotation signifies, Tanpınar’s feelings and thoughts about Istanbul were not a desire to reclaim what is lost to time. Rather he reflected on the delicacy of “memory,” or how memory was shaped by the needs of the present. According to Tanpınar, what the present needs is an aesthetic unity that might render the present a part of the monolithic time. Therefore, he was keen on recovering the cultural traditions in the mold of the modern/the present. The same idea is emphasized throughout the novel; for instance, it is evident in Mümtaz’s explanations to Nuran when she accuses him of being reactionary:

Mümtaz’s obsession with things past gave Nuran the inkling that he wanted nothing more than to be shut up in catacombs. [...] Among the throngs of unfortunates, Mümtaz forged ahead, blithely spouting ‘*Acemaşiran*’ and ‘*Sultanîyegâh*’ [¹²⁵]. But what about society? Where was the overture to life? [...] Taking Nuran by the arm, he pulled her away from the front of the ablution fountain. ‘I know,’ he said. ‘A new life is necessary. Maybe I’ve mentioned this to you

¹²⁴ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 37.

¹²⁵ *Acemaşiran* and *sultanîyegâh* are tones or *makams* in classical Turkish music.

before. In order to leap forward or to reach new horizons, one still has to stand on some solid ground. A sense of identity is necessary... Every nation appropriates this identity from its golden age.' (*A Mind at Peace* 197-8)¹²⁶

In the quotation above, Mümtaz speaks on behalf of the implied author. So what does Tanpınar want to achieve when he makes Mümtaz protest like this? Tanpınar's search in the archives of Ottoman/Turkish cultural memory is not undertaken with the hope of restoring a morally superior or utopian past; rather, it is an attempt to reach "a new life" and to reclaim an aesthetic unity that will lend a sense of renewed selfhood and autonomy to Turkish culture. That is, Mümtaz believes that preserving a sense of identity and golden age is not the end itself, but it is a means to and a pre-requisite for the end: obtaining a new life. So, Tanpınar, in the manner of Benjamin, who was well-aware of the impossibility of resurrection of the things lost and who did not want to experience (himself) such a resurrection, intended to embrace his present which was shaped by the past as its continuation. Again one of the explanations provided by Mümtaz in the novel conveys Tanpınar's message:

I don't think I can survive more than ten minutes even in the Istanbul of Kanuni and Sokollu.¹²⁷ For that I would have to give up so much that was gained and discard so many important parts of identity. To see Suleymaniye as it was first built would be to deprive ourselves of the full splendor of our [present] familiar and beloved Suleymaniye, a splendor that turns the play of light in the waters of Bosphorus to images of golden palaces and that has come down to us in the eternity of time. We taste [Suleymaniye's] beauty differently in its enriched sense because of the experience of four centuries and of our identity, whose contours are sharpened each day by its position between two different worlds of value. (101-2)¹²⁸

¹²⁶ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 38.

¹²⁷ Kanuni or Suleiman the Magnificent, the tenth sultan of the Ottoman Empire and Sokollu Mehmed Pasha was an Ottoman statesman hailing from Bosnian prominent Sokollu family.

¹²⁸ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 39.

The invaluable gift of the past to the present, that is, the cultural and architectural heritage and its significance, according to Mümtaz, can only be understood and appreciated “in the eternity of time,” that is, when time is regarded as a monolithic entity. The narrator recurrently states that Istanbul, as an open-air museum of both the Eastern and the Western civilizations, displays itself to its inhabitants and visitors, and those who live there should see it as a cultural heritage of both civilizations:

[h]ere [in Istanbul] two opposing and difficult-to-imitate polarities of life, which didn't appear without latching on to one's skin or settling deep within, actually merged: genuine poverty *and* grandeur, or rather, their castoffs... [...] a store of artwork from Byzantine icons to old Ottoman calligraphy panels; embroidery, decorations, all in all, caches of objects d'art; [...]. This represented neither the traditional nor the modern East. Perhaps *it was a state of timelessness* whose very clime had been exchanged for another. (emphasis added, *A Mind at Peace* 46-7)¹²⁹

The quotation above underlines the fact that the present people live in has been shaped by the past, which forms “a state of timelessness;” therefore, it implies that people who feel this “timelessness” can understand their identity better and be safe from the threats of a sense of rootlessness.

The use of Istanbul in *A Mind at Peace* also presents a poetic concept of the city as a site of decay and death (in the first and last chapters) and a locus of desire and visions (in the second chapter of the novel). In this first chapter, the narrator offers detailed sketches of Istanbul's old neighborhoods, whose poverty and distress reflect the mood of the city, and its inhabitants' despair and crisis. For instance, Mümtaz observes the signs of the approaching Second World War everywhere in the city:

‘[t]here will be a war,’ he said. This was different from any ordinary mobilization [of soldiers]; it was more certain, more decisive. Determination of one hundred, one thousand percent. Within all these shops such silent preparation continued; telephones were answered and instantly tin, rawhide, paint, and machine parts were sucked out of the market; numbers changed, zeroes multiplied, and

¹²⁹ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 40.

opportunities decreased. The imminence of war.” (*A Mind at Peace* 74)¹³⁰

In addition to the bleak atmosphere of a coming war, the physical illness of İhsan and Mümtaz’s spiritual illness caused by his breaking up with Nuran reinforce the idea of decay and death represented by the melancholic state of Istanbul where even the streets are ill: “[a]n *afflicted road*, he thought; a meaningless thought. But, like that, it’d been planted in his mind. An *afflicted road*, a road that had succumbed to leprosy of sorts, which had putrefied it in places up to the walls of the houses aligned on either side” (emphases original, 71).¹³¹ Mümtaz feels crushed under the heaviness of his mind and heart due to sorrow and anxiety caused by İhsan’s illness, the impending war and the loss of Nuran: “...Mümtaz thought: *I think therefore I am, cogito ergo sum. I perceive therefore I am. I struggle therefore I am. I suffer, therefore I am! I’m wretched, I am. I am a fool, I am, I am, I am!*” (emphases original, 77).¹³² Mümtaz’s mind is not at peace at all.

In the same way, Huxley’s novel emphasizes the themes of aging, disease, decay, decomposition and death represented by the London intelligentsia. The novel ends with deaths of multiple characters: Webley’s murder, Spandrell’s suicide, John Bidlake’s death of intestine cancer and little Phil’s death of meningitis. But of these deaths, the most tragic one is the death of little Phil. His death towards the end of the novel is one of the most shocking events because a little child is subjected to the horrors of a death by meningitis.¹³³ The disease and death in the novel become metaphors that represent physiological, psychological and sociological

¹³⁰ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 41.

¹³¹ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 42.

¹³² For Turkish see Appendix A, note 43.

¹³³ “Huxley’s wife was ravaged by the unmitigated pathos of little Phil’s death [due to] some very personal reasons. Maria Huxley had every right to feel outraged as a mother of a sickly child whose somewhat altered portrayal and vicarious killing in the novel was later described by Arnold Kettle as ‘an instance of pathological masochism on the part of the novelist’ (Kettle 168)” (Farkas 126).

dissolution and disharmony. It can be argued that these deaths of characters are depicted to heighten the feelings of melancholy and depression in the novel. Their deaths also emphasize the idea of universal irrelevancy and futility of life that the novel discusses from the very beginning to the end.

If we go back to the issue at hand, in the second part of Tanpınar's novel, called "Nuran" and presented as a flashback, the narrator provides the reader with a "dreamlike" setting of Istanbul. Given in the first part of the novel as a sick city, Istanbul in the present is the embodiment of the "modern" and the modernization project carried out in Turkey which is criticized by the novel. In the second part, however, Istanbul emerges as a city representing a sense of time in which the old and the new can co-exist within a perfect harmony. In other words, In contrast to the wretched sights of Istanbul portrayed in the first chapter of the novel, the second chapter is rather cheerful and bright. In this part, Istanbul becomes not only an object of Mümtaz's and Nuran's affections but also a witness to their earlier passionate love for each other. Seyhan says about this part of the novel that "In this chapter, narrated as memory, poetry and song as well as reflections on art predominate and define Tanpınar's characteristic stylistic gestures. The narrator inscribes Istanbul's sites with poems, citations, songs and memories in such a way that the cityscape and each text cited continuously refer to, reflect on, and explain one another" (144). The most beautiful sights of Istanbul are described with the power of words in the novel, and Pamuk claims that it is "[t]he greatest novel ever written about Istanbul" (*A Mind at Peace*, Back Cover). It can even be claimed that with his narrative fiction Tanpınar creates the art of poetic, musical and visual expressions; therefore, it is a tripartite and a three-dimensional expression. In other words, Tanpınar's expression in *A Mind at Peace* is almost like an Istanbul painting and a Bosphorus song or poem:

[t]his was a realm of squat-minareted and small-mosqued villages whose lime-washed walls defined Istanbul neighborhoods; a realm of sprawling cemeteries that at times dominated a panorama from edge to edge; a realm of fountains with broken ornamental fascia

whose long-dry spouts nevertheless provided a cooling tonic; a realm of large Bosphorus residences, of wooden dervish houses in whose courtyards goats now grazed, of quayside coffeehouses, the shouts of whose apprentice waiters mingled into the otherworld of Istanbul ramadans like a salutation from the mortal world, of public squares filled with the memories of bygone wrestling matches with drums and shrill pipes and contenders bedecked in outfits like national holiday costumes, of enormous chinar trees, of overcast evenings, of eerie and emotive echoes and of daybreaks during which nymphs of dawn bore torches aloft, hovering in mother-of-pearl visions reflected in mirrors of the metaphysical. (*A Mind at Peace* 132)¹³⁴

Mümtaz finds several similarities between Istanbul, the object of his obsessive love, and Nuran. He even feels confused and asks Nuran out of curiosity, “do we love each other or the Bosphorus?” [...] Nuran, by unexpectedly entering his life, illuminated things that had been present within him; [...] as a consequence, there was no possibility of extricating Istanbul, the Bosphorus, Ottoman music, or his beloved from one another” (237-8).¹³⁵ The more they go for walks around Istanbul, the stronger their love for each other becomes. They even begin to associate some places of Istanbul with some specific music: “by and by, they [Mümtaz and Nuran] gave names to locales of their choosing along the Bosphorus, as the Istanbul landscape of their imagination merged with traditional Ottoman music, and a cartography of voice and vision steadily proliferated” (193).¹³⁶

Briefly, it can be stated that Huxley and Tanpınar agreed that the modern individual has to face problems such as the loss of traditional values and ideals, a world deprived of purpose, and controlled by mass behavior, and as a result of all, they feel a sense of rootlessness. In Huxley’s novel, the scenes of pleasure emerge as a means of revealing these problems, while this is not the case in *A Mind at Peace*. Huxley criticizes the way modern English people look for pleasure in mind-numbing parties, but Tanpınar

¹³⁴ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 44.

¹³⁵ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 45.

¹³⁶ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 46.

depicts the way modern Turkish people entertain through *fasıls* as a key solution for the problem of loneliness, rootlessness and mass behavior.

3.2 Huxley's and Tanpınar's Ideas of the Modern as Represented through Characters

What follows is an exploration of major characters in both of the novels; yet it aims at more than a character-analysis because its prior aim is to demonstrate how and why both Huxley and Tanpınar used characters as tools for a discussion of their own engagements with the issue of modernity. Characters in both novels represent a different aspect of the novels' central concern, which is the portrayal of the discontent arising from the lack of harmony/wholeness in modern life due to modernity as experienced in "the West" and the modernization project carried out in Turkey.

Because both novels are examples of the novel of ideas and because there is "the drama of individualized ideas" (Hoffman 129) in this type of novel, characters are the most significant element in analyzing them. As mentioned before, characters in a novel of ideas should be regarded as necessary tools which present the reader with a thorough analysis of contrasting and contending modes of thought: that is why, both Huxley's and Tanpınar's novels foreground characters more than anything else. There is almost no plot in *Point Counter Point*, which is built on detailed descriptions of characters and their dialogues. And likewise, in *A Mind at Peace* characters occupy the most important part of the work, each chapter is named after an important character like İhsan, Nuran, Suad and Mümtaz, referring to the ideas they stand for. This section of the dissertation will therefore focus on characters in pairs based on their similar attitudes to life in order to demonstrate the critical perspectives and attitudes Huxley and Tanpınar held towards some aspects of their society in the matters of modernity and modernization.

Technically, in the novel of ideas, ideas are used "in default of characterizations" (Hoffman 129). This is to say that "all major characters in

a novel of ideas are stock characters, or types, whose sole function is to embody a given perception of the world” (Hoffman 129). As one of Huxley’s mouthpieces in *Point Counter Point*, the novelist Philip Quarles, defines the novel of ideas in his notebook: “[t]he character of each personage must be implied, as far as possible, in the ideas of which he is the mouthpiece. Insofar as theories are rationalizations of sentiments, instincts, dispositions of soul, this is feasible” (*Point Counter Point* 351). Here, Huxley through Quarles, explains how the novelist of ideas should integrate ideas with character and narrative. For instance in *Point Counter Point*, Lord Edward Tantamount is the symbol of socially disengaged scientism; his assistant Illidge is a socialist; a free-spirited artist, Rampion is the representation of “vitalism”¹³⁷ or the balanced human being; the idle and stony-hearted young character, Spandrell is vitalism’s nihilist negation; the novelist character, Philip Quarles represents the desiccated and isolated intellectual; one of the representatives of the idle young people, Lucy Tantamount is the personification of the sexually liberated woman figure of the 1920s; and so on.¹³⁸ In a similar way, characters in *A Mind at Peace* represent ideas and/or are the holders of these ideas: the romantic-idealist Mümtaz is the personification of socially disengaged intellectual or Tanpınar’s double; Nuran stands for the idealized past that is lost; Suad is a nihilist negation of peace; and İhsan¹³⁹ stands for harmony or balance itself.

However, the novel of ideas seems to have a very big drawback: it determines and limits both the form and content of the novels. As a generic quality, it can be said that the counterpoint technique is used, and from the

¹³⁷ Here, I refer to D. H. Lawrence’s “philosophy of vitalism.”

¹³⁸ “Given Huxley’s inclination to draw fictional portraits in the likeness of people he knew” (Nancy 10), in a *roman à clef* attitude, it is claimed that some of these characters stand in for actual individuals: According to Grosvenor, “Lord Edward Tantamount is arguably the biologist J.S.B Haldane; Rampion is unmistakably D.H. Lawrence, Lucy Tantamount is thought to be Nancy Cunard; and Quarles embodies many of Huxley’s more negative self-perceptions” (12). But these biographical resemblances in no way change the characters’ function as spokespeople for ideas.

¹³⁹ İhsan also stands in for Tanpınar’s mentor, Yahya Kemal Beyatlı.

point of content, this entails unending duels of ideas. In other words, because the main objective of the novelist of ideas is to dramatize the conflict of opinions and attitudes in the novel, s/he should create “characters who have a point of view” drawn from the prevailing intellectual interests, and these intellectual interests may be held by only a limited number of people in any society. Its sociological range is narrow. This drawback is recognized by Philip Quarles: “[t]he chief defect of the novel of ideas is that you must write about people who have ideas to express – which excludes all but about .01 per cent of the human race. Hence the real, the congenital novelists don’t write such books. But then I never pretended to be a congenital novelist” (*Point Counter Point* 351). Through these words of his fictional character, Huxley, perhaps himself “a non-congenital novelist,” emphasizes an important generic quality of the novel of ideas. Quarles asserts that only those “characters who have ideas” can exist in the novel of ideas, or only “.01 per cent” of the participants in the human race, a minority in any generation, possess significant thoughts to be expressed in the novel of ideas. Then, it means that “99.9 per cent of the human race, at any given moment, lacks ideas worth expressing” (Meckier, *Critical Essays* 6). Huxley believed that the novelist of ideas has to turn his/her observations towards an important segment of the community: thinkers, scientists, politicians, literary men. So, as Quarles asserts the novel of ideas is an inherently elitist project. Tanpinar, in the same manner, takes his characters in *A Mind at Peace* from the literate and the privileged segments of society. So, it can be stated that the same generic feature of Huxley’s novel of ideas is also employed in Tanpinar’s novel. The majority of the characters in *Point Counter Point* and *A Mind at Peace* are from the upper-class or they are related to them in one way or another. Yet, paradoxically enough, both novelists criticize these “people who have ideas to express.” Throughout the 1920s Huxley was, as Woodcock puts it, “fascinated as well as repelled by the life of meretricious intellectuality and futile moneyed gaiety” he saw around him (13). Therefore, although this feature of the novel of ideas can

be regarded as displaying an elitist tendency¹⁴⁰ of its writer, it also brings a particular responsibility for the novelist: “[b]y criticizing this often misguided and irresponsible percentile of the human race, the novelist of ideas [...] keeps the world safe for intelligence” (Meckier, *Critical Essays* 6). In this sense, although the novels of ideas produced by Huxley and Tanpinar are inherently elitist, we cannot simply call Huxley and Tanpinar elitist writers because, while their characters are from a restricted social circle, Huxley’s and Tanpinar’s depictions of these characters are satirical rather than confirmative. In other words, choosing the thinking minority of the community as the target of their satirical novels, Huxley and Tanpinar dared to check this so-called important part of the society that assumed to itself the privilege of guiding and leading – manipulating – others’ ideas in their societies. Also, it should be remembered that Huxley’s and Tanpinar’s aim is never to satirize or condemn the “99.9 per cent of the human race”, and their satire targets only “.01 per cent of the human race.” Both novels display the decadent and dysfunctional members of the intellectual elites in their societies: a portrait of aristocrats idle, degenerate, and egocentric at the expense of others in *Point Counter Point* and a presentation of intellectuals indecisive, ignorant, superfluous, physically sick and emotionally wounded in *A Mind at Peace*. So although in these novels their characters are from a restricted social circle, it is not strictly accurate to call Huxley and Tanpinar elitist writers.

Characters’ ideas in *Point Counter Point* and *A Mind at Peace* collide with and confuse one another, and in this way Huxley and Tanpinar expose a resulting sense of being “rudderless” (Meckier, *Critical Essays* 7) as the prominent characteristic of the post-war decade. Characters in *Point Counter Point* and *A Mind at Peace*, who stand for members of the thinking segment of their societies, hold their own explanations of life egotistically,

¹⁴⁰ Firchow claims that “[b]ecause the novel of ideas is inherently concerned with people who have, or think they have, ideas (as well as, of course, emotions and imaginations), because these ideas tend to figure prominently in this type of novel, its audience is usually more sophisticated and intellectual – and more limited – than that for most other sorts of novel” (“Mental Music” 63).

and it is the novelist of ideas who satirically conveys the insufficiency of these ideas to explain modern reality. Novels of ideas thus include different temperaments and attitudes within the scope of one narrative, and their chief objective is to show the interaction, the dialogue and the conflict between ideas. Throughout *Point Counter Point* and *A Mind at Peace* characters/ideas represent insufficient intellectual, aesthetic and philosophical attitudes towards modern life that fail to explain the nature of things fully and, instead, contradict each other. In the rest of this chapter, Mark Rampion and Maurice Spandrell from *Point Counter Point* and İhsan and Suad from *A Mind at Peace* will be analyzed and compared in order to reveal how Huxley and Tanpınar formulated their attitudes to the idea of the modern.

Characters in *Point Counter Point*, as mentioned before, represent a different aspect of the novel's central concern which is the portrayal of discontent arising from a constant intolerance of "the opposites" (such as "reason," "passion" and "body") to one another, and of the lack of harmony/completeness in life. The novel presents one way of responding to life in the new era which lacks any sort of certitude: the viewpoint of a cold analytical intellectual (Philip Quarles), a scientist (Lord Edward Tantamount), a nihilist (Maurice Spandrell), a religious mystic (Dennis Burlap), and a sensualist (Lucy Tantamount). They all lead one-dimensional lives because they live by "one" ruling principle and cannot tolerate other principles. Mark Rampion is uniquely presented in the novel in terms of the life-philosophy he stands for. Unlike others in the novel, Rampion is aware of the loss of certitude in life and tries to cope with this predicament of the modern era by proposing a life which should embrace diverse attitudes and philosophies. As Meckier also notes, "only Rampion has both the insight and the life-style the human being must preserve if he is to survive and exert influence in the modern world" ("On Huxley's" 68). Rampion is demonstrated as a "balanced (141-478) and ideal (133)" character who knows how "to be a perfect animal *and* a perfect man (133). Rampion is

assigned a judgmental role in the novel. Several times he criticizes the others for being one dimensional and non-human. Through Rampion Huxley raises one of the most severe criticisms of modern human beings and modernity itself:

‘[y]ou try to be more than you are by nature and you kill something in yourself and become much less.’ [...] ‘The world’s an asylum of perverts. There are four of them at this table now.’ He looked round with a grin. ‘A pure little Jesus pervert.’ Burlap [the editor who preaches a Franciscan way of living, yet ironically cares about nothing but lust and money] forgivingly smiled. ‘An intellectual-aesthetic pervert.’ ‘Thanks for the compliment,’ said Philip. ‘A morality-philosophy pervert.’ He returned to Spandrell. ... ‘And what sort of a fool and pervert is the fourth person at this table?’ asked Philip. ‘What indeed!’ Rampion shook his head. ... He smiled. ‘A pedagogue pervert. A Jeremiah pervert. A worry-about-the-bloody-old-world pervert. Above all, a gibber pervert.’ He got up. ‘That’s why I’m going home,’ he said. ‘The way I’ve been talking – it’s non-human. Really scandalous. I’m ashamed. (474, 481-2)

Here Rampion suggests that an individual should be many-faceted; s/he should not live by one ruling principle. If the individual does not confine him/herself in such uniform and fixed perspectives or prisons of banalities, it might be, for Rampion, possible to accept a purely phenomenal reality and to be human. “As the proponent of life and the prophet of doom for twentieth-century civilization in this novel, Rampion decries the modern disease of self-denial (Nance 55). Also, as mentioned in the quotation above, these characters have narrowed their selves down to a single principle; Burlap’s, so-called, religious-sentimental perspective, Philip’s exclusion of feeling, Spandrell’s demonic-philosophical attitude to life. The novel proposes that religion, science and industrialization should be blamed for human beings’ modern predicament; once understood poorly and applied badly, they are guilty of rendering the modern individual to a one-dimensional subject:

‘[n]ot only you. All these people [are guilty].’ With a jerk of his head he indicated the other diners. ‘And all the respectable ones, too. Practically everyone. It’s the disease of modern man. I call it Jesus’s diseases on the analogy of Bright’s disease. Or rather Jesus’s and

Newton's disease; for the scientists are as much responsible as the Christians. So are the big business men, for that matter. It's Jesus's and Newton's and Henry Ford's disease. Between them, the three have pretty well killed us. Ripped the life out of our bodies and stuffed us with hatred. (139)

Rampion also emphasizes the rottenness of the London intelligentsia as a microcosm of the modern Western civilization. He asserts that the problems of the modern age have been caused by three things: the doctrines of Christianity, the Enlightenment project and the idea of progress, although Rampion does not explicitly use the last two terms: “[t]he Christians, who weren't sane, told people that they'd got to throw half of themselves in the waste-paper basket. And now the scientists and business men come and tell us that we must throw away half of what the Christians left us. But I don't want to be three quarters dead. It's time there was a revolt in favor of life and wholeness” (142). Rampion thus attacks these three groups of people, Christians, scientists and business men, who have been responsible for bringing Western civilization to this point of destruction, and – in words that remind us of Huxley's non-fiction writings – complains that the state of things in the twentieth century is out of control: “[p]eople live in terms only of money, not of real things, inhabiting remote abstractions, not the actual world of growth and making... the great machines that having been man's slaves are now his masters...”, and there are degenerate effects of “standardization, industrial and commercial life on the human soul” (253). He explicitly attacks various ideological positions – Bolsheviks, Fascists, Radicals and Conservatives, Communists and British Freeman, Lenin and Mussolini, MacDonald and Baldwin – as follows:

[a]ll equally anxious to take us to hell. ...They all believe in industrialism in one form or another, they all believe in Americanization. Think of the Bolshevik ideal. America but much more so. America with government departments taking the place of trusts and state officials instead of rich men. And then the ideal of the rest of Europe. The same thing, only with the rich men preserved. Machinery and government officials there. Machinery and Alfred Mond or Henry Ford here. The machinery to take us to hell; the rich or the official to drive it. ... I can't see that there's anything to

choose between them. They're equally in hurry. In the name of science, progress, and human happiness! Amen and step on the gas. (355-6)

Rampion here bases his argument on the use of excessive machinery either by the rich or the officials. The negative impact of America upon Europe, including its political, cultural or technological impact, is criticized by Huxley.¹⁴¹ He is mainly critical of the direction to which Europe is led by rich people and officials and advises human beings to abandon this way of thinking: “[w]e are entirely on the wrong road and ought to go back – preferably on foot, without the stinking machine” (356).

Rampion the artist portrays a parody of modern times in his drawings. In his drawing called “the fossils of the Past and the fossils of the Future” (247) he depicts a grotesque procession of monsters marching diagonally down and across the paper:

[d]inosaurs, pterodactyls, titanortheriums, diplodocuses, ichthyosauruses walked, swam, or flew at the tail of human monsters, huge-headed creatures, without limbs or bodies, creeping slug-like on vaguely slimy extensions of chin and neck. The faces were mostly those of eminent contemporaries. Among the crowd Burlap recognized J. J. Thompson and Lord Edward Tantamount, Bernard Shaw attended by eunuchs and spinsters and Sir Oliver Lodge attended by a sheeted and turnip-headed ghost and a walking cathode tube, Sir Alfred Mond and the head of John D. Rockefeller carried on a charger by a Baptist clergyman, Dr. Frank Crane and Mrs. Eddy wearing haloes, and many others. (247-8)

Huxley criticizes these people and the ideas they stand for. Modern progressivist thought has its origins in a “scientific method,”¹⁴² after which,

¹⁴¹ Criticism towards Americanization and machinery is dealt more in Huxley's next novel, *Brave New World*, so these concepts and from which perspective Huxley criticizes them will be explored in the following chapter.

¹⁴² “Scientific method is a body of techniques and procedures which has characterized natural science since the 17th century for investigating and acquiring new knowledge. It is based on empirical and measurable evidence and consisting in formulation, testing and modification of theories” (http://scientificmethod.com/sm5_smhistory.html).

according to the above-mentioned thinkers and business people,¹⁴³ it has become possible to understand scientific knowledge as something cumulative and science would provide for the improvement of the human condition both materialistically and morally. However, as far as Huxley was concerned, “progressivist thought reached its apotheosis in the positivism and scientism of the century of industrialism” leading up to the World War I, and “the chaos and destruction of the war placed against the idea of progress a question mark” (Grosvenor 6). Huxley has “Rampion criticize the ‘progress syndrome’ and its mental presuppositions and consequences from the point of view of what one may call an ideal of life in harmony with Nature, both inside and outside” (Schmithausen 164). Therefore, in his painting Rampion depicts human “monsters” (*Point Counter Point* 247) in a non-human condition along with the wild animals which lived in ancient times. Rampion’s second drawing also touches upon the outline of history and it is drawn as a reaction to H. G. Wells’ outline of history. Wells’ outline is described as follows:

[a] very small monkey was succeeded by a very slightly larger pithecanthropus, which was succeeded in its turn by a slightly larger Neanderthal man. Paleolithic man, neolithic man, bronze-age Egyptian and Babylonian man, iron-age Greek and Roman man – the figures slowly increased in size. By the time Galileo and Newton had appeared on the scene, humanity had grown to quite respectable dimensions. The crescendo continued uninterrupted through Watt and Stephenson, Faraday and Darwin, Bessemer and Edison, Rockefeller and Wanamaker, to come to a contemporary

¹⁴³ Huxley brings historical characters together with his own fictional characters in order to satirize these people. In other words, Huxley deliberately uses the names of historical figures, who serve as models for his characters. These allusions are meant to satirize political leaders, scientists, and thinkers as well as socialism and totalitarianisms. Some of these historical figures are as follows: J. J. Thom[p]son was a British physicist who most importantly invented the mass spectrometer. G. B. Shaw was an Irish playwright who supported the elective breeding or *shavian eugenics*. Sir Oliver Lodge was a British physicist who elaborated on Maxwell’s *aether theory*. Alfred Mond was a British industrialist, financier and politician. John D. Rock[e]feller was an American industrialist who had a career in oil industry. Dr. Frank Crane was a Presbyterian minister, a speaker, and a popular columnist in the US. Mrs. Eddy was the founder of Christian Science that believes that sickness and disease are the result of fear and ignorance and can be healed through prayer. Also see Meckier’s essay titled “Onomastic Satire: Names and Naming in *Brave New World*” which will be dealt with in the following chapter.

consummation in the figures of Mr. H.G. Wells himself and Sir Alfred Mond. Nor was the future neglected. Through the radiant mist of prophecy the forms of Wells and Mond, growing larger and larger at every repetition, wound away in a triumphant spiral clean off the paper, towards Utopian infinity. (248-9)

Huxley here, through Rampion's comments, summarizes Wells' work, and this description in the novel is a satire of the one in the original book by Wells, *The Outline of History* (1919-20). Wells' outline, according to Rampion, does not reflect the true history of mankind because it is shown as a progressive movement and the size of the figures continues increasing through the ages towards a "Utopian infinity" (249). Yet, Rampion's depiction of the human "progress" is as follows:

[t]he small monkey very soon blossomed into a good-sized bronze-age man, who gave place to a very large Greek and a scarcely smaller Etruscan. The Romans grew smaller again. The monks of the Thebaid were hardly distinguishable from the primeval little monkeys. There followed a number of good-sized Florentines, English, French. They were succeeded by revolting monsters labeled Calvin and Knox, Baxter and Wesley. The stature of the representative men declined. The Victorians have begun to be dwarfish and misshapen. Their Twentieth Century successors were abortions. Through the mists of the future one could see a diminishing company of little gargoyles and fetuses with heads too large for their squelchy bodies, the tails of apes, and the faces of our most eminent contemporaries, all biting and scratching and disemboweling one another with that methodical and systematic energy which belongs to the very highly civilized. (249)

Rampion shows Western man on a course of steady decline into barbarism since the Greeks, reflecting a very pessimistic portrayal of man and a refutation of the idea of "progress." Within a declining movement, Rampion shows how human beings deteriorate within time, with a degeneration of modern civilization and degradation of industrialized life, both caused by those very people who, in Rampion's terms, wish to be more than human. Huxley again, this time through Rampion's drawings, reiterates the idea of a decline in "true" social and human progress since the Greeks. Also it should be noted that apart from the scientists and businessmen mentioned above, he

criticizes such clergymen of the Western church as John Calvin, John Knox, Richard Baxter and John Wesley because he wants to emphasize that it is not only science and economy, but also religion which should be held responsible for the decline of Western civilization, because like science and sensualism, religion also brews, in Rampion's words, "lop-sided individuals" (*Point Counter Point* 303).

He maintains an objective view of the perverse members of the group, and his life philosophy and belief in humanity beyond social codes serve as foils to the other worldviews the novel offers. So what is the solution of the problem that Rampion poses? Like D. H. Lawrence, Rampion sharply criticizes modernity, and he preaches vitalism, spontaneity, immediacy, and intensity of feeling. Vitalism refers to embracing a life-affirming approach. According to Lawrence's philosophy of vitalism, the "material world and humans are best understood as being shaped by a dynamic field of energy and flow" (Martin, "Introduction" 25). In several of Lawrence's works like *Sons and Lovers* (1913) and *Lady Chatterley's Lover* (1928) "vitalism's ontological claims are often coupled with ethical and political claims that argue for the free flow of instinct, libido and passion against institutional repression and control" (25). In *Point Counter Point*, Lawrence's philosophy of vitalism is represented through Rampion and his arguments which are "in favor of life and wholeness" (*Point Counter Point* 142). Rampion asserts that modern men and women have been inclined either towards the direction of excessive rationality or excessive spirituality, disregarding their instincts and feelings. Mark Rampion is a man who above all believes in "life and wholeness" (142).

Although Rampion believes that the problem solves itself by creating wars and revolutions, he also thinks of another solution that can be practical until the permanent solution is found. He believes the root of the evil and also this temporary solution lies in "the individual psychology:"

[s]o it's there, in the individual psychology, that you'd have to begin. The first step would be to make people live dualistically, in two compartments. In one compartment, as industrialized workers, in the

other as human beings. As idiots and machines for eight hours out of every twenty-four and real human beings for the rest. ... Spend your leisure hours in being a real complete man or woman, as the case may be. Don't mix the two lives together; keep the bulkheads watertight between them. The genuine human life in your leisure hours is the real thing. (357-8)

In the quotation above, Huxley suggests that living dualistically could be an escape from degrading and fruitless work. So, Rampion complains of “the horrible unwholesome tameness of our world. ...It's factories, it's Christianity, it's science, it's respectability, it's our education. They weigh on the modern soul. They suck the life out of it” (111). Also according to Rampion, modern people cannot achieve “the art of integral living” (380) or spirituality which is preventing the mechanized life from having control on people by codifying them as mere consumers, employees, egocentric loners, and objects to be disciplined and exploited. In other words, Rampion differentiates the art of integral living or “noble savagery” (*Point Counter Point* 134, 231) from institutionalized Christianity. The art of integral living, “which is damnably difficult,” (*Point Counter Point* 478) is meeting the needs of one's body, mind and soul without obeying the rules set by advanced industrial society. Such a person is also called a “life-worshipper” (*Do What You Will* 298) by Huxley himself, and when Rampion talks about a life-worshipper, he has an *atavismus*' way of living in his mind, as he explains “An atavismus – that's what we all ought to be. Atavismuses with all modern conveniences. Intelligent primitives. Big game with a soul” (123). As mentioned above, Rampion highly values balance, harmony and completeness as the most significant requirements of a healthy and sane civilization. Throughout the novel, Rampion satirizes several institutionalized agents of modern life such as industry, religion, science, education, and family, all of which are depicted as corrupt in advanced industrial society; and these ideas, as also expressed by Huxley in his non-fiction, anticipate many of the key ideas of Adorno, Horkheimer and Marcuse, as mentioned before. It is significant that, by introducing the idea

of “intelligent primitives” Rampion expresses a wish for a new state of existence for the modern individual in industrial society. The term “primitive” in this context is used with positive connotations: a person who does not have to give up any part of his existence (body, soul, intelligence) and who is able to cherish the technological advancements and blessings of advanced industrial society to improve all aspects of his/her existence (intellectual, spiritual and sensual) at the same degree and time.¹⁴⁴

This novel has been shown in the preceding paragraphs to reflect Huxley’s criticism of and discontent with modernity. At this point we should try to understand on what basis and how Huxley formulates an understanding of modern. It can be claimed that a close look at *Point Counter Point* provides us with Huxley’s formulation of the modern, where his implied definition as manifested through Rampion’s arguments is founded on a Eurocentric perspective. Although Huxley’s non-fiction criticizes modernity as experienced by “the west,” (by which he refers to America and England) he never intended to give up the major tenets of modernity which he takes as ideas embodied in the Enlightenment, namely, the triumph of reason, rationality and individuality. Besides, he accepts it as *de facto* that modernity is an experience which originated in the West and spread to the rest of the world. This idea is foregrounded by some characters, several times in the novel, most evidently in Rampion’s identification of the ideal civilization with “the West:” “the Greeks and Etruscans were civilized. They knew how to live harmoniously and completely, with their whole being. [...] We’re all barbarians. [...] The sane, harmonious, Greek man gets as much as he can of both sets of states. He’s not such a fool as to want to kill part of himself” (124). When Rampion claims that “we’re all barbarians,” he means the contemporary Western civilization. It is interesting that Rampion gives references only to ancient Western civilizations when he thinks of ideal civilizations; and it is

¹⁴⁴ The idea of “primitivism and savagery” in the context of Huxley’s literary career will be elaborated more in the following chapter regarding the counterpoint between the primitivism of the Brave New Worlders and that of John Savage.

equally interesting that Rampion does not mention any ancient non-Western civilizations as examples of ideal civilizations.

As another example of Huxley's Eurocentric formulation of the modern, we can study in more detail the parts of the novel in which England and India are contrasted: England as representative of "the West" and India of "the East," by implication. As mentioned in the previous chapter, Huxley situates India at a time in Europe's past and this suggests that according to Huxley there is a single line of progress. To reinforce this claim we can discuss Philip Quarles and his wife Elinor's visit to the East. Elinor's letter from Lahore to her father is an account of life in the east under western eyes:

'[t]he bazaars are the genuine article - maggoty. What with the pullulations and the smells, it is like burrowing through a cheese. From the artist's point of view, the distressing thing about all this oriental business is that it's exactly like that painting of Eastern scenes they did in France in the middle of the last century. You know the stuff, smooth and shiny, like those pictures that used to be painted on tea canisters. When you're here, you see that the style is necessary. The brown skin makes the faces uniform and the sweat puts a polish on the skin. One would have to paint with a surface at least as slick as an Ingres.' He read on with pleasure. The girl always had something amusing to say in her letters. She saw things with the right sort of eye. (*Point Counter Point* 166)

As explained before, Huxley's novels become more intelligible when they are read together with his non-fictional writings. Relying on what Huxley wrote about his visits to oriental places, especially to India, in his *Jesting Pilate*, this chapter of *Point Counter Point* can be regarded as a fictional version of Huxley's impressions of India. The fact that Elinor has a gift for seeing the things (in Lahore) with "the right sort of eye" is obviously her father's comment. He seems to agree with Elinor because he claims that she can see things with "the right" sort of eye. Elinor's depictions of Lahore, which amuses her father are a sign of her Eurocentric perspective. One can even assert that Huxley's descriptions of the East through Elinor in this part of the novel seem to be written in order to dissuade those who want to visit

the orient. The India represented in *Point Counter Point* is a mixture of mud and excessive spirituality. The Quarles' comments about Indian society are reminiscent of Huxley's writings in his *Jesting Pilate*: reading Huxley's *Jesting Pilate*, Meckier states that Huxley finds Indians uncultivated, poor and a nation deprived of universal cleanliness ("Philip Quarles's" 449), and confronted with the East, Huxley feels proud of being a Westerner (*Jesting Pilate* 156).¹⁴⁵ And after his journeys to the east, Huxley expressed a similar view: "[w]estern observers, disgusted, not unjustifiably, with their own civilization, express their admiration for the 'spirituality' of the Indians, and for the immemorial contentment which is the fruit of it. Sometimes, such is their enthusiasm, this admiration actually survives a visit to India" (*Jesting Pilate* 109). The same idea is emphasized in *Point Counter Point* when Philip heads home from his trip to India: "what a comfort it will be to be back in Europe again!" (*Point Counter Point* 86). From this perspective it can be stated that Huxley criticized modernity as experienced in the West; yet on his journeys to the East he experiences at first hand that the east was far from reaching the civilizational level of the west, so he ruled out the East as an alternative to the problematic experience of modernity in the West.

Another example of the attitude that degrades Indians is found in the ideas expressed in *Point Counter Point* by Lord Tantamount. Towards the end of the novel, he claims that

there are a lot of people who dispose of the dead more sensibly than we do. It's really only among the white races that the phosphorus is taken out of circulation. [...] The only people more wasteful than we are the Indians. Burning bodies and throwing the ashes into rivers! But the Indians are stupid about everything. (*Point Counter Point* 469)

¹⁴⁵ "Among the genuine books which I discovered imbedded in a ship's library was Henry Ford's *My Life and Work* [1922]. I had never read it; I began, and was fascinated. [...] It was somewhere between the tropic and the equator that I read the book. In these seas, and to one fresh from India and Indian 'spirituality,' Indian dirt and religion, Ford seems a greater man than Buddha" (*Jesting Pilate* 155-6). Huxley's encounter with Ford's book is one of the several examples in *Jesting Pilate* showing his feeling of relief caused by leaving the "dirty and spiritual" East.

Although Lord Tantamount tries to draw attention to an ecological issue, the necessity of preserving phosphorus, he harshly criticizes Indians from the vantage point of a stranger, a westerner. This comment aligns Lord Edward with Huxley in the latter's own comment about the lack of hygiene of a holy man travelling in a train with him in Lahore (*Jesting Pilate* 42). Huxley's Eurocentric perspective and its correspondence with Elinor's and Lord Edward's ideas about the "inferiority of India" (as an implied representative of the East) become much more evident when Rampion idealizes the ancient Greeks and Etruscans, that is, in the comparison between Huxley's depictions of the Lahore holy man – "undoubtedly dirty" and "long unwashed" (*Jesting Pilate* 42) – and Rampion's idolization of a 'sane, harmonious Greek' (*Point Counter Point* 164). This contrast is strongly indicative of a biased perspective on the East. On the grounds of such grotesque observations of and severe criticisms towards the East, it can be argued that Huxley fails in *Point Counter Point*, in this respect, to achieve the novel's ideal of point-counter-point or the side-by-side existence of multiple viewpoints; India is not represented as an equal "point" that can "counter" another "point," England. The west is represented as superior to the east in *Point Counter Point* because, like Huxley, the novel adopts a West-over-East dichotomy, reflecting Huxley's belief that the West developed earlier and faster than the East, and this is part of his linear/forward-movement understanding of history.

An exploration of the attitude Tanpınar adopted when he formulated his idea of the modern and history as represented in his novel may help clarify how his key philosophical ideas like *terkip* contribute to his novel. It can be stated that İhsan is Rampion's equivalent in Tanpınar's novel, because he is a central character who brings the others in the novel together and creates philosophical, political and social discussions. Again as mentioned before, like Rampion, who is inspired by Lawrence, İhsan is a fictional representation of Tanpınar's mentor, Yahya Kemal. With İhsan, Tanpınar puts forward his novel's main theme, the idea of *terkip* which

brings him close to the notion of Multiple Modernities. As mentioned before, Tanpınar's understanding of modern is quite different from that of Huxley and also his philosophy of the "modern" constitutes and formulates the major principles of his understanding of time.

From the very beginning to the end of the novel, İhsan provides and develops a fierce and persistent dialogue on the cultural politics of modern Turkey. He conveys the issues which have been shown to embody Tanpınar's philosophy of life, and he enters into some controversial discussions about the modern or modernization and changes taking place in Turkey. In the novel there are some long philosophical and aesthetic debates. The most important theme, the idea of *terkip*, entails and contributes to such contemporary debates as the perception of time, "the legacies and burdens of the past, memory" (Seyhan 146), identity, traditions, and the idea of Multiple Modernities. In these debates, the optimistic İhsan and the nihilist Suad generally act as counterpoints to each other's comments and viewpoints. İhsan states

'[w]e're in the process of creating a new social expression particular to us. I believe this is what Suad is saying.' [Suad:] 'Indeed, with one leap to shake and cast out the old, the new, and everything else. Leaving neither Ronsard nor his contemporary in the East Fuzûli ... [...] The new ... We'll establish the myth of a new world, as in America and Soviet Russia.' [Mümtaz:] 'And do you think they actually cast aside everything, all of it? If you ask me, neither our denial of the past nor our resolve to create can establish this new myth. If anything, it rests in the momentum of the New Life itself.' [... İhsan:] 'We'll try to establish a new life particular to us and befitting our own idiom.' (*A Mind at Peace* 105-6)¹⁴⁶

In this lengthy quotation, through the clash between İhsan and Suad, Tanpınar introduces his understanding of *terkip* which emphasizes the idea of "establishing a new life particular to us." The quality of having an experience of modernity or "New Life" particular to a culture is the most important idea in disclosing Tanpınar's understanding of the modern. As mentioned in the previous chapter, the Multiple Modernities approach

¹⁴⁶ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 47.

underscores diverse experiences of modernity all of which are characterized to be local, polycentric and respectful to the multiplicity of identities. Multiplicity is the key word in understanding Tanpınar's novel. In the idea of Multiple Modernities the so-called contrasting views about modern life can exist. Tanpınar's idea of *terkip* is produced in order to cope with and to solve the problems caused by experiences of "break," "incompleteness" or "crisis," and it corresponds with a quest for "wholeness" and "harmony" in life. Therefore, İhsan emphasizes the necessity of going beyond the categories of the "modern" and the "traditional" because seeing life in these categories clashes with the idea of *terkip* and, according to him, seeing life dichotomously just worsens the problem of "duality" or the feeling of being "broken."

Tanpınar's idea of the modern and "a new life" can be further clarified with an explanation of his understanding of time and Bergson's *durée*. In other words, to be able to have a complete understanding of Tanpınar's philosophy of time and life, concepts like "music, dreams and time" should be handled as a unified body. In *A Mind at Peace*, Tanpınar aims to prove that by means of *durée* it is possible for both an individual and a culture to get in touch with a new dimension of temporal experience that exceeds the claim that tradition refers to the past and that modern means the present. Instead, with the perception of *durée*, he foregrounds "continuity and mobility, the indivisibility of duration" in Bergson's terms (*The Creative Mind* 129). Tanpınar's quest is for the perception and reflection of "monolithic time" in which, ideally, the categories of the traditional and the modern should lose their distinction or dissolve. Modernization, as İhsan takes it, does not mean Westernization and likewise the idea of preserving traditions is not equal to conservatism or reactionism. So, Tanpınar's novel blurs the boundaries between experiences of the traditional and the modern and provides a very different understanding of temporality from "the mathematical" (*The Creative Mind* 2) one, through his representation of music and dreams or through the perception of

intuition which is hinted by Mümtaz as follows: “Music toiled beyond time. Music, the ordering of time – *zamanın nizamı* – elided the present [the mathematical perception of time]” (*A Mind at Peace* 320).¹⁴⁷ When music starts, Mümtaz, who often seems to represent Tanpınar’s own views, feels that the earth stands still and music dismantles the difference between the past and the experience of the present.

Tanpınar’s “idea of monolithic time which is understood intuitively through music and dreams” can be taken as a philosophy which also shapes his theories on cultural issues: İhsan’s theory of *terkip* can be taken as an example. Guests at a *fasıl* gathering listen to İhsan’s diagnosis of Turkey’s problems and his optimistic ideas about remedies. İhsan/Tanpınar thinks that Turkey should modernize by preserving traditional values and local colors that leave marks in our lives: “to change by continuing and to continue by changing.” This is one of the original ideas introduced in the novel. At the beginning of the novel, when Mümtaz sees children playing games and singing songs, he thinks to himself:

[w]hat should persist is this very song, our children’s growing up while singing this song and playing this game [...] Everything is subject to transformation; we can even foster such change through our own determination. What shouldn’t change are the things that structure social life, and mark it with our own stamp. (*A Mind at Peace* 22)¹⁴⁸

İhsan also persistently draws attention to the necessity of attaining a composition/co-existence or *terkip* of traditional and modern or local and universal. In this idea of *terkip*, there is no place for abrupt breaks and abandonments. Tanpınar’s idea of the historical also reinforces this point of view. Unlike Huxley who differentiates between past, present and future in a linear relationship in his *Point Counter Point*, Tanpınar adopts “a monolithic view of time” which brings him closer to Benjamin’s idea of the past. Characters in the novel sense monolithic time during their *fasıl*

¹⁴⁷ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 48.

¹⁴⁸ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 49.

meetings. The transcendental experience of music, as mentioned before, appeals to the *fasıl* guests' souls, takes them to the realms of dream, and eases the pain of civilizational crisis. One of the poetic descriptions of the characters' experience of music is as follows: “[t]he timbre and style of the *ney* acknowledged nothing as traditional or modern, but chased after *zaman* without *zaman*, timeless time, that is, after fate and humanity as unrefined essences. [...] The music had transfigured each [character] into a vision familiar only to the seer – as in a dream” (*A Mind at Peace* 310).¹⁴⁹ What Bergson called “mathematical time” freezes with the *ney*'s magical sound and it leads the listeners into a hypnotic state of disconnection from the world.

The end of Tanpınar's novel raises a very significant question: can tradition be reconciled with the imperatives of modernization? Through Mümtaz Tanpınar answers this question by stating that, although it is challenging, “I need to take on my responsibilities. And if I can't, I'm prepared to be crushed beneath them” (444).¹⁵⁰ The responsibilities that Mümtaz is ready to take up involve the tasks the novels seems to suggest of the Turkish intellectual: finding a solution to civilizational/modernization crisis and creating *terkip* in Turkey. The novel makes it clear that it is difficult to overcome this problem and to obtain a new harmonious and balanced life. Yet, no matter how difficult it is to reconcile tradition with modernization, the novel's ending – the portrayal of Mümtaz's determination – also encourages an affirmative answer to this question.

Before concluding this chapter, we need to have a look at one more issue. Several Turkish critics, as mentioned before, have claimed that Suad's death is “a translated suicide” inspired by the demonic characters of Dostoevsky and Huxley, and this chapter has also drawn attention to the similarity between their suicides. So, what might be the reasons why Tanpınar is writing “a translated suicide” resembling the suicide of

¹⁴⁹ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 50.

¹⁵⁰ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 51.

Spandrell? First, Suad, like Spandrell in Huxley's novel, embodies the opposite of every value and idea – completeness, harmony, balanced life – ideas that are expressed by characters that sometimes act as Huxley's and Tanpınar's mouthpieces (Rampion in *Point Counter Point* and İhsan in *A Mind at Peace*). Like Spandrell, Suad is an overtly symbolical character; the symbol of void, uncertainty, and death. In this way, through a character like Suad, Tanpınar intensifies the feeling of “uneasiness and discontentment” in Mümtaz and the novel, and consequently in the reader. Furthermore, it is possible to see the issue from a different point: Tanpınar might have intentionally created a “translated suicide” for the ending of his novel in order to pinpoint the state of people in Turkey who disregard their roots and heritage and create an identity borrowed from Europe. From this perspective, Suad's suicide could be seen as an intentionally-created similarity to Spandrell's, in order to represent and criticize people who regard modernity as westernization, and those who lack “authenticity” within the experience of modernity and modernization. Perhaps that is why İhsan, long before Tanpınar's critics, criticizes Suad's “translated” existence and İhsan's critical attitude to the Suad character further problematizes the modernization project carried out in Turkey. İhsan states that:

[r]egrettably, the world has already lived through and dispensed with this variety of angst a century ago. Hegel, Nietzsche, and Marx have come and gone. Dostoevsky suffered this anguish eighty years prior. Do you know what's new in our case? It's neither Éluard's surrealist poetry nor the torments of Nikolai Stavrogin. [...] Suad's problems [are] bygone relics [for me]. (*A Mind at Peace* 343)¹⁵¹

İhsan argues that Suad's borrowed anguish was experienced long ago by Hegel, Nietzsche and Marx. Suad's problems do not seem authentic and he claims that Suad's concerns do not rely on the “authentic” problems that Turkey faces in that particular moment of time. Suad's suicide may undermine the realism of Suad's characterization – both for Tanpınar and his critics – yet it is evident that Mümtaz, the representative of Turkish

¹⁵¹ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 52.

intellectuals, realizes that it is his responsibility to create “a new life” or formulate *terkip*.

This chapter explored Huxley’s and Tanpınar’s novels in order to understand to what extent *A Mind at Peace* engages with *Point Counter Point* in terms of the writers’ discontent with modernity and modernization. Two common points, “the counterpoint technique” and “the musicalization of fiction” have been explained and the chapter has explored how these two formal concepts were employed by Huxley and Tanpınar in their novels. Indicating these formal similarities has helped the chapter underline the common theme of the novels which is the representation of a quest for harmony and completeness. Having emphasized the parallelisms between the novels, the chapter has demonstrated differences concerning the writers’ approaches to the notion of “leisure” and “pleasure.” Marcuse’s notion of “one-dimensional individual” and “alienated leisure” and Adorno’s and Horkheimer’s analysis of “false progress” and “the culture industry” in advanced industrial society have been used as tools to explore Huxley’s critical perspective foregrounded through house parties in his novel. It has been indicated that Tanpınar’s understanding of leisure differs from Huxley’s in that Tanpınar regards leisure as having a potential to create and support individual initiative, imaginative ingenuity and mental work. In Tanpınar’s novel, the musical parties called *fasıls* and Istanbul are two important examples of settings which are capable of creating genuine pleasure for the characters. This difference between Huxley’s and Tanpınar’s attitudes to leisure has been discussed in the light of the terms theorized by Marcuse, Adorno and Horkheimer. Tanpınar’s approach to leisure has been studied also with the help of Bergsonian notions like “*durée*” and “pure time.” It has been emphasized that there is a significant difference between Huxley’s and Tanpınar’s understanding of time and the modern as reflected in *Point Counter Point* and *A Mind at Peace*. Huxley’s novel rests on a linear/forward movement idea of history and a Eurocentric understanding of the modern while Tanpınar’s ideas about the

representations of time, memory and past have resemblances to the philosophy of Bergson and Benjamin, as well as to the idea of Multiple Modernities. Tanpınar in his novel uses both an Eastern philosophy, *Mevlevi* Sufism, and a Western philosophy, Bergsonian understanding of time, and in this way his novel suggests the idea of *terkip* which refers to the idea of creating “a new life” particular to a culture. Huxley’s and Tanpınar’s discontent with modernity and modernization arises from their diagnosis of the lack of harmony and completeness in modern life. Huxley from the standpoint of a westerner with a colonial past was concerned with modern life as depicted in *Point Counter Point* and it corresponds to the Western world or the predicament of the Western man. On the other hand, the scope of Tanpınar’s concern with modern life in *A Mind at Peace* is more specific, in that he is more interested in the experience of modernity in his country, Turkey.

CHAPTER 4

**THE CORRESPONDING FORMULATIONS OF
THE MODERN
IN *BRAVE NEW WORLD* and *THE TIME REGULATION INSTITUTE***

This chapter analyzes Huxley's *Brave New World* (1932) and Tanpınar's *The Time Regulation Institute* (1961) in terms of their structural and thematic features which are seen to have been shaped by the writers' discontent with modernity and the modernization experienced in their countries. This chapter first explores the formal features of *Brave New World* and *The Time Regulation Institute* and then the historical contexts in which they were produced to examine to what extent the novelists' engagements with the discourse of modernity are similar and to what extent they are different. Unlike the previous one, this chapter aims to reveal that the distance between the two writers regarding their understanding of the modern decreases towards the later years of their writing careers and to show that their discontent with modernity as exposed in *Brave New World* and *The Time Regulation Institute* have resemblances, particularly in terms of both novels' criticisms of the formulation of time in the liberal tradition of modernity and in their deeming modernity a rupture. In this respect, the chapter aims to indicate that with *Brave New World* Huxley experienced a paradigm shift in his understanding of the modern because he gave up conceptualizing the modern in terms of space and started to use terms of time to theorize an understanding of the modern. This shift is significant because firstly it brings Huxley's understanding of the modern closer to that of Tanpınar's, and secondly both writers' attempt to conceptualize the modern in terms of time indicates that they are discontented with the ways in which the modern is carried out.

Brave New World and *The Time Regulation Institute* are frequently called Huxley's and Tanpınar's most popular novels, and both of them were written later in the writers' careers. *Brave New World* was written four years

after *Point Counter Point* (1928) and *The Time Regulation Institute* was written twelve years after *A Mind at Peace* (1949). *Brave New World* and *The Time Regulation Institute* reflect some changes in both writers' styles, which is not surprising since neither Huxley nor Tanpınar were inclined to adhere permanently to one idea or one literary style. So, this chapter will also be attentive to the changes in the writers' worldviews and fictional styles. *Brave New World* and *The Time Regulation Institute* will be studied as examples of the modern satirical novel. Therefore, first of all, there will be a discussion on how satire is used and/or revised in the works of Huxley and Tanpınar to convey their philosophical perceptions of the modern within the context of early twentieth-century England and mid twentieth-century Turkey. Then the historical contexts of each text will be highlighted, which will prepare the ground for an exploration of the parallels between Huxley's and Tanpınar's formulations of modernity as reflected in *Brave New World* and *The Time Regulation Institute*.

4.1 Satire and The Modern Satirical Novel

Satire is a literary mode which has been used in a wide range of literary works. The satirist's tone is significant in revealing his/her attitude to the issue s/he satirizes. In other words, the satirist writes not only out of his/her dissent but also from a moral vantage point and a concern for the public interest (Frye 223; Griffin 37; Hodgart 172). In other words, satire cannot function without a standard against which the reader can compare its subject. "Satire implies a moral or social comparison between what it presents and a standard of normality assumed to be in the reader's mind" (Frye 157). So, the satirist not only criticizes the problematic issues in his/her society by rendering them laughable and/or reprehensible, but s/he also tries to direct the reader towards what s/he considers an ideal alternative. Satire, which is written against decadence and corruption, demands that human beings should improve and reform themselves and

their world. Then it can be briefly put that the satirist's main intention is to criticize and correct (Griffin 49; Hodgart 67).

Several scholars have delineated the major characteristics of satire. In *The Anatomy of Satire*, Gilbert Highet argues that "satire is topical; it claims to be realistic (although it is usually exaggerated or distorted); it is shocking; it is informal; and (although often in a grotesque or painful manner) it is funny" (5). Northrop Frye, in a similar manner to Highet's statement, argues that satire is "militant irony" (223) and contingent upon two elements: "one is wit and humor founded on fantasy or a sense of the grotesque or absurd; the other is an object of attack" (224). In Frye's thought, imaginative fantasy is one of the fundamental elements that makes satire a major literary mode. By "fantasy or a sense of grotesque or absurd", Frye means literary devices that help the satirist present his object of attack in disguise; the satirist defines the presumed moral norms and standards by measuring them against the grotesque and absurd. A satirical work, whose intention is to criticize people, institutions and world-views, is able to mask its relationship with factuality by means of fantasy or a sense of the grotesque and the absurd. In other words, satire makes use of fantasy, grotesque or absurd elements in order not to be a mere attack or an expression of pure indignation. The satirist, who uses humor and wit to create a sense of grotesque or the absurd in a satirical work, can hence balance the real (the object of attack) with the fictitious (fantasy/grotesque/absurd). Also, without fantasy, or a sense of grotesque or the absurd, there is the risk that the reader may not see the writer's satiric point; i.e., the risk of the reader taking what the satirist says literally. Through Frye's definition of satire, it can also be inferred that the satirist uses wit and humor in order to stimulate laughter or feelings of scorn at the targeted subject in the reader. The object of satire, according to Frye, should be determined in such a way that both the writer and the reader should agree on its undesirability. In the same manner, Matthew Hodgart argues that the primary characteristic of satire is a "combination of aggressive attack and

fantastic travesty” (132). Agreeing with Highet and Frye, it is suggested by two other scholars of satire (Edward A. Bloom and Lillian D. Bloom) that satire should keep its realism and absurdity at a similar degree, and they assert that satire should be realistic enough to enable its reader to gain insight into the problems that urged the satirist to write satirical works. In this way the satirist takes his/her subject of satire from real-life experiences and balances them with aesthetic features in his/her art.

Both Huxley and Tanpınar can be regarded as satirists. As the previous chapters of this study have explained, they both wrote novels informed by standards and values they deemed either ideal/universal or perennial. Huxley adopted a pattern of a “fundamentally correct, standard” (*Jesting Pilate* 208) and of “universal values” (208) which affected both his philosophy and his literary career. Tanpınar also held the idea of maintenance of the values which are “true to us” (*A Mind at Peace* 252) and which “provide us [with] harmony and peace of mind” (*A Mind at Peace* 328) and emphasized the continuity of the collective memory. As two novelists writing with an agenda of pointing out the importance of these ideals, standards and values in their work, it is not surprising to observe that Huxley and Tanpınar wrote satirical novels in which they explicitly expressed their discontent with a modern loss of values and harmony. In their novels they criticize individuals, society and ideologies with the intention of correcting them.

As regards the relationship between satire and the novel, Jerome Meckier contends that

[s]atirical novelists stress what is puzzling about the life process or wrong with it. They register a philosopher’s displeasure with the way life works, its apparent lack of a satisfactory design and/or purpose. [...] the satirical novelist reveals a more perplexing, perhaps even a more absurd world than the reader customarily acknowledges. (*Satire and Structure* 4)

The common features of what Meckier defines as the modern satirical novel can be listed as follows: satire in the novel produces an attack on historically

specific targets by way of rhetorical strategies and literary devices like irony, parody and ridicule. The satirical novel often contains one symbol through which it usually abstracts itself from the world. This aloofness of satire from the world is also very important because the satirist does not draw a realistic picture of its object of attack. Thus it can be stated that the use of symbol brings about the estrangement of the reader from reality, which is a general feature of the satirical novel. Furthermore, by means of its aloofness, the satirical novel conveys its criticism implicitly. To illustrate, while in *Brave New World* a “euphoric, narcotic, pleasantly hallucinant” drug called “soma” is used as a symbol of the powerful influence of science and technology on society, the institution in *The Time Regulation Institute* is employed as a symbol of the dysfunctionality of the modernization project carried out in Turkey.

Another feature of the satirical novel is that it very often attacks historical figures. For instance, Huxley criticizes Henry Ford, Sigmund Freud, and D. H. Lawrence in *Brave New World*. Yet, satirical novelists may also focus their attack on particular social groups or ideologies. *The Time Regulation Institute*, for instance attacks Turkey’s modernization project. In this case, the satirical novel generally includes a large number of characters, and each embodies a different world view that the novel satirizes. Therefore, in the satirical novel characters function as mirrors in which the presumed audience is expected to see him/herself. In fact, it is the targeted audience’s world view that is the object of criticism.

The technical features of Huxley’s and Tanpınar’s satirical novels in terms of the categorizations presented in Arthur Pollard’s *Satire* are as follows: Pollard contends that there are indeed few literary forms that cannot accommodate at least a touch of satire and “the novel is so amorphous that few, if any, of its examples will fit a classification very comfortably” (23). He maintains that the satirical effect is provided through tone because “the author so conceives his subject [...] that he then arranges his characters and incidents in relation one to another with the object of

obtaining the maximum satirical effect” (23). The examples Pollard gives of novels from English literature in which satirical effect emerges through tone are *Tom Jones* (1749) and *Vanity Fair* (1847-8). He also argues that there are works that are better defined as “satiric[al] allegories” (28) and these allegories – “the criminal biography, the beast-fable, the utopia, the imaginary journey and the biblical parallel”¹⁵² (28) – are not mere parodies that seek to emphasize the weaknesses or incongruities of the original, but these allegories, to Pollard, “use the original as a norm to emphasize their own real satiric object” (28). To illustrate, Huxley’s *Brave New World* reflects its writer’s idea that utopian fantasy is not necessarily an ideal condition, but it can be a world of synthetic happiness or full of sufferings that leads to the dehumanization of the individual. Hence, Huxley’s dystopia grows out of an idealism or utopian fantasy which is at odds with the shortcomings of his own society. Also, according to Pollard’s arguments about satirical allegories, it can be argued that Tanpınar uses the criminal biography device for a social satirical allegory. His *The Time Regulation Institute* reveals the writer’s ideas of the various forms of hypocrisy, fraud and deception that were results of the modernization project in Turkey because, as it will be explained, Tanpınar thought that some aspects of the project of Turkey’s modernization turned social and cultural values upside down.

As a subgenre of the novel, the satirical novel emerged in Turkish literature around the *Tanzimat*. Although satirical novels written in this period aimed to criticize the way Turkey was westernized, they paradoxically helped “the Western” ways of life to be “imported.” That is, they criticized the Turkish westernization since they believed it was carried out in a “wrong”/superficial way (Westernization of dressing, eating and entertainment habits), so they assumed that there was a more substantial

¹⁵² The criminal biography (*Jonathan Wild* [1743] by Fielding), the beast-fable (*Animal Farm* [1945] by Orwell), the utopia (*Brave New World* [1932] by Huxley), the imaginary journey (*Gulliver’s Travels* [1726] by Swift) and the biblical parallel (*Absalom and Achitophel* [1681-2] by Dryden).

“right path” to modernization, which is thinking and behaving like a Westerner. Some major examples of the Turkish satirical novel which preceded Tanpınar’s work are *Felâton Bey and Râkım Efendi* (1875) by Ahmet Midhat Efendi, *Araba Sevdası* (1896) by Rezaizade Mahmut Ekrem, *Şipsevdi* (1911) by H. R. Gürpınar, and *Ay Peşinde* (1922) by H. R. Karay. Although Ahmed Midhat Efendi, Rezaizade Mahmut Ekrem and H. R. Gürpınar wrote novels with a satirical purpose, it was Tanpınar who first started a systematic employment of satire in the modern Turkish novel which is blended with irony and humor.¹⁵³ His style later influenced the work of some other Turkish novelists like Oğuz Atay (1934-1977) and Adalet Ağaoğlu (1929-). So, in terms of the working definitions and the characteristics explained above, Huxley’s *Brave New World* and Tanpınar’s *The Time Regulation Institute* should be regarded as two early examples of the modern satirical novel.

The rest of the chapter will explore the generic and content-related similarities and differences between *Brave New World* and *The Time Regulation Institute* in order to emphasize whether Huxley’s and Tanpınar’s satirical novels display any intellectual parallelisms, specifically in relation to the writers’ problematization of modernity and modernization.

4.1.1 *Brave New World* as a Satirical Dystopian Novel of Ideas

In this part of the chapter the generic features of Huxley’s *Brave New World* as a modern satirical and dystopian novel of ideas will be discussed. Since the novel also participates in the subgenre of the dystopian novel, the term “dystopian novel of ideas” will be used in the analysis of the novel. An analysis of *Brave New World* as a dystopian novel contributes to the main argument of the chapter because this section illustrates Huxley’s fears concerning a world driven by totalitarian ideologies, uncontrolled

¹⁵³ Walter Feldman “Time Memory and Autobiography in the *Time-Setting Institute* of Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar (38); Berna Moran “Introduction” to *The Time Regulation Institute* (3).

science and over-consumption, which constitute a large part of his overall criticism of modernity.

In England, according to Meckier, it is three twentieth-century novelists, “Huxley, Waugh and Powell, [who] made the satirical novel a recognizable modern genre” (*Modern Satirical* 6) although some of the novels of Fielding, Dickens, and Peacock also participate in this subgenre. Reed Way Dasenbrock describes *Brave New World* as “an experiment in visionary or utopian satiric tradition” (247). Moran, too, emphasizes the novel’s engagement with satire and dystopia by stating that Huxley, as one of the writers of the satiric tradition, used “dystopia as a form of satire” in this novel (“The Time Regulation Institute” 274).

In the twentieth century it was science which urged both utopian and dystopian thinking. Along with the growing skepticism towards the utopian promise of science and technology, thinkers like Nietzsche, Foucault and Adorno, and novelists like Zamyatin, Huxley and Orwell warned their readers of the disruptive and upsetting effects of an overreliance on scientific and technological thinking. The dystopian novels of Zamyatin, Huxley and Orwell, which are taken as the defining texts of the twentieth century Western dystopian novel, depict the state of the world in which some utopian visions are realized, but only in the form of nightmares.

Gregory Claeys distinguishes “dystopia” from “utopia” as follows:

‘[d]ystopia’ is often used interchangeably with ‘anti-utopia’ or ‘negative utopia’, by contrast to utopia [no place] or ‘eutopia’ (good place), to describe a fictional portrayal of a society in which evil, or negative social and political developments, have the upper hand, or as a satire of utopian aspirations which attempts to show up their fallacies, or which demonstrate, in B. F. Skinner’s words, ‘ways of life we must be sure to avoid.’ (107)

While utopias are depictions of ideal or dream societies, dystopias concern themselves with nightmarish future societies. Although it is widely accepted that dystopia is an “anti-utopia” or “negative-utopia” as pointed out above, it should be underlined that the relationship between utopia and dystopia cannot simply be explained in terms of opposition or negation, since utopia

and dystopia have some inherently-formed and overlapping structures.¹⁵⁴ Utopian fiction portrays an ideal society imagined in order to raise a criticism of the current order of things. Dystopian fiction generally depicts utopian visions gone awry. Yet, it allows for constructive suggestions for social change: “the successful dystopia cannot pose problems that readers will perceive as beyond their ability to change: the mission is to motivate the reader, not merely to horrify” (Sisk 11). So relying on these interconnected purposes and structures of utopian and dystopian visions, one can claim that utopia and dystopia are not fundamentally opposed projects, as it will be demonstrated in Huxley’s novel.

Perhaps the most fundamental characteristic of the dystopian novel is the use of the technique of defamiliarization. In most dystopian novels events take place in the future; the dystopian novel, then, is a projection of its writer’s fears into the distant future of a society, usually of a utopian society scientifically planned and founded. So, it should be stated that the satiric impulse is closely related to idea of creating other worlds to “provide fresh perspectives on problematic social and political practices that might otherwise be taken for granted or considered natural and inevitable” (Booker, “Introduction” 19). What motivates dystopian writers to create other worlds is explained by Dasenbrock as follows: “[w]e can get a more analytic perspective on the world we live in by creating a version of reality in a wildly different form, and so the relation between the satiric and the utopian tradition is a complexly linked one” (243). That the dystopian novel’s setting is usually a future society, which is a different world from the reader’s, makes dystopian fiction resemble science fiction. Unlike science fiction, however, dystopian fiction is always concerned with social or political criticism.

Brave New World takes place in a future time, 2540 A. D. or “in this year of stability A. F. [After Ford] 632” (*Brave New World* 2). As Mustapha

¹⁵⁴ To complicate the issue more, M. Keith Booker claims that “one man’s utopia is another man’s dystopia” (15).

Mond, one of the ten World Controllers, explains, “the introduction of Our Ford’s first T-Model [was] chosen as the opening date of the new era” (*Brave New World* 46). There are two places functioning as the setting in the novel: the World State in London and the Savage Reservation in New Mexico.¹⁵⁵ Setting the novel at a so remote date estranges the readers from their real time and place. If we recall *Point Counter Point*, Rampion depicts his bleak predictions of the world’s future, and the world of *Brave New World* is just the same as what Rampion had foreseen: a 1930 vision of world, a culmination of industrialism and Americanization realized “in the name of science, progress, and human happiness” (*Point Counter Point* 356).

According to Claeys, English dystopian literature focuses on two major themes: “the socialist engineering of human behavior via the reconstruction of society; and the eugenic engineering of human behavior via the biological manipulation” (109). In *Brave New World* scientism emerges as a tool of oppression. In the same way, the figure of the scientist is also used as a satirical tool in some of Huxley’s novels like Shearwater in *Antic Hay* (1923), Lord Edward Tantamount and Illidge in *Point Counter Point* (1928), Mustapha Mond in *Brave New World* (1932), Anthony Beavis in *Eyeless in Gaza* (1936) and Dr. Obispo in *After Many A Summer* (1939).¹⁵⁶

As another technical feature of the dystopian novel, we can mention the element of a backstory. A backstory refers to the events that happened in the life of characters before the beginning of a fictional story. In a dystopian novel, the backstory generally explains how this nightmarish world has emerged or how it has become different from the world familiar to the reader. Thus, it disturbs the reader by presenting a bleak picture of the present, that is, the time of publication. In *Brave New World* the backstory is

¹⁵⁵ Huxley’s choice of London and New Mexico as the settings for his novel will be elaborated while analyzing Huxley’s understanding of the modern and of “civilization vs. barbarity” towards the end of the chapter.

¹⁵⁶ Huxley’s use of “the scientist as a character” in *Brave New World* will be explored later.

not explicitly given but the reader understands the key parts of it by eavesdropping on several explanatory conversations between the characters.

Meckier holds that *Brave New World*

opens *in medias res* and showers the reader with a series of unexplained details. [...] Huxley suddenly introduces the reader into a new world, and it is not until the momentum with which puzzling details are presented slows down that one becomes an informed visitor and is ready for an explanation of how the society one lives in has become the society one is reading about. (*Satire and Structure* 184)

To introduce the reader to the brave new world or the World State, the novel first concentrates on the main scientific factors and the most important of these is the “manufacture” of human beings designed for their predestined social functions. This is “the state manipulation of the biological make-up of society” (Bradshaw, “Introduction” 5). Some “Alpha” students, and the reader, are given information through a tour taking place in the “Central London Hatchery and Conditioning Center,” guided by its Director who is called “the DHC” (*Brave New World* 2). The DHC gives a presentation about the function of the several departments of the center. Since the World State does not trust the “pre-modern” ways of human reproduction and the idea of family, scientists manufacture human beings in test-tubes and through chemical differentiations they decide whether the human being will become an “Alpha,” a member of the top group of the social pyramid and destined to control the world, and an “Epsilon,” a member of the bottom part of the social pyramid. Alphas get the most oxygen in order to have the best brains, but Epsilons get the least because they do not need to have best brains to do the work they are responsible with. The other classes in between them are “Beta,” “Gamma,” and “Delta.” *Brave New World’s* society is thus a highly stratified one whose members’ social destinies are pre-determined according to the needs of the society. Those members who are destined for the lower castes undergo a process of

“bokanovskification,”¹⁵⁷ which arrests the fertilized egg’s development. Reminiscent of eugenics, this process brings about standard Epsilons, Gammas and Deltas who play the most important role in the stability of the World State: they constitute the labor force and they are produced and trained to fulfill their work without thinking or questioning. They are conditioned to like their servitude and never create trouble for the World Controllers. As the DHC emphasizes, “the secret of happiness and virtue [is] liking what you’ve *got* to do. All conditioning aims at that: making people like their unescapable social destiny” (*Brave New World* 13). Hence, at the very beginning of the novel, the reader is also informed that these human beings, if they can still be called that, as the novel asks, undergo social conditioning in “Neo-Pavlovian Conditioning Rooms” (*Brave New World* 16). The World State conditions all people to hate nature (e.g. flowers, trees), art and anything connected with mental effort (e.g. books, historical monuments); instead, they are conditioned to love promiscuity and excessive consumption of manufactured articles because this is “in the interests of industry” (*Brave New World* 44). In the conditioning rooms, infants are further conditioned (through the technique of “hypnopaedia” or sleep-teaching) to love their own caste. To illustrate, during the tour, the DHC plays a recording which is used to condition the Beta children:

Alpha children wear grey. They work much harder than we do, because they’re so frightfully clever. I’m really awfully glad I’m Beta, because I don’t work so hard. And then we are much better than the Gammas and Deltas. Gammas are stupid. They all wear green, and Delta children wear khaki. Oh no, I *don’t* want to play with Delta children. And Epsilons are still worse. They are too stupid to be able to... (*Brave New World* 24)

¹⁵⁷ Huxley uses the name Bokanovsky to describe an early cloning process. By this name, perhaps he alludes to the French politician Maurice Bokanovsky (1879-1928), who tried to achieve economic and political stability (Sexton, “Aldous Huxley’s Bokanovsky” 85). Huxley probably associated Maurice Bokanovsky with being the advocate of the rationalization of industry in France. Bokanovsky was also concerned with the economic problem of undesirable birth rates in France therefore; in Huxley’s satiric dystopian novel, he was an appropriate figure to be the name-giver of the World State’s cloning of human beings.

These “suggestions from the State” (*Brave New World* 25) and the messages of these suggestions vary according to the target listeners, creating class consciousness and maintaining the caste system. The social regulators in the World State use language, rhymes and hypnopædic phrases to manipulate the minds of the masses to make them fulfill their pre-destined roles obediently. Thus, it can be seen that Huxley envisaged propaganda being used as a legitimate tool of state control. Language becomes a means of manipulation or propaganda in the hands of Controllers as one of the significant characters in the novel, Helmholtz Watson, an Alpha-plus lecturer at the College of Emotional Engineering, claims, saying that “words can be like X-rays, if you use them properly they’ll go through anything. You read and you are pierced” (62). Words are used in such a way that they make all citizens conform to the rules set by the World Controller. Some of the slogans are recurrently uttered by the characters and they are all related to praise of promiscuity, over-consumption of goods, progress, civilization and using soma. Some of these slogans are: “[e]veryone belongs to everyone else” (35), “[e]nding is better than mending” (43), “[t]he more stitches, the less riches” (44), “[e]verybody is happy now” (67), “[w]hen the individual feels, the community reels” (84), “[c]ivilization is sterilization” (98), [p]rogress is lovely (90), “[o]ne cubic centimeter cures ten gloomy sentiments” (48), “[a] gramme is better than a damn” (49) and “[I] drink to my annihilation” (72). Scattered throughout the novel, these slogans direct the reader to understand the basic principles of the World State: the dominant ideology in the brave new world or “the civilized world” (92) prioritizes self-delusion and immediate gratification of all desires by generating an excessive consumption of products and simple entertainment and the feeling of happiness among the people in the World State.¹⁵⁸ Thus, it induces and disseminates its propaganda of oblivion, obedience, steadfast

¹⁵⁸ In the rest of the chapter, the use and function of slogans in both *Brave New World* and *The Time Regulation Institute* will be highlighted as a similarity between the two novels.

infancy, triviality and the prioritizing of society over the individual by means of technological and scientific tools, techniques and interventions.

Before proceeding with a discussion on the historical background of the novel, it is useful to introduce some of its major characters. The two Alpha male citizens, Bernard Marx and Helmholtz Watson, are depicted as misfits who are discontented with the society they live in because both develop some tendencies that the World State regards as subversive, like having pleasure in being alone and abstaining from sex. As Guinevera Nance points out, “being more individualistic genetically and less restrictively conditioned, the Alphas are the most susceptible to disaffection” (72). Having different reasons for being discontented with the society they live in, Bernard and Helmholtz feel isolated and lonely. Bernard’s isolation stems from a physical defect and his inability to fit in the society although he really longs to. About his defect the narrator states “[t]oo little bone and brawn had isolated Bernard from his fellow men, and the sense of this apartness, being, by all the current standards, a mental excess, became in its turn a cause of wider separation” (60). His friend Helmholtz, on the other hand, feels lonely because he is clever enough to realize that the World State provides happiness and satisfaction at the expense of their freedom. During one of his talks with Bernard, he confesses his thoughts about “a queer feeling and extra power inside him:”

‘[d]id you ever feel,’ he asked, ‘as though you had something inside you that was only waiting for you to give it a chance to come out? Some sort of *extra power* that you aren’t using – you know, like all the water that goes down the falls instead of through the turbines?’ He looked at Bernard questioningly. [...] ‘I’m thinking of a queer feeling I sometimes get, a feeling that I’ve got something important to say and the power to say it – only I don’t know what it is, and I can’t make any use of the power. (emphasis added, *Brave New World* 61-62)

Helmholtz cannot express what this “extra power” is and he does not know the appropriate methods to think differently from the way that is taught by the World State. Yet, it is clear that, due to “the extra power inside him,” he

cannot help imagining what it would be like if things were different. Even though he cannot produce a philosophical criticism of his own society, he finds it insufficient and unsatisfactory. This is a part of the backstory of the novel and the plot gets complicated when these Alphas meet another alienated man, John the Savage, someone coming from another society.

The introduction of John the Savage into the story makes the questions raised by the novel become more explicit and the satire directed to the World State and Mustapha Mond becomes more severe. The other society in the novel is called the Savage Reservation and it is the complete opposite of the controlled and sterile World State, from which it is segregated by electrified fences. Every aspect of the Savage Reservation contradicts life in the World State: they lack technology, make love, give birth, raise families, live close to nature and die of old age. John the Savage's mother, Linda, is a Beta who had got lost in one of her journeys to the Reservation with an Alpha man, the DHC. Lost in a totally strange environment populated by "savages," Linda also learned that she was pregnant with child by the DHC. She gave birth to John in the Reservation, which prevented her from going back to the World State because it bans giving births. John is called the Savage, yet he is not thoroughly a savage: having parents from the World State, yet obliged to live as a stranger among the Pueblo Indians, John experiences a series of difficulties caused by his unusual situation. Although he tries to be like the Indians by joining in their tribal rituals, his physical appearance and his mother's behavior mark him as separate from them and keep him isolated from them. All his happiness lies in reading Shakespeare's work, a volume of which has been given to him by one of his mother's lovers, Popé. That is, John, who is later called the Savage by the people of the World State, has already been isolated in the primitive culture. Being already an outcast from the primitive culture, John readily accepts Bernard's offer to live in the World State, which John has always idealized on the basis of the stories told by his mother. He even rejoices in this invitation by quoting from Miranda's speech in *The Tempest*:

O, wonder!
How many goodly creatures are there here!
How beauteous mankind is! O brave new world
That has such people in't! (Act V-Scene I)

Shakespeare's dramatic irony is here repeated when John thinks that everything is great in the "Other Place" imagining the World State as the "brave new world." It should also be emphasized that Shakespeare's *The Tempest* provides an important equivalent to *Brave New World* in that the two texts relate to one another in terms of two characters' moments of irony. Although John reads Shakespeare's play several times, he does not perceive the irony of Miranda's exclamation, "O brave new world" (Act V, Scene I). Through this ironic exclamation, and its use as the novel's title, Huxley's novel makes a connection between Miranda's and John's naïve enthusiasm, and it is implied that, like Prospero's island, the Brave New World is neither an exciting nor a happy place. To John's excessively hopeful remark, Bernard reacts by wryly stating "[h]adn't you better wait till you actually see the new world?" (126).

Transferred to the World State together with his mother, John himself comes to a realization of its less than idyllic nature after witnessing the ways and rules that the system forces on its individuals. He is horrified by the Malthusian Drill (a way of contraceptive), Death Conditioning, the prohibition of books (including Shakespeare), the use of soma, feelies (a sensory cinematic experience in which viewers feel everything with their senses), promiscuity and Bokanovsky Group workers, who are produced by the Bokanovsky process. These enforcements that are meant to keep people happy and stable in the World State disillusion him since he realizes that they devalue the individual and let him/her lead an insipid life devoid of creativity and freedom. John eventually sees the World State as a hell which derives its strength from producing uniform masses and, ironically, providing them with incessant happiness.

After breaking the rules of the World State, the three "renegades," as Nance calls them (79), Bernard, Helmholtz and John, confront the World

Controller. In fact, this confrontation between two opposing ideas, between Mustapha Mond and John, is the *raison d'être* of the novel: when Bernard retreats from his ideas and Helmholtz questions the climatic features of the place to which they will be exiled, John engages in a discussion with Mond, which proves that he is Mond's intellectual equal. When Mond defends the system by arguing that people of the World State are happy and free from disease, old age and the painful effects of unfulfilled desires, John questions the possibility of the existence of freedom and human rights in such a world, emphasizing how individual freedom and creativity has been sacrificed for the sake of happiness, comfort and stability. Mond directs an "either-or" discussion in which no one can impose his ideas onto the other, and no third alternative¹⁵⁹ or a way-out of the problem can be offered by Mond or John. After this climactic moment, John voluntarily retreats to his hermitage in an old lighthouse where he dies alone, by his own hand.

The society depicted in *Brave New World* is very much like the embodiment of the aspects of modernity that would later torment the theorists of the Frankfurt School. That is, what connects *Brave New World* with the ideas of Adorno, Horkheimer and Marcuse includes the novel's concern with the misuse of science, instrumental rationality and the Enlightenment faith in universalism. As mentioned before, Adorno briefly discussed Huxley's satirical dystopian novel in *Prisms* (1955) and he shared with Huxley "a deep distrust of instrumental rationality, that is, the ascendancy of a technologically exploitable knowledge that asserts itself without grounding itself in something broader, more fundamental" (Baker, "The Nightmare" 246). Written in the interwar period, *Brave New World* is a narrative of historical regression that is disguised as historical progression and in many ways it corresponds to a very dark picture of the world depicted in *Dialectic of Enlightenment* (1944). As mentioned in Chapter 2, Adorno and Horkheimer produced a very dark vision of the Enlightenment agenda, or dialectic of Enlightenment because they aimed to criticize the

¹⁵⁹ The novel's suggestion of a third alternative will be elaborated later in this chapter.

Enlightenment's estimation of reason as the universal and objective representative of reality. Likewise, Huxley's novel provides a critique of the totalizing assertions of reason, science and technology. As Baker claims, "*Dialectic* is an important intertext [...] that connects Huxley's critique of science and the instrumental ethic of positivism to the theoretical debate on modernity and modernism" ("The Nightmare" 248). Huxley's critique of the totalizing claims of reason, science and the instrumental rationality in this novel is a way in which he engaged in the question of modernity: as we have seen, he had become increasingly critical of modernity as failing to justify Enlightenment reason; therefore, he criticized the dark side of modernity, or the things it brought about. As Anthony Giddens claims, modernity caused "the emergence of a new type of social system (the consumer society) [...], subjecting human beings to the discipline to dull and repetitive labor [...], and totalitarian rule that connects political, military and ideological power in more concentrated form" (6-8). Huxley started to argue that "the very achievements of modernity negate and undermine themselves; that the attempt to rationalize life ends in greater irrationality, that the goal of personal freedom ends in collective compulsion, etc." (Cahoone 181). In this sense, it can be argued that by the nineteen-thirties, Huxley's attempt to create what he calls "the novel of social history" (*The Olive Tree* 23) is inseparable from his satirical dystopian view-point, through which he raised a sustained critique of the consequences of modernity.

Brave New World was written to satirize Wells's utopian novel *Men like Gods* (1923), Huxley having described it as "a novel about the future – on the horror of the Wellsian utopia and a revolt against it" (*Letters* 348). Meckier, on the other hand, claims that the target of Huxley's satire is much larger: "Huxley's dystopia puts into fictional form the outcome of trends that disturbed him for several years" (*Modern Satirical* 107). The intellectual "trends" which, Meckier thinks, disturbed Huxley were first mentioned in a *Preface* written by Huxley to J. H. Burns' 1929 *A Vision of*

Education, Being an Imaginary Verbatim Report of the First Interplanetary Conference. Huxley there foregrounds the discontent arising from the utopic ideas of H. G. Wells, Helvetius (1715-1771), and his behaviorist heirs like J. B. Watson (1878-1958) and Pavlov (1849-1936), and also Freud (1856-1939). Huxley thinks that the ideas of these thinkers and scientists paved the way for the modern theories and practices of eugenics and the idea of conditioning human beings. “As the Great Depression arrived, as fascism and communism grew in power, and World War II approached, the satiric tradition in English literature took a different turn” (Dasenbrock 246), and Huxley wrote a dystopian novel in which his moral stance and basis of condemnation became more explicit. In the twentieth century, Enlightenment optimism was replaced with a nightmarish view of the world and humankind. The “combination of annihilating war, the subsequent obliteration and erasure of cultural and historical memory” (Hitchens, “Foreword” x) and Freudian psychology’s replacement of love with the libido (Buchanan 28; Baker, *The Dark* 117) are the main social factors that led Huxley to write *Brave New World*. The philosophical conclusion that Huxley drew is that the ideals of happiness and stability of society in the 1930s in the West were pursued either with defective methods or at all costs.

Huxley adds another dimension to the satirical mode in the novel, and this is his use of “onomastic satire,” which was first identified and discussed by Meckier (*Modern Satirical* 185). He defines onomastic satire as “the ironic juxtaposition of historical names, which, through contrapuntal interplay, give body to a subtext told at the characters’ expense” (*Modern Satirical* 182). For instance, Huxley’s use of the names of letters from the Greek alphabet underscores the idea of mass-produced sameness and conformity in the World State.

Onomastic satire which is another satirical device used by Huxley in *Brave New World* has been found by several critics who have made connections between Huxley’s characters and real figures from history, but

it should be stated that although Huxley's naming in *Brave New World* is very significant and reveals themes in the novel, attempts to connect the characters with the real people remain speculative (Meckier, *Modern Satirical* 190, McGiveron 92, Higdon 172). Meckier states that "Huxley discredits carefully selected nineteenth- and twentieth-century figures by naming Brave New Worlders after them" (*Modern Satirical* 191). An Alpha, Bernard Marx seems to be named after Claude Bernard, the French physiologist who is considered the father of experimental medicine, and Karl Marx. Both Claude Bernard and Karl Marx become then a part of the satire, which implies that their ideas and successes have become means to shape a dystopian society. Thus, ironically, Bernard Marx is not a socialist. The World Controller Mustapha Mond, who is depicted as a caricature of altruistic technocrats in general and who attempts to rearrange society and keep it stable at the expense of individual freedoms and rights, is another character who seems to take his name from historical figures. His last name, for Meckier, comes from Sir Alfred Mond, who united several of England's chemical industries and became the manager of the resulting corporation (Imperial Chemical Industries Limited or ICI) in 1926, while his first name is borrowed, again according to Meckier, from two sources: "Kemal Ataturk (originally Mustapha Kemal) and Fulke Greville's Senecan closet drama, *Mustapha*¹⁶⁰ (1609)" (194). One could argue that the second source, Greville's Senecan play, seems a more appropriate source, given that Huxley had already used the famous "Chorus Sacerdotum" part from Greville's play *Mustapha* (1609) as a thematically-illuminating and poignant epigraph for his *Point Counter Point*.

The discussion between Mustapha Mond and John the Savage constitutes the philosophical dilemma of the novel and it is Helmholtz Watson who has the potential to break the stalemate between the ideas of

¹⁶⁰ The epigraph is as follows: "[O] wearisome condition of humanity! / Born under one law, to another bound; / Vainly begot and yet forbidden vanity; / Created sick, commanded to be sound. / What meaneth nature by these diverse laws? / Passion and reason, self-division cause" (Greville, *Mustapha* 1609).

John the Savage and Mustapha Mond. Helmholtz Watson could be seen as the third alternative, a solution to the stalemate, due to the fact that he discovers the key to his identity in poetry. According to Meckier, he is named after John Broadus Watson, Pavlov's best-known American disciple and Hermann von Helmholtz, the German physicist who formulated the law of conservation of energy (*Modern Satirical* 195). Meckier thinks that Helmholtz Watson is a complete mix of a behaviorist, J. B. Watson and another scientist who is known for his theories of vision, perception and energy, Herman von Helmholtz. Being a mix of Watson and Helmholtz implies that Huxley's character does not give up science nor does he relinquish the power of personal and perceptual energy. Meckier therefore argues that Helmholtz in the novel reconditions himself and experiences "a spurt of belated artistic and spiritual growth" (*Modern Satirical* 196) by transferring the ideas of J. B. Watson to his rediscovery of the self as an energy system. The novel suggests that Helmholtz will eventually learn how to activate "the extra power inside him" and to evolve into a poet.

As for Lenina Crowne, one of the most important female characters in the novel, her last name is borrowed, according to Meckier, from a Restoration playwright John Crowne, the writer of the comedy, *The Married Beau or The Curious Impertinent* (1694) based on a part in *Don Quixote* (1605). The Restoration plays portrayed objections to curiosity and jealousy, and in *The Married Beau* a husband's jealousy and his attempt to test his wife's fidelity is depicted. Crowne was also concerned to show the importance of chastity and virtue in his play; yet, ironically, Lenina Crowne is depicted as adjusting to the sexual mores and deeds of the World State. John Crowne's ideas of chastity, virtue, heroic romantic love and moral lessons are emptied and transformed into the idea of free-love and promiscuity in the pattern of dating-habits in the World State. The sexual revolution has been achieved in the World State as a consequence of

“banishing danger from assignation”¹⁶¹ (Meckier, *Modern Satirical* 190), and as a result of contraception promiscuity can be prevalent in the World State; however, sexual intercourse is now devoid of romance, feelings, and love. Lenina Crowne, a Beta worker, described as “pneumatic” (*Brave New World* 56) ironically takes her first name from Vladimir Ilyich Lenin. Naming Lenina after the Russian revolutionary is again an act of satire of her namesake because Lenina is a conformist in her society.¹⁶² Also, throughout the novel, the name of Henry Ford, the twentieth-century American industrialist, and the name of his model T car are used in the novel for their society’s Lord (God) and holy symbol (a sort of holy cross). This forcefully indicates that in the World State religion is replaced by faith in the mechanized production of goods, that is, it is the era of the worship of technology and capitalism.

To sum up, the onomastic satire in *Brave New World* subjects the historical characters indicated by their namesakes to ignorance and infamy, and through the satire they are criticized for having promoted an undesirable and malfunctioning future in which their names mean either little or nothing to the current holders. Huxley uses onomastic satire to deepen his critique of modernity by criticizing the scientists, politicians, and businessmen who have contributed to create contemporary society that is totalizing, imprisoning, maddening and ignorant, or, in his words “a vast stony structure” (*Letters* 428).

It can be briefly stated that with *Brave New World* Huxley aims to explore what the humankind risks to realize its dreams and ideals and he

¹⁶¹ In Crowne’s play the heroine who meets an admirer in a “remote and silent shade” experiences anxiety and cries, “Oh, oh, oh! I shall be undone” (“The Foolish Maid” in *The Married Beau*). Conscience-stricken, the heroine worries about the danger of seduction and scandal as a result of an affair. So, according to Meckier in Crowne’s play there is the idea of danger in assignation and the play informs the reader/audience of the dangers of having affairs (*Modern Satirical* 191).

¹⁶² Huxley’s views on socialism and communism will be touched upon in the next section.

questions if the pursuit makes it worth losing some human values.¹⁶³ It is this dilemma Huxley presents to the reader in *Brave New World*. Although the novel does not explicitly offer a way out in the novel, it strongly suggests that ends do not always justify the means. The novel is considered “a prophetic fable” (Barfoot 3) by many readers – including the Frankfurt School theorists – because of the actualization of Huxley’s dystopian vision concerning the misuse of science and technology and the betrayal of the Enlightenment’s premises.

4.1.1.1 The Historical Context of *Brave New World*

Brave New World registers the fears and hopes of the English society of the nineteen-twenties and thirties as interpreted by Huxley and it rests on carefully formulated beliefs about politics, history, and society. The intellectual climate of the nineteen-twenties and thirties was dominated by a sense of indecision and complexity, and Huxley thought that it stemmed from a clash between what in his essays collected in *Music at Night* (1931) he calls “the old romanticism and the new/modern romanticism.”

It is in the sphere of politics that the difference between the two romanticisms is most immediately apparent. The revolutionaries of a hundred years ago were democrats and individualists. For them the supreme political value was that personal liberty, which Mussolini has described as a putrefying corpse and which the Bolsheviks deride as an ideal invented by and for the leisured bourgeoisie. The men who agitated for the English Reform Bill of 1832, who engineered the Parisian revolution of 1830, were liberals. Individualism and freedom were the ultimate goods which they pursued. The aim of the Communist Revolution in Russia was to deprive the individual of every right, every vestige of personal liberty (including the liberty of thought and the right to possess a soul), and to transform him into a component cell of the great ‘Collective Man’ – that single mechanical monster who, in the Bolshevik millennium, is to take the place of the unregimented hordes of ‘soul-encumbered’ individuals who now inhabit the earth.

¹⁶³ In *Point Counter Point* a “standard” value that modern individuals should not give up, emerges as the unity and harmony of body, soul and passion in human beings. Likewise, in *Brave New World* Huxley highlights the significance of adhering to some values, and this time the values Huxley emphasizes are the individual freedom, rights, and creativity.

[...] To the Bolshevik idealist, Utopia is indistinguishable from one of Mr. Henry Ford's factories. (Huxley, "The New Romanticism" 213-4)

The old romanticism, according to Huxley, embodies the ideas of the poets and philosophers of the romantic period who endorsed individualism, personal liberty and had an optimistic view of human history. To Huxley, the new romanticism, on the other hand, entails "a conjunction of liberalism, communism, fascism, and the American industrialist capitalist Henry Ford (the presiding deity of *Brave New World*)" (Baker, *Brave New* 54). In the same essay of 1931, Huxley indicates resemblances between Ford and Lenin in terms of their obsession with industrial technology, technological progress and mass production. As Huxley saw it, "the new romanticism" denotes the collectivist ideologies of the first half of the twentieth century, which he found solely materialistic and essentially anti-liberal. Baker claims that "modern romanticism is an example of what Huxley conceived as a cultural trend. As a form of false utopianism it envisioned the goal of human history as a collective state, authoritarian and regimented" (*Brave New* 54).

Huxley's fears concerning modern science, particularly applied science and technology informed most of his novels and essays during the period between the wars. "Huxley feared that the combination of bureaucracy and technology would lead to the rise of a managerial class of technical specialists who valued order and security above all else" (Baker, *Brave New* 8). The rise of the technocrat was a fearful scenario for Huxley because he thought that with the development of applied science and technology, the nature of politics would be changed by technocrats who, by using scientific and technological means like genetic engineering, could create all-powerful states or totalitarian governments ruled by dictators. In other words, Huxley was not against science and technology nor did he question their benefits *per se*. Yet, he was well aware of a problem which can be described as a possible exploitation of technological developments by a society which is driven by a prevailing sense of consumption and

materialism, ruled by a centralized bureaucracy, and composed of obedient and conformist masses. In short, it is possible to argue that scientific ideas can be used by the governing class who, in the name of social betterment, planning and stability, may not hesitate to reduce citizens and cultural values to means or commodities, and to disregard all the intellectual, emotional, artistic endeavor and the idea of free-will and political opposition/resistance as either rubbish or threatening in the name of order and stability.

In the World State science is not non-ideological; rather, it helps to create the technological means to control the people. At this point of the discussion, one can bring up the issue of Huxley's recurrent use of the figure of the scientist in his satirical novels. In *Point Counter Point* the reader is presented with Lord Edward Tantamount as the scientist character. Even in this early satire, Huxley mocks Lord Tantamount's futile experimentations with animals. The representation of the scientist's unending desire and aspiration of obtaining a deeper understanding of life, the nature of the universe is depicted as his playing the role of God. Huxley at this stage of his writing career finds Lord Tantamount's experimentations with animals absurd and ridiculous. Yet, in time, the desires of the scientist character grew more problematic because to Huxley his desires became the very epitome of domination and threat to the nature of humans and the world. *Brave New World* too includes an ambitious scientist character, Mustapha Mond. Mond "functions as a social planner in a Taylorized world of docile citizen consumers" (Baker, "Science and Modernity" 43). "Taylorized" and "Fordist" are adjectives which are today widely used to denote a production system invented by American industrialists Henry Ford and Frederick Winslow Taylor better known as assembly line to increase productivity and efficiency. In Huxley's *Brave New World*, this system – assembly line – is applied to all aspects of life as social engineering by the rulers of the World State. The satirical portrayal of Mond is important in that it marks a significant shift in Huxley's approach to

science and scientists: compared to the figure of the ridiculous scientist, Lord Tantamount, in *Point Counter Point*, Mond in *Brave New World* is “the more self-assured and domineering technocratic sadist” (Baker, “Science and Modernity” 43). The figure of Marquise de Sade and sadism, which have influenced Huxley (and later the writers of *Dialectic of Enlightenment*), seem to have informed Huxley’s portrayal of Mond. As Baker claims:

[t]he Marquise de Sade was a symbolic figure who represented the desire for mastery, in particular, the mastery of both human and external nature. All [Huxley, Adorno and Horkheimer] associated de Sade with instrumental reason or applied science as a master trope for the Enlightenment ideology that, predicated on the ostensibly irrefutable results of scientific positivism, reduced everything to measurement, efficiency, instrumentality, and a rationalism bent on exploiting and controlling the natural world. (“Science and Modernity” 41)

As the master controller of the World State, Mond is a Sadeian figure. Huxley (and the Frankfurt School thinkers) took the Sadeian figure¹⁶⁴ negatively as a merciless and shrewd person. Therefore, Mond as a Sadeian figure was depicted as a competent ideologue and manipulator who aligns his technocratic ideology with science, communal entertainment and religion. In the third chapter of Huxley’s novel, Mustapha Mond lectures children about why the World State is the best way of governing:

‘[a]nd do you know what a ‘home’ was? Home, home – a few small rooms, stiflingly over – [...]. No air, no space; an understerilized prison; darkness, disease, and smells. Psychically, it was a rabbit hole, a midden, hot with the frictions of tightly packed life, reeking with emotion. What suffocating intimacies, what dangerous, insane, obscene relationships between the members of the family group! Maniacally, the mother brooded over her children (her children) ...’ [...]. ‘Our Freud had been the first to reveal the appalling dangers of family life. The world was full of fathers – was therefore full of misery; full of mothers – therefore of every kind of perversion from sadism to chastity; full of brothers, sisters, uncles, aunts-full of madness and suicide.’ [...]. ‘We have the World State now. And

¹⁶⁴ In Adorno and Horkheimer’s *Dialectic of Enlightenment* there is an essay titled “Juliette or Enlightenment and Morality” in which they criticize the Sadeian figure as the embodiment of the enlightenment philosophy: cruel and totalitarian.

Ford's Day celebrations, and Community Sings, and Solidarity Services.' [...] 'Now – such is progress – the old men work, the old men copulate, the old men have no time, no leisure from pleasure, not a moment to sit down and think – or if ever by some unlucky chance such a crevice of time should yawn in the solid substance of their distractions, there is always soma, delicious soma.' (*Brave New World* 32, 34, 49)

Mond contrasts the stable behaviorist present of the World State with its unstable neurotic past by concentrating on the nuclear family as a social institution. He states that prior to the establishment of his scientific utopia, there was a world of chaos. So, he argues that

'[n]o wonder these poor pre-moderns were mad and wicked and miserable. Their world didn't allow them to take things easily, didn't allow them to be sane, virtuous, happy. What with mothers and lovers, what with the prohibitions they were not conditioned to obey, what with the temptations and the lonely remorse, what with all the diseases and the endless isolating pain, what with the uncertainties and the poverty – they were forced to feel strongly. And feeling strongly (and strongly, what was more, in solitude, in hopelessly individual isolation), how could they be stable?'(36)

Mond has no faith in humanity's capacity for creative and intellectual labor. He degrades the family because he thinks it is "the source of all evil" (*Brave New World* 35), which is therefore rendered obsolete by the World State technology. In a society where promiscuity is regarded as virtue, Mond explains his feeling of disgust with familial relationships. He is proud of reducing the "interval of time between desire and consummation" (40) through the universal availability of the objects of desire. So in the novel it is emphasized that everything, even women and men, are commodified in the World State because they live on the rule that orders that "everyone belongs to everyone else" (35). Mond's thoughts and comparisons of "the modern" world with "the pre-modern" one also reveal the fact that Mond as an ideologue would like to believe that when he wants something, it is not merely for his own personal advantage, but that his desires are dictated by pure reason. His claims imply that the World State is complete, natural and necessary, and people should be grateful to him for bringing order, stability

and happiness to their world. Therefore, he insists on the importance of stability, which he takes as the “primal and the ultimate need” (*Brave New World* 38) to create social order of hedonistic conformity, and so ironically alluding to Voltaire’s *Candide* (1759), he justifies himself by arguing that “all’s well with the world” (39). According to Mond, the chaotic world of the past was practically ordered, controlled and tamed via technology and science.

As in *Point Counter Point*, Huxley uses the counterpoint technique in *Brave New World*: two competing world views – progressivism and primitivism – are counterpointed. In *Point Counter Point* the characters speculated about the imminent downfall of (Western) societies due to the threats of dehumanization of people posed by modernity through capitalism, politics and the use of science and technology. In *Brave New World* Huxley presents the reader with a depiction of a future world where the progressivist world view has become triumphant. In Mond’s hands such notions as science, entertainment and religion become the very means of maintaining and consolidating his power and status as well as the stability of the World State. In the “utopian new era” of the World State, the World Controllers benefit from science and technology in order to repress people’s so-called anarchic desires and impulses, therefore it can be stated that in the World State, technology, science and religion are rendered means to keep the masses under control. Therefore, science and technology are allowed in the World State to the extent they guarantee the social, economic and political durability and stability of the State. Technology and science bring forth soma, feelies, obstacle golf, Community Sings and Solidarity Services and other activities as forms of entertainment bring about passive obedience and material consumption. The citizens of the World State are taught to “end [throw things away] rather than mend” (43), so they keep consuming the products and spending money and Mond emphasizes it by stating that “the machine turns, turns and must keep on turning – forever [...] wheels must turn steadily, but cannot turn untended. There must be men to tend

them, men as steady as the wheels upon their axles, sane men, obedient men, stable in contentment” (37). The World State produces forms of mindless entertainment by means of which everything is reduced to the level of social and economic utility. Taking soma is advised in the World State because it is claimed that “half a gramme for a half-holiday, a gramme for a week-end, two grammes for a trip to the gorgeous East, three for a dark eternity on the moon” (49). All these products and activities distract the residents of the World State and help ensure that its citizens conform to the rules and regulations of the World State.

In the World State, science is used as an instrument of political control to keep the community obedient, stable and contented. As the World Controller, Mond reviews the papers written by scholars and scientists and decides which are to be published or not. In chapter twelve of the novel, after reading a scientific paper titled “A New Theory of Biology,” Mond comments that: “the author’s mathematical treatment of the conception of purpose is novel and highly ingenious, but heretical and, so far as the present social order is concerned, dangerous and potentially subversive. *Not to be published,*” [...] “the author will be kept under supervision. His transference to the Marine Biological Station of St. Helena may become necessary” (emphasis original, *Brave New World* 160). Although Mond is shown to assess the work as “a masterly piece of work,” he is also depicted as believing that

once you began admitting explanations in terms of purpose – well, you didn’t know what the result might be. It was the sort of idea that might easily decondition the more unsettled minds among the higher castes – make them lose their faith in happiness as the Sovereign Good and take to believing, instead, that the goal was somewhere beyond, somewhere outside the present human sphere, that the purpose of life was not the maintenance of well-being, but some intensification and refining of consciousness, some enlargement of knowledge. (*Brave New World* 160-1)

To Mond, this scientific paper is “not, in the present circumstance, admissible” because it may lead people from higher castes to think other

than what they are taught. They may object to the present system and bring about the end of Mond's so called "happy and civilized society" (*Brave New World* 119). Mond even orders the exile of its writer from the World State lest he disperses these "heretical, dangerous and subversive" ideas and causes the shattering of Mond's theory of life's purpose upon which he founded the World State, that is, Mond's community relies on the maintenance of the well-being and happiness as the Sovereign Good. As emphasized in the novel, because Mond forbids scientific works and experiments which have the potentiality to make the individual question the present circumstances and think of alternatives to it, Mond is, in fact, not a supporter of individual development, and it can even be argued that the portrayal of Mond in the novel shows that he does not have faith in science as a means of human progress. He uses the ideas of Pavlov, J. B. Watson and Freud for a surge backward toward collectivism. In other words, it is emphasized in the novel that it is not science and technology *per se* which cause human decay, but it is the way in which they are used as a means of gaining and maintaining power over people.

By writing a political satire in the form of a dystopian novel, Huxley's intention was to underscore the concerns and problems regarding totalitarian ideologies, uncontrolled science and over-consumption which are often placed in the background in the fiction of Huxley's contemporary writers. Particularly the supposedly neutral nature of science caused Huxley to worry about ethical issues. "For Huxley, there is something monstrous and inhuman about uncontrolled science; it exists apart from humanity, driven by its particular laws and always linked to some burgeoning crisis. The resulting 'crisis' involved the unanticipated appearances of a 'new mental and physical environment'" (Baker, "Science and Modernity" 37). So, in *Brave New World* Huxley undertakes to show what "a new mental and physical environment," defined according to the applications of certain scientific and technological projections of the twentieth century, would be like.

As pointed out in Chapter 2, much of Huxley's work on the uncontrolled nature of science shaped the thought of Marcuse, especially his ideas about "technical reason." As a matter of fact, many of Huxley's writings in the thirties anticipate the major points formulated later by such theorists of the Frankfurt School as Adorno, Horkheimer and Marcuse. Huxley, as mentioned in the earlier chapters, had a great influence on the Frankfurt School theorists with his foresight concerning imminent social and political problems. Though Huxley esteemed the advances and accomplishments of modern science, he feared its potential to manipulate, control and subjugate both nature and humankind. In the same way, Adorno and Horkheimer had some reservations about historical progress and scientific materialism. As they discuss in their *Dialectic of Enlightenment* (1944), capitalism, the instrumental reason and modern subject's endeavor to objectify and master nature in the modern age made Adorno and Horkheimer grow skeptical about developments in science and technology. So, both Huxley and the Frankfurt School theorists shared a concern about the social effects of modern science and technology. Relying on their critical estimations of science and technology and their possible negative effects on society, it can be asserted that Huxley, Adorno and Horkheimer were cynical of and discontented with the modern world due to the incongruities between reality and the Enlightenment philosophers' optimistic anticipations about individuals and the world.

As discussed in Chapter 2, the nineteen-thirties is a significant turning-point in Huxley's writing career in that his philosophy of life and aesthetic practice started to change from the thirties onward: he began to grow more skeptical towards the use of science and the idea of progress and their social ramifications. As Baker puts it; "[h]is deep mistrust of instrumental reason, the popular culture industry, and technocratic forms of social organization had become, by 1934, his 'contemporary starting point' for a reassessment of Western science" ("Science and Modernity" 38). Therefore, *Brave New World* occupies a special place in Huxley's writings

both as a “reassessment of Western science,” and as a transitional work in his career: before *Brave New World* he wrote satirical novels attacking artistic, intellectual and political London society as a microcosm of the modern Western civilization, as manifested in *Point Counter Point*.¹⁶⁵ After *Brave New World*, he started to write novels which focus on the spirituality and philosophy of time because he adopted a new social and moral outlook: he embraced pacifism and Mahayana Buddhism and moved to Los Angeles in 1937 (Bedford, *The Turning Points* 534). The novels written after *Brave New World* with the exception of *Ape and Essence* (1948) have been called “the novels of transformation”¹⁶⁶ from satire to spirituality (Sion 75). Accordingly, his last novel, *Island* (1962) is a utopian novel which entails spiritualism as its major theme. In this sense, it can be argued that Huxley’s ironic and pessimistic skepticism and his satire reached a climax with *Brave New World*; in fact but his satire in *Brave New World* went beyond being a criticism of Western society and evolved into a universal dystopia. In this sense, Huxley’s social satire during the nineteen-twenties was replaced with what Dasenbrock calls “utopian or visionary satire” (244) starting from *Brave New World* on.

Written in this social and historical context, Huxley’s *Brave New World* is a literary description of totalitarianism which is consolidated by the exploitation of modern scientific and technological advances as used to regulate and control large groups of people. It is a satire that projects the dangers of totalitarianism that are inherent in the corporate state: in the World State, which is like a corporation in having concerns about making profits, the masters divert people away from meaningful matters of public concern, channeling them to politically harmless modes of childish amusement, personal mediations, and drugged, narcissistic enchantment.

¹⁶⁵ The four novels written before *Brave New World* and considered to be Huxley’s social satirical novels are *Crome Yellow* (1921), *Antic Hay* (1923), *Those Barren Leaves* (1925) and *Point Counter Point* (1928).

¹⁶⁶ They are *Eyeless in Gaza* (1936), *After Many A Summer Dies The Swan* (1939) and *Time Must Have A Stop* (1944).

Also, *Brave New World* is a warning against the bourgeois capitalism illustrated by America and the imminent developments in Western consumer society.

4.1.2 *The Time Regulation Institute* as a Satirical Allegory

This part of the chapter will focus on *The Time Regulation Institute* as a modern satirical allegory in order to foreground the novel's critical attitude to the mentality that equates modernization with Westernization. As in *A Mind at Peace*, Tanpınar aims to shed light on the issue of Turkey's problematic engagement with modernity and modernization in *The Time Regulation Institute*. In a sense, *The Time Regulation Institute* starts where *A Mind at Peace* ends: the pessimistic ending of *A Mind at Peace* that is highlighted by both Suad's suicide and the end in Mümtaz and Nuran's love affair hints at the imminent problems handled in *The Time Regulation Institute*. It can be argued that these problems were directly caused by the modernization project carried out in Turkey, which escalated after the nineteen thirties. Unlike in *A Mind at Peace* in which the wise İhsan and the Nietzschean Suad engage in a discussion about the modernization project carried out in Turkey, Tanpınar's narration in *The Time Regulation Institute* is not structured around argumentative dialogues between the characters. Rather, this novel depicts a Turkey in transformation as a consequence of the project of modernization; to put it more precisely, the Turkey before, during and after the transformation is humorously displayed.

The novel's title evinces that it is about an Institute which is set up to make certain that all clocks and watches in Turkey, starting from Istanbul, are set correctly and work in a unified manner. The main narrative, however, centers around Hayri İrdal, the protagonist and the narrator, not the Institute mentioned in the title. The reader is introduced to Halit Ayarç, another major character, and the Institute until page 306 of the novel; so it can be claimed that the novel is about neither Halit nor the time regulation institute, but about the narrator himself. In other words, the narratives of the

Time Regulation Institute and Halit Ayarçı are inserted into the life of Hayri İrdal who reflects upon his own life-story. The title also indicates *The Time Regulation Institute*'s major theme: modernization should not be understood as a mere institute/a building/a name. It should not be used to exploit the country's mania for progress. Tanpınar's understanding of the modern as displayed in *The Time Regulation Institute* will be understood better with an exploration of this theme in connection with its suggestions of "Eastern" and "Western" conceptions of time.

The novel, like *A Mind at Peace*, consists of four parts which are titled "Great Expectations," "Small Truths," "Towards Dawn" and "Every Season Has An End." The sub-title, "Great Expectations" is clearly an ironical allusion to the Dickensian bildungsroman,¹⁶⁷ and as in any bildungsroman, the deeds Hayri narrates clearly demonstrate how they have changed him or led to his personal "growth." The adult-in-the-making mode is parodied in the novel. Also, Hayri can be taken as a mock-picaro because unlike a picaro who is an outsider and untouched by the rules of society, he is well aware of his own contribution to corrupt society. In this part the reader is introduced to the novel's protagonist-narrator Hayri İrdal and his childhood experiences. Hayri himself depicts how his father's grandfather wanted to have a mosque constructed but could not afford it and left this responsibility to Hayri's father. We learn that Hayri's father also failed to fulfill his father's wish, and, therefore the artifacts, which were already bought to be placed in the mosque once constructed, have to remain in Hayri's childhood home. The reader is informed that Hayri the child was surrounded by such objects as carpets, curtains and a "queer" clock (*The Time Regulation Institute* 108) called "the Blessed One," or *Mübarek* (*The Time Regulation Institute* 45) since Hayri's mother attributed to the clock a spiritual character as either "saintly" or "evil," and saw it as definitely not from this world. In this part Hayri mentions his inexplicable attraction to

¹⁶⁷ The relationship between the orphan narrative in a bildungsroman and the nation-building attempt in the context of the modernization project carried out in Turkey will be further explored later in this chapter.

clocks and watches. Due to his poor interest in school education, Hayri becomes apprenticed to a clock and watch master called Nuri Efendi¹⁶⁸ who has a watch and clock-setting shop where Hayri helps him repair and regulate the watches and clocks. Here Hayri learns his master's philosophy of time and the relationship between humans and instruments that measure time.

The second part, "Small Truths," begins with the announcement of Hayri coming back home from the First World War. Hayri, who is married now, gets a job at the post office thanks to Abdüselam Bey, a philanthropist and friend of Aristidi Efendi, who deals with alchemy. Hayri lives in Abdüselam Bey's mansion with his wife Emine and their children Zehra and Ahmed. Hayri gets into trouble due to a complicated situation about a precious stone and is put on a trial and accused of stealing the famous "Sherbet Maker's Diamond," or *Şerbetçibaşı Elması* (*The Time Regulation Institute* 98) which, in fact, does not exist. This situation causes Hayri to experience a breakdown and he is handed over to a juridical psychiatrist, Dr. Ramiz. Having been trained in psychoanalysis in Vienna, Dr. Ramiz tends to explain each and every situation of people in Turkey in Freudian terms. This part of the novel exemplifies the novel's satire of Freudian psychoanalysis and the character, Dr. Ramiz, who represents it. As Hayri states, for Ramiz, psychoanalysis "was like a religious order leading one to the eternal truth rather than a process applicable to a patient. This new science seemed everything to him [...] It was the only key to the mystery of life" (104).¹⁶⁹ Hayri is diagnosed with "a typical father complex" (111) by Dr. Ramiz and a comical relationship begins between the two characters. In the course of his treatment, Hayri learns several terms from the field of psychoanalysis. To illustrate, Hayri is prescribed "a list of all dreams [he is] expected to see" (118) by Dr. Ramiz and it is as a part of "the newest and

¹⁶⁸ *Efendi* is used to address men and it means gentleman. Also in this chapter, several other words of addressing and honorifics in Turkish will be used, as they are in the novel, such as *Hanım* (Madam) and *Bey* (Sir).

¹⁶⁹ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 53.

the most personal method to [Hayri's] case, a method devised by [Ramiz who] calls it the 'Guided Dream' method" (119)¹⁷⁰ for the treatment of Hayri's father complex. Dr. Ramiz, after his recovery, introduces Hayri to his friends in the coffeehouse at Şehzadebaşı where the reader through Hayri witnesses how people from all walks of life in Turkey spend their leisure hours. As Hayri quotes from Dr. Ramiz, visitors of the coffeehouse "live in their imagination, in totally different worlds. They dream collective dreams" (131).¹⁷¹ After his wife's death, Hayri joins the Spiritualists Association where he meets his second wife, Pakize who is depicted as a woman who is sometimes incapable of differentiating the real life from the reality created in American movies. Hayri leads this part of his life by performing magic tricks that he learned from Seyit Lütfullah, a man who seeks the treasure of Andronicus through prayers and magic; and, together with other psychics, who are the members of the Spiritualists Association, Hayri conducts sessions for summoning spirits. This phase of his life, which is full of magic tricks and superstitions, is depicted in terms of irrationality and metaphysics by the narrator himself, and this period of his life is important to the extent that it shows whether or not there is a discrepancy between his life before and after the establishment of the institute. In other words, the novel ironically emphasizes that after the establishment of the institute Hayri's life – as an epitome of the modern Turkey – has grown to be more "rational" and "productive." Therefore, the reader cannot easily identify with Hayri before or after the institute because both phases are equally satirized.

In the third and most humorous part of the novel, "Towards Dawn," Hayri encounters Halit the Regulator (*Ayarıcı*), who is amazed by Hayri's skill with watches and by his concept of time which he learned from Nuri Efendi. So, immediately after their first meeting, Halit offers him a job in

¹⁷⁰ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 54.

¹⁷¹ The idea of "idleness" (*The Time Regulation Institute* 131) and of having "collective dreams" (131) in the coffeehouses will be elaborated later in this chapter in terms of Tanpınar's understanding of time.

his new enterprise, the Time Regulation Institute. Hayri is to be the assistant director. Initially, Hayri has some reservations regarding the Institute; for instance, he questions his state of “having employment but no work” (207). Halit the Regulator tries to influence Hayri via his modern/“Western” philosophy of time and work, and his capitalistic vision of establishing new markets for the masses. When Hayri voices his doubts about the Institute, Halit condemns him for lacking faith in them and for being conservative. Halit believes that Hayri’s attitude is “outmoded” (202) and “obsolete” (221). According to Halit, lacking faith in the idea of the new stems from the old-fashioned “Eastern” working and thinking habits and they absolutely have no place in the “new world [populated by] the new man” (203). Influenced by the discourse produced by the liberal tradition of modernity, Halit the Regulator identifies the modern and courage with “the West” and the conservative and cowardice with “the East,” so he despises Hayri whom he finds cowardly and “Eastern”. Halit emphasizes the distinct features of the new reality they live in: “[o]riginal and new. Be careful, I’m saying new, NEW! Where there is new there’s no need for any other merit” (202).¹⁷² Bombarded by the words of the master of manipulation (a.k.a Halit the Regulator), Hayri cannot object to his benefactor, and later he yields to deceit and embraces hypocrisy. Nuri Efendi’s sayings about his own conceptualization of time revitalized through Hayri are re-arranged and used for the campaign of disseminating Halit the Regulator’s “modern” and capitalistic concept of time and work. Astonishingly, the Institute thrives and enjoys a worldwide fame. At a point on their way to success, Hayri is even forced to fabricate a great Ottoman thinker of time whose knowledge is comparable to the European great philosophers of the Enlightenment Age, and so Hayri writes a book about Sheik Ahmed the Timely (*Zamani*) Efendi. This very prolific Ottoman philosopher of time, who is imagined to have lived in the seventeenth century, is so popularized by Halit the Regulator’s campaigns that a Dutch Orientalist called Van Humbert pays a visit to

¹⁷² For Turkish see Appendix A, note 55.

Turkey to see his grave. The information regarding Hayri's bestselling and well-known account on the life of Sheikh Ahmet the Timely and the visit of the Dutch Orientalist are minor details in the novel. However, they can be regarded significant to the extent they contribute to the satirical tone of the novel: the novel satirizes the orientalist viewpoint that stereotypes "the East" as an exotic and fantasy land and criticizes the view that essentializes "the East" as a laboratory where Eastern societies are studied and thereby a view of Eastern culture is fabricated. Also mentioning the Dutch orientalist helps the novel satirize the Turkish wish to be approved by "the West:" the novel satirizes a mentality which assumes that when Van Humbert, a westerner, approves the validity of Sheikh Ahmet the Timely, the Time Regulation Institute – the epitome of the modernization project of Turkey – seems to be more valid and functional.

In the last part of the novel, "Every Season Has an End," Halit the Regulator wants Hayri to design the most unusual and flamboyant building for the Institute: a building in the shape of a giant clock. When Hayri designs houses for the personnel of the Institute, they object to this idea because when their personal affairs are concerned, they do not seem to be open to change and modernization. So, Halit the Regulator feels disappointed and leaves the Institute. No sooner does he withdraw from the Institute than a group of American experts come to the Institute to explore it. According to American experts' report there is no point in the existence of such an institute so the Municipality of Istanbul orders its liquidation. As in the visit of the Dutch Orientalist, the visit of American experts is used to make the same criticism: just as the institute's validity and maintenance depend on positive feedback from a westerner, the decision of its liquidation also relies on "the West." That is, characters in the novel can believe that the institute is useless and absurd only when "Western experts" report its impracticality. It can thus be argued that the novel is a satire on Turkey's attempt at modernization, which is narrated by Hayri Irdal whose

misadventures can be read as an allegory for the clash between East and West.

The novelist of a modern satirical novel may use an omniscient or a first-person narrator, and his/her choice depends on the satirical tone and target of the novel. Huxley, for example, employs a third-person omniscient narrator in *Brave New World* because, as it will be further revealed in this chapter, this narrator suits the purpose of creating an impression of absolute objectivity. The nature of the narrator in *Brave New World* thus seems to permit the reader to make his/her own judgments. Unlike *Brave New World*, Tanpınar's satirical novel is narrated from the first-person point of view as a fictional character's memoir; the novel is read as Hayri İrdal's autobiography. In this sense, the novel has a metafictional dimension. This type of narration is often regarded as unreliable because the reader cannot know anything unmediated by the narrator's subjective point of view. It can be argued that due to the nature of first-person narration, nothing and nobody in the novel can exist apart from the life of the narrator, that is, the reader is introduced to incidents and people only as they come into and take a part in the narrator's life story or thoughts. By casting the narrative in the first-person, Tanpınar leaves the reader completely at the mercy of Hayri's subjective perception of events. Tanpınar further complicates the issue of Hayri's unreliability by adding a postscript, which he did not publish. In this postscript Hayri is claimed to be a paranoid. As Moran argues the issue of the postscript is a "defensive self-censorship which Tanpınar might have prepared in case the social satire of his text proved to be too harsh for the political climate" ("The Time Regulation" 329). What is more, the novel's protagonist-narrator also claims that he is writing this book retrospectively not in the manner of a confession of his sins as in an autobiography, but rather as a record of the talks and activities of his dear benefactor, Halit the Regulator, who changed his life in a positive way. The retrospective narration of Hayri also demonstrates that the Hayri who addresses to the reader is an old person who tries to rationalize his actions and evade his

responsibility. The retrospective narration thus also makes Hayri a less trustable narrator due to his flawed perception and because memory itself tends to be selective.

Tanpınar's novel is an example of satirical allegory.¹⁷³ Tanpınar always dealt with important and controversial issues in his literary and non-literary writings. The Turkey which emerged as a consequence of the modernization project had not much to do with the modern Turkey in Tanpınar's mind, so this problem and its critique constituted the main theme of his writings. In *The Time Regulation Institute* satire is founded, apart from allegory, on irony and a humorous mode. The novel foregrounds some tragicomic and absurd¹⁷⁴ (*abes*) moments and figures through the employment of irony with a satirical purpose. Through the employment of irony, the satire in the novel becomes more subtle, but not less effective. Humor is also a tool of criticism Tanpınar uses in his novel and his humor causes laughter and provokes thought at the same time. As a satirical allegory, *The Time Regulation Institute* has two levels: Hayri İrdal's autobiographical narrative consisting of characters such as Halit Ayarç, Dr. Ramiz and the Institute constitutes the outer layer of the novel. And through these allegorical figures the reader is led towards the inner layer of the novel: a critique of an understanding of modernity and modernization as experienced in Turkey.

The Time Regulation Institute also critiques several belief systems and their outcomes – alchemy, psychoanalysis, spiritualism, politics and the

¹⁷³ A satirical allegory is a form of satiric expression and it describes a story that is based on a combination of the elements of allegory and satire, that is, the satirist uses allegory to satirize a subject. It can be claimed that an allegorical mode is quite common in Turkish literature. The early novels written in the *Tanzimat* period such as *The Love of Talat and Fitnat* (*Taaşuk-u Tal'at ve Fitnat* 1875), *The Awakening* (*Intibah* 1876) and *The Carriage Affair* (*Araba Sevdası* 1896) also instrumentalized satirical allegory in order to disseminate their writers' political aims.

¹⁷⁴ The sense of absurd for Tanpınar is not the same as that of Existentialism. To state it briefly, the absurd in Existentialism refers to the confrontation between human needs and the silence of the world; the absence of meaning in life (*Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*). However, in Tanpınar's novel the absurd refers to the unreasonable, preposterous and ridiculous situations to consolidate the satirical mode.

Hollywood movies – through the characters that are used as allegorical figures. To begin with, it can be argued that Hayri is a Turkish Everyman who experiences the modernization project carried out in Turkey because, as Martin Riker puts it, his life-story (and consequently, the entire novel itself) “resembles at many turns the journey of the Turkish people into modernity” (www.nytimes.com). The whole story in the novel is narrated in the form of Hayri İrdal’s memories. Right from the beginning, Hayri represents himself as a lay person who can hardly be considered an intellectual:

‘[e]veryone knows that I am not much of a scholar. Except for the stories of Jules Verne and Nick Carter, which I read in my childhood, my education consists of what I could glean from the history books I leafed through [...], and from such storybooks as *The Thousand and One Nights*, the *Tale of the Parrot*, and Ebu Ali Sinâ. [...] Before the establishment of our institute, I had, now and then, taken the opportunity of glancing at the schoolbooks of my children. It also often happened that I read articles and serials in the dailies at the coffeehouses of Edirnekapı and Sehzadebaşı where I fooled away my time.’ (*The Time Regulation Institute* 27)¹⁷⁵

Hayri is not a writer as he himself confesses above and he shows himself lacking a literary taste and an artistic compulsion. As noted above, his relationship with reading and writing is a limited one. It can even be claimed that his reading materials, mentioned above, show that his preference of literature is that of a teenager. Hayri is a character who lacks intellectual depth, and compared to the major characters in *Point Counter Point*, he is just the opposite of characters like Mümtaz and İhsan.

It can be asserted that Hayri is a sort of mirror, wherein beholders are expected to discover their own faces. Hayri is a representative of Turkish people who experience modernization as a “break” in their existence, a shift from “the East” to “the West,” and a crisis/a trauma in their identity. To illustrate, when Halit asks him to dress like a bureaucrat and wear a suit, Hayri feels

a dramatic shift in my entire being. New horizons and perspectives suddenly unfurled before me. Like Halit Ayarç, I began to perceive

¹⁷⁵ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 56.

life as a single entity. I began to use terms like ‘modification,’ ‘coordination,’ ‘work structure,’ ‘mind-set shift,’ ‘metathought,’ and ‘scientific mentality.’ [...] I even made imprudent comparisons between East and the West, and passed judgments whose gravity left me terrified. [...] In a word, it seemed as if his courage and powers of invention had been transferred to me, as if it were not a suit at all but a magic cloak. (*The Time Regulation Institute* 35)¹⁷⁶

In the quotation above, the novel makes fun of the mentality that sees wearing a suit as a sign of a magical personal transformation. Through Hayri, all Turkish people that awkwardly try to mimic the ways (and words) of Western societies are satirized by the novel. Read as an allegory, Hayri is a microcosm of Turkey which tries hard to modernize, in fact, to Westernize, and ends up with experiencing duality. Tanpınar in his essay, “Medeniyet Değiştirmesi ve İç İnsan (1951) states that “duality has first started in the general public life, then it has divided our society into two in terms of mentality, and at last, it has deepened its process by situating this duality inside every individual” (*Yaşadığım Gibi* 34).¹⁷⁷ Tanpınar’s sociological observation suggests that Turkish society contracted by duality is destined to fail because of a nation-wide inability to understand how modernity can be like and what it can mean in the Turkish context. This duality is foregrounded by Dr. Ramiz when he diagnoses Hayri with a sort of father complex. He claims that Hayri, as the representative of Turkey experiencing the project of modernization, could not live through the oedipal complex and failed to replace his father and reach “the Symbolic Order” in Lacanian terms (65). Ramiz also adds that “instead of taking his [Hayri’ father’s] place, you have sought a father substitute all your life. I mean you have not yet reached adulthood. You have remained a child, haven’t you?” (*The Time Regulation Institute* 112)¹⁷⁸ Ramiz’s statements can also be read as an allegory of Turkey in that the novel seems to suggest

¹⁷⁶ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 57.

¹⁷⁷ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 58.

¹⁷⁸ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 59.

that the newly-founded Republic failed to take the Ottoman Empire’s place completely, and like Hayri Turkey looked for “father substitutes” in “the West” to compensate for its lost past and heritage. This nationalist discourse took its power from a differentiation of “the self” and “the other.” The past and the Ottoman Empire were taken as “the other” and “the self” was ironically invented upon the principles borrowed from “the West,” so this dilemma of the nationalistic discourse in Turkey – differentiation of Eastern civilizations from Western civilizations – caused further problems like the duality in all aspects of life. Tanpınar in the same article, “Medeniyet Değiştirmesi ve İç İnsan”, discusses the duality and the crisis Turkey went through as follows:

[t]he reason for this crisis which makes us doubt not only our deeds but the underlying principles from which they are gaining speed, which make us deal with light matters that reach the point of a joke rather than with important matters pertaining to life, or which change the character of these important matters pertaining to life and turn them into a joke is the duality which has resulted from our transition from one civilization to another. (34)¹⁷⁹

In the early years of the Republic, the problem of duality escalated more when Turkey started to look for solutions/substitutions which was thought were in Europe, or, broadly in “the West.” So Ramiz’s diagnosis in fact allegorically reveals Turkey’s problematic understanding and experience of modernization: having “local” problems but looking for their solutions elsewhere, or trying to live borrowed lives. This idea is overtly emphasized when Dr. Ramiz continues to claim that [this complex] “is not so important. It’s even quite natural. Especially in our community today. For, socially we all suffer from this illness. Just look around you, we always complain of our past, we are all preoccupied with it. [...] Young and old, we are all concerned with it” (*The Time Regulation Institute* 115).¹⁸⁰ Not admiring “the father” and seeking others for substitution is the metaphorically-

¹⁷⁹ Translated by Berna Moran in the Introduction to Tanpınar’s *Time Regulation Institute* (6). For Turkish see Appendix A, note 60.

¹⁸⁰ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 61.

explained version of Turkey's engagement with modernity and modernization. It is implied that in the end Turkey is stuck between a specter of an unappreciated past and a West which is constantly looked up to and idealized. It seems that the novel uses Dr. Ramiz as a tool to diagnose that Turkish people in general are like "infants who lack independence and maturity" (*The Time Regulation Institute* 115).

The character Halit the Regulator¹⁸¹ is one of the most effective allegoric tools in Tanpınar's satirical novel. He is an allegoric caricature of the kind of mentality the novel satirizes. Through Halit the Regulator, the novel critiques the current state of society when the novel was written. When Hayri (or Turkey) is in a state of despair, Halit the Regulator – an embodiment of a distorted conceptualization of "the West" that emerged in the early years of the new Republic – is introduced into the novel. It is distorted because Halit the Regulator represents "the West" as it is understood and mimicked during the *Tanzimat* and the early years of the Republican period.

Satire, as mentioned before, originates from the discord between traditional, social and moral values and the acts contradicting these in life so, there must be a rational system of norms shared by the implied author and the presumed reader. *The Time Regulation Institute* targets those who trespass these norms and Halit the Regulator is the main target of the novel's critique because he is displayed as the most corrupted man in the society depicted by the novel. His mistakes stand for what Tanpınar considers a major misunderstanding characterizing the modernization project: putting an end to the struggle between the old and the new, and embracing the new. This means that when the old/the past is ignored or denied, it results in a break, a duality and a state of rootlessness in consciousnesses because, to Tanpınar, the struggle between the old and the new refers to a richness and a harmony and this way of seeing is parallel to

¹⁸¹ Halit the Regulator's name, which indicates his manipulative personality, will be dealt with in the following section where Tanpınar's use of onomastic satire in *The Time Regulation Institute* is analyzed.

his idea of “to change by continuing and to continue by changing” (*Yaşadığım Gibi* 16-37).¹⁸² That is, when the old and the new exist together, their struggle, which is regarded as a positive and constructive feature, paves the way for harmony, the very idea Tanpınar called *terkip*.

Halit the Regulator is a master of manipulation and the first of his manipulative acts in the novel occurs when he tries to convince Hayri that the latter’s older sister-in-law who has no talent for music can be a great singer because, to Halit, “today’s art is a question of the masses. What the crowd applauds and what it doesn’t nobody can tell. [...] We’re living in the age of radio, first a little fame on the radio, and then perhaps she becomes a famous singer in a club, or maybe a professional vocalist ... And *voilà!*” (*The Time Regulation Institute* 201)¹⁸³ Before proceeding further, it can be claimed that *The Time Regulation Institute* through Halit the Regulator seems to illustrate the mentality of popular culture that the Frankfurt School theorists criticize in *Dialectic of Enlightenment*. According to Adorno and Horkheimer, the advance of monopoly capitalism and technology serve the culture industry which produces popular culture, consumer manipulation and product standardization (*Dialectic of Enlightenment* 135). Halit the Regulator, who is a representative of “modern times,” expresses the mentality of capitalist reason which aims to produce standardized entertainment for mass consumption through a product of technology such as the radio. Hayri objects to Halit saying that “she [his sister-in-law] knows nothing at all about music. She has no understanding of Turkish *makams*: she can’t tell the difference between a *Mahur* and *İsfahan*, a *Rast* from an *Acemişiran*”¹⁸⁴ (*The Time Regulation Institute* 201).¹⁸⁵ Yet, after a week, with Halit’s help, the sister-in-law, who has no talent for music, starts

¹⁸² For Turkish see Appendix A, note 62.

¹⁸³ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 63.

¹⁸⁴ *Mahur*, *İsfahan*, *Rast* and *Acemişiran* are tones or *makams* in classical Turkish music.

¹⁸⁵ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 64.

singing in a club and everybody applauds her with loud cheers. This dialogue between Hayri and Halit the Regulator also reflects the novel's satirical attitude to the musical taste of people who cannot even differentiate one *makam* from the other. So, after this, for Hayri, Halit the Regulator becomes a great man who has power to keep the promises he makes and to realize the most unlikely dreams. This fraud, presenting the masses with a meritless singer as if she was a great artist, is the first of his manipulations and tricks played on people around him. Halit the Regulator's philosophy of life is based on understanding "today's reality" (*The Time Regulation Institute* 202) and for him it entails "to ask how he can benefit from people and things" (203). This is what he calls "entrepreneurial spirit" (202). In their several discussions about understanding "today's reality," (202) Halit the Regulator wants Hayri to stop living according to the criteria of the past because he claims that today people "are no longer confined by the traditional mode" and "everything today is a matter of the new" (202) and "desire the change" (203).

The most significant fraud of Halit the Regulator in the novel is the establishment of the Time Regulation Institute, which he decides to set up on the basis of theories and principles learned from Hayri's master, Nuri Efendi. When Hayri tells about Nuri Efendi, Halit the Regulator cheers up and explains his amazement, "[y]ou don't say so! A man of such caliber among us! My dear, this is a real philosopher, and a philosopher we are in need of... philosophy of time... you see? Time, that means philosophy of work... You are yourself a philosopher, Hayri Bey, a genuine philosopher" (*The Time Regulation Institute* 198).¹⁸⁶ Halit the Regulator aims to regulate time through an institute which is established without even a pre-defined function. The institute represents Turkey and its experiences during the modernization project. *The Time Regulation Institute* seems to deal with the gap between the premises of the Republican reforms and the ways they are carried out, "in the staged dysfunctionality of an institution devoted to

¹⁸⁶ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 65.

accelerating the modernization of a new nation and the modern automatization of its new national subjects” (Ertürk, *Grammatology* 117). The novel is critical of the institutes, organizations, agencies and the system of bureaucracy established during and as a part of the modernization project of Turkey. Their nature of necessity, function, efficiency and contribution to the country’s well-being are ridiculed and satirized through the institute allegory. The institute, where all of the posts are given to Hayri’s and Halit the Regulator’s relatives and friends, is therefore run on the basis of favoritism. Halit the Regulator’s false convictions and beliefs are adopted from trade strategies of industrially advanced Western countries such as England and the USA, in that he is called “the little America” by Zeynep Bayramoğlu (141) on the grounds that Halit the Regulator affects judgments of the masses by means of creating false needs which aim to integrate individuals into the existing system of production and consumption via manipulative and catchy slogans, mass media, advertising, and industrial/bureaucratic management. As pointed out earlier, according to Marcuse, this way of thinking eventually results in a “one-dimensional” society which consists of the masses having a uniformity of thought and behavior. Concordant with Marcuse’s ideas, the novel expresses its satirical position due to a growing dissatisfaction with reforms and changes introduced in Turkey as a part of the project of modernization founded on the liberal tradition of modernity.

Another satirical point in the novel is the power of language and the influence of the slogans on the masses. For example, when Hayri’s sister-in-law is to be introduced as a singer in public, Halit the Regulator, like a manager or an advertiser, knows how to use the correct words for her publicity: “[I]et’s sum up now what we have. You say that she is *ugly*, that means in terms of present-day concepts, she’s *sympathetic*. You say that her voice is *bad*, that means it is *touching and favorable* for certain airs. You say she’s *untalented*, that means she is *original*. I’ll take care of her

tomorrow” (emphases added, *The Time Regulation Institute* 204).¹⁸⁷ Like the World State of *Brave New World*, in which people are manipulated, controlled and even brainwashed through the words and slogans, Halit the Regulator in *The Time Regulation Institute* cunningly alters and manipulates Nuri Efendi’s sayings for the sake of his personal interests and commercial purposes. Some of these slogans that indicate his propaganda are “metals are never regulated on their own,” “regulation of time necessitates the chasing of seconds,” and Halit the Regulator himself also makes up more creative slogans such as “shared time is shared work,” “a true man is conscious of time”, and “the path to well-being springs from a sound understanding of time” (*The Time Regulation Institute* 207). As mentioned before, what the novel mainly satirizes through its allegorical character, Halit the Regulator, is the instrumental rationality and pragmatism. Thanks to his pragmatism, or in his words, “entrepreneurial spirit” (202), he becomes a successful businessman for a while.

In the novel the relationship between Hayri and Halit the Regulator is explicitly likened to the pact made between Faustus and Lucifer in Christopher Marlowe’s play *Dr. Faustus* (1604). As in the case of Faustus, who offers his soul to Lucifer in return for a twenty-four-year of servitude from a demon called Mephistopheles, Hayri’s allegiance with Halit the Regulator provides him with prosperity, wealth and success as a result of their trickery. In Tanpınar’s novel, after the success of the Institute is acknowledged by the public, the journalists write that “Hayri Irdal is but a reappearance in our contemporary life of this oriental Faust” (*The Time Regulation Institute* 245).¹⁸⁸ This parallelism between Halit the Regulator and Mephistopheles drawn by the novel contributes to Halit the Regulator’s portrayal as an evil character. Yet, it would be incorrect to claim that Hayri is a completely innocent and honest man who merely accepts and applies his benefactor’s ideas and orders because Hayri is well aware of Halit’s fraud

¹⁸⁷ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 66.

¹⁸⁸ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 67.

and manipulative acts, and he deliberately lets Halit manipulate him. He interferes with Hayri's way of thinking and speaking, and even how he dresses. Cognizant with Halit's fraud and lies, Hayri states that

I would never deny that our institute was the fruit of Halit the Regulator's productive mind. He was a great friend to me, a benefactor in every respect. But I had never been an instrument of the institute, or a docile medium [...] but all my life I had to live through the contingencies which contributed to the erection of the institute, and I paid a price for them. The institute is the fruit of my life. [...] Even though I was among a host of lies there was a big reality that could not be refuted: the Time Regulation Institute [...]. (*The Time Regulation Institute* 38-9, 243)¹⁸⁹

When Hayri is accused of being Halit's "puppet" (248) by the journalists, he resents them and wants to emphasize his role and contribution to their success. The point emphasized here is the fact that there are not any characters who play a judgmental role in *The Time Regulation Institute*. Unlike *A Mind at Peace* and *Point Counter Point*, *The Time Regulation Institute* lacks a character that represents and verbalizes what the text considers the ideal. *A Mind at Peace* and *Point Counter Point* contain characters like İhsan and Rampion and through their life philosophy the novels criticize their societies. Yet, in *The Time Regulation Institute* Hayri does not emerge as a character who criticizes Halit the Regulator. On the contrary, overtly influenced by Halit, Hayri grows to resemble Halit the Regulator, and he is as guilty as his benefactor, whom Hayri calls "the saintly creature" (*The Time Regulation Institute* 30). Along with Hayri, the whole society in the novel is dragged towards the way directed by Halit the Regulator and they all "participated in the frenzy" (*The Time Regulation Institute* 38) of time regulation and its fining system since people voluntarily pay the fine if their watches and clocks are not regulated correctly.

Halit the Regulator can be likened to Suad in *A Mind at Peace* in the sense that both want Turkey to create "the new man" by eradicating "the old" completely. Both are unaware of the dangers in pursuing such desires.

¹⁸⁹ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 68.

The desire to regulate, engineer and “modernize” the country and its people by regulating all the clocks and watches does not solve the problem Halit the Regulator diagnoses: a sense of “pure time” (Bergson, *The Creative Mind* 2) or in his words, “living according to the different times” (*The Time Regulation Institute* 180) in Turkey. What is “pure time” for Bergson is called “the inner time” or “the inner man” (“iç zaman - iç insan” *Yaşadığım Gibi* 27) by Tanpınar. At this point it can be argued that Halit the Regulator is an allegory of the kind of mentality the novel severely satirizes because he confidently argues that: “the watch is but an instrument, an important one, no doubt. Progress begins with the evolution of the watch. Civilization took its gigantic step when men started to carry their watches in their pockets, and reckoned time independently from the sun. Thus they were severed from nature. They started to count an independent time” (*The Time Regulation Institute* 223).¹⁹⁰

Tanpınar’s target and scope of satire in this part of the novel is larger and he produces a more universal satirical attitude to the understanding of the modern time. In keeping with Bergson’s philosophy, Tanpınar’s novel suggests that when humans separate themselves from nature, or when they view themselves as superior to nature, they tend to invent a new dimension of time, which is “independent,” or, in Bergson’s terms, “mathematical time” (2). The novel satirizes the mathematical time which entraps human beings and divides their life into segments. This criticism is reminiscent of Rampion’s critical views concerning the idea of modern time in industrialized societies which requires individuals to live their lives in different “compartments and work as idiots and machines” (*Point Counter Point* 357). It is a kind of imprisonment enacted on human beings via the mathematical counting of time. Therefore, the novel’s purpose is to satirize the idea of progress, which Tanpınar like Huxley (and the Frankfurt School thinkers) took as something that imprisons people between the ticktocks of time. In other words, due to the understanding of time in narratives resting

¹⁹⁰ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 69.

on the liberal tradition of modernity and the idea of progress, the modern individual has started to regulate his/her life according to regulated, objective, mathematical time, or in Tanpınar's words, "independent time" (*The Time Regulation Institute* 223). Therefore, the novel critically attracts attention to a long-neglected understanding of time; that is, time as a relative entity. Hence the satire in the novel is also directed to the modern way of living and the idea of progress which prioritizes the kind of time which is expressed in terms of minutes, hours, or work. So, Halit the Regulator claims that "to work is to be a master of one's time and to know how to make use of it. We, as pioneers, will pave the way. We shall inculcate into people's minds the consciousness of time. We shall toss in the air a host of words and ideas. And we shall declare that man must work above all, and work is time" (*The Time Regulation Institute* 222).¹⁹¹ So, relying on Halit the Regulator's statements, one can contend that Tanpınar's novel criticizes the fact that time and time regulation are taken as a meta-narrative or a *façade* through which people are "taught" the principles of the modern labor, which necessitates people to regulate their experiences in order to meet the needs of the capitalist modern age. And as a consequence of these arguments, one can also claim that the novel's critical engagement with the idea of progress is similar to that of Huxley (and the theorists of the Frankfurt School) in that they all believed that progress may bring development in the material resources of a nation but it may not lead to a spiritual progress. Therefore, like *Brave New World*, *The Time Regulation Institute* is a novel which foregrounds the devastating desires of the pragmatist men like Mustapha Mond and Halit the Regulator.

Dr. Ramiz, a psychoanalyst, is another allegorical figure in the book. Through Dr. Ramiz the novel does not aim to satirize psychoanalysis *per se*; rather its target of criticism, like that of Huxley's novels, is the figure of the scientist and the intellectual who lives and interprets life solely through theoretical information. In other words, the novel emphasizes that science

¹⁹¹ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 70.

and technology should be in the service of human beings to make their life easier, and scientific theories should be based on life, not vice versa. In Tanpınar's novel *Dr. Ramiz* is a scientist figure who tries to shape life according to theories. He tries to convince Hayri to mold himself according to theories of psychoanalysis. As mentioned before, he even prescribes certain dreams Hayri should see. Hayri the narrator comments on one of Dr. Ramiz's absurd speeches as follows:

[p]erhaps because of his fatigue and nervousness, he [Dr. Ramiz] didn't like the dreams I told him. He was accusing me of not seeing the dreams that men who disliked their fathers, who sought fathers wherever they went, should see. "I don't understand," he [Dr. Ramiz] said. "How can a personality like you not see a single dream suiting his case? Try to see it next time at least. [...] I am giving you now a list of all the dreams you are expected to see this week." (*The Time Regulation Institute* 117-8)¹⁹²

Dr. Ramiz can be considered an example of the dandy figure which first emerged in Turkey in the novels of the *Tanzimat* (Gürbilek, *Kör Ayna* 48). According to Gürbilek, who discusses in detail the dandy figure in Turkish literature, early novels in Turkish literature¹⁹³ used the dandy figure to display the Western influence on Turkish people, or Turkish people mimicking Western people (*Kör Ayna* 47). For example, Mahmut Ekrem's dandy character, Bihruz Bey is an obsessive fantasizer or dreamer who truly thinks that the imaginary worlds he reads in such novels as Lamartine's *Graziella* (1849) and Rousseau's *Nouvelle Heloise* (1761) can be real. Also, Bihruz Bey is overtly influenced by the novels he reads: Bernardin de Saint Pierre's *Paul and Virginia* (1788), Prevost's *Manon Lescaut* (1731) and Dumas's *The Lady of the Camellias* (1848). In the early Turkish novels, the dandy figure who is at the same time "an orphan" (Gürbilek, *Kör Ayna* 48) allegorically stands for the Turkish society vulnerable to foreign influences in the absence of the past. In this sense, it can be asserted that in Tanpınar's

¹⁹² For Turkish see Appendix A, note 71.

¹⁹³ Mahmut Ekrem's *The Carriage Affair* (1896), Halid Ziya's *The Blue and Black* (1897), and Yakup Kadri's *The Rented Mansion* (1921).

novel the orphan narrative is suggestive of the nation-building process in Turkey. According to this perspective, the figure of the orphan that is embodied by Dr. Ramiz is a metaphor for Turkey; an orphan is deprived of parents, bereft of advantages, protection, happiness and benefits, previously enjoyed. So according to the nation- and state-building ideology, Turkey (like an orphan) was vulnerable and miserable due to the feeling of an absent past, therefore in need of (a family) protection and social engineering. The state-building ideology thus needed to fabricate the idea of an orphan Turkey to build the state and nation, and this ideology also “modernized” the nation and reaffirmed its own legitimacy by means of the orphan discourse. The feeling of an absent past in fact stems from the feeling of a lost powerful and glorious past. That is, the feeling and idea of owning the power and glory in the past and lacking them in the present indicates the impasse of belatedness.

Hayri describes Dr. Ramiz as follows:

Ramiz Bey, upon a first encounter, left a discordant impression which could not be easily accounted for. Much later, when I grew accustomed to him, I realized that this was due to a disharmony existing between his protruding forehead, the bony regular features of his face, and his chin of which all the lines seemed to try to escape somewhere. But this fugitive chin was far from having a natural ending. Nor had he a natural voice. He began with strangely uttered sounds that gradually turned themselves into a confused murmur as if they wanted to disappear without leaving a trace behind. I do not know why, but this face and this voice always reminded me of spirals made of irregular curves. He had just come back from Vienna where he had completed his studies. (*The Time Regulation Institute* 104)¹⁹⁴

The repetition of similar words like “discordant,” “disharmony,” “[un]natural,” “strange,” “confused” and “irregular” in the portrayal of Dr. Ramiz contribute to his caricaturization demonstrating the novel’s critical attitude towards pretentious intellectuals like Dr. Ramiz. Also, like Huxley’s *Brave New World*, Tanpınar’s novel has an ambivalent attitude to Freudian

¹⁹⁴ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 72.

theories, that is, the novel seems to ridicule Freud and his ideas through a caricature character like Dr. Ramiz, who himself feels like a misfit in his society and consequently he seems to be in need of psychological treatment. Freudian psychiatry is admired by Dr. Ramiz since he sees it as a field of science that represents “the West” and so needs to be immediately imported to Turkey to “solve” Turkish people’s problems. Yet, the novel at the same time overtly makes use of Freudian theories such as “the father complex” to explain Hayri’s psychological problems. In other words, as reflected in *The Time Regulation Institute*, people in Turkey who experience the modernization project suffer from some psychological complexes and the problem of inner restlessness that need some serious treatment. So, it can be argued that as in Huxley’s novel, the use of Freudian theories in Tanpınar’s fiction is a contradictory issue in that the novels paradoxically both ridicule and benefit from Freudian ideas.

Like Huxley, Tanpınar, too, uses onomastic satire in his novel. He gives several characters fanciful names and they serve to satirize sham and hypocritical people. To illustrate, Halit the Regulator is a figure of the hypocritical bureaucrat who aims to “regulate” or “modernize” society by using and manipulating the people around him. He is the embodiment of pragmatism. Like Mustapha Mond in *Brave New World*, Halit the Regulator aims to homogenize society by means of regulating the concept of time and rendering it the same for everyone in the country. He even intends to create employees who are like “automatons. [...] People will be just like alarm clocks, speaking when fixed to do so, and then remaining silent when they’re not on duty, isn’t that it?” (*The Time Regulation Institute* 227).¹⁹⁵ In planning the preparation of the institute’s employees who will dress in uniform and “act like set clocks,” and speak, smile, and pause at set intervals while giving memorized speeches, Halit states that automatization is “the greatest strength and dependence of this century” (*The Time Regulation Institute* 227). Their duty is to extend a new sense of

¹⁹⁵ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 73.

temporality. And like Mond who proclaims “history as bunk” (*Brave New World* 30), Halit the Regulator indirectly encourages Turkish people to ignore their past when he intends to wipe out people’s public memory and bring about a societal amnesia about local history. Consequently, he aims to replace public memory with a narrative of the modern adopted from “the West,” which merely serves for him to establish a capitalist system. Like Mond who behaves as the promoter of the Brave New World, Halit the Regulator sets out to be both the founder and publicist of the Time Regulation Institute and sells his new ideas about work and time.

Naming in the novel signals its humorous and satiric point of view when especially Sheik Ahmed the Timely Efendi is introduced into the story. He is one of the caricatures in the novel. When the dialogue between a group of authorities and Hayri about Ahmed the Timely is recounted, the sense of the absurd and irony escalates rapidly. What makes this scene ironical and absurd is that Halit the Regulator and Hayri rely on a made-up character on whom they build their vision and project of modernization.

‘[w]hat sort of a man was he [one of the authorities asks]?’ [...] ‘Well, he was a patron saint!’ But who was a patron saint of liars? I wondered. ‘He was tall, fair with a brownish beard, and with black eyes. He used to stammer in his youth. But they say that he cured himself thanks to his own will. More exactly, my late teacher Nuri Efendi used to say so. He had strange whims. For instance, although he produced excellent fruit he ate only grapes. He never touched honey or sugar. He was from the order of the *Mevlevi* dervishes. He was the son of a rich man. He was not appreciated in his lifetime as he was against polygamy.’ [Halit the Regulator interferences,] ‘So he had a modern mind like us, eh?’ (*The Time Regulation Institute* 239)¹⁹⁶

Ahmed the Timely is a fabricated character and the novel seems to suggest that he represents the modernization project of Turkey. The narrative of Ahmet the Timely as the representative of the modern provides Halit the Regulator with a tool to make his “modern” ideas look more local and authentic. Therefore, to Halit the Regulator, Ahmet the Timely becomes a

¹⁹⁶ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 74.

need of the present and history is re-constructed to the extent it serves the needs of the present. This could be interpreted in the light of Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger's notion of "the invention of tradition:"

'[t]raditions' which appear or claim to be old are often quite recent in origin and sometimes invented"... The invented traditions seem to belong to three overlapping types: a) those establishing or symbolizing social cohesion or the membership of groups, real or artificial communities, b) those establishing or legitimizing institutions, status or relations of authority, and c) those whose main purpose was socialization, the inculcation of beliefs, values systems and conventions of behavior. (9)

So the notion of the invented tradition foregrounds that no matter which type they fall into, traditions are invented, constructed or formally instituted in the present. Hobsbawm and Ranger also claim that traditions are often invented to serve particular political ends. Hobsbawm argues that the increase in the political invention of traditions can be seen as an effort to protect the ruling classes and monarchies from the emergence of democracy and political liberalism. The idea of the invention of tradition is also pertinent when one explains its use in the modern development of the nation.¹⁹⁷

Relying on the insight attained from the notion of invented traditions, it can be argued that Tanpınar's novel also attracts attention to the invention of the distinction between tradition and modernity. That is, since there is an invented distinction between modernity and tradition, then it means that modernity needs and constructs tradition through which it defines itself. One can state that in *The Time Regulation Institute* the modern, which is identified with Halit the Regulator, invents and makes use of (a representative of) tradition, Ahmet the Timely, first to define itself and then to consolidate its validity and magnitude. The novel from this perspective underlines the fact that tradition and the modern are two interrelated terms in that they invent one another.

¹⁹⁷ Another related concept, Benedict Anderson's "imagined communities," will be discussed later in this chapter.

As another example of Tanpınar's ironical use of naming, one can talk about the name of a female character, Hayri's second wife Pakize, which literally means "pure and innocent." Unlike, Nuran (whose name means "the moment of heavenly light") in *A Mind at Peace* who is depicted as a well-educated woman and Hayri's first wife Emine (whose name means "trustworthy, benign and innocuous"), Hayri's second wife, Pakize (and her two sisters), are projected as "petty" females who have no depth and as characters unable to differentiate reality from dreams inspired by an American style of life demonstrated in Hollywood films. Tanpınar portrays them as women who have no real contact with reality. All these characters and their behavior in fact contribute to the absurdity in the novel. Pakize thinks that she is a movie star; her older sister wants to be a singer and the other sister wants to win a beauty contest. These dreams of the female characters also strengthen the same satirical point of the novel: aspiring to success and wealth via the shortest way possible. Hayri, by contrast, feels that "there was something wrong with Pakize. When I sensed this, the person whom I had been hugging and with whom I had been sharing the responsibilities of my life began appearing to me hopelessly disabled and half-witted" (*The Time Regulation Institute* 147).¹⁹⁸ "Pakize's escapism" (*The Time Regulation Institute* 146) into movies functions in two ways in the novel. Firstly, her portrayal in the novel is used to demonstrate women who, according to Tanpınar, are more prone to be influenced by lives described in the novels and films made in Europe and America, and so she tends to create her life based on lives adopted from "the West." And secondly, Pakize's escapism helps Hayri use it as a pretense for his unfaithfulness to his wife. That is, Hayri deems her "hopelessly disabled and half-wit" and so justifies his affair with another woman, his boss's wife Selma.

One may think that in a work of satire it is natural to satirize the characters and their behavior; however, Tanpınar's criticism gets harsher

¹⁹⁸ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 75.

when he depicts the behavior of female characters and their choice of entertainment. It can be claimed that Tanpınar's approach to leisure and pleasure in *The Time Regulation Institute* is similar to that of Huxley in his both novels in that some female characters like Pakize and Hayri's aunt are reflected as people Huxley described as "Good-timers," who pass their time by dealing with "stupefying" activities. After the establishment of the Institute, these characters start to throw home parties almost every night just because they would like to appear more "Western" and "modern." They believe that having parties like they saw in Hollywood movies will make them "modern" people who belong to "the West." So the novel emphasizes that unlike the function of *fasıls* in *A Mind at Peace*, these house parties in *The Time Regulation Institute* are the types of leisure-activities which do not improve characters, particularly the female ones, artistically, philosophically or intellectually.

Gürbilek also discusses a similar point as she claims that several male novelists in Turkish literature, like Peyami Safa, Halit Ziya Uşaklıgil, Namık Kemal, Ahmet Mithat and Hüseyin Rahmi, are inclined to portray their female characters in keeping with their idea that women are more apt to be influenced by novels and films than men do due to their "weak" nature¹⁹⁹ (Gürbilek, *Kör Ayna* 19-50). When Hayri talks about his second wife, he states that "Pakize was not a person involved with watches and clocks, with psychoanalysis, and superior knowledge. She was a modern lady. She liked movies. She watched the universe on the white screen. [...] This woman is stark raving mad an idiot... She is a liar" (*The Time Regulation Institute* 247, 249).²⁰⁰ Ironically enough, a character like Hayri who earns his life by lying and deceiving others accuses Pakize, his wife, of lying. The novel is critical of her understanding of the modern. It can also

¹⁹⁹ Gürbilek does not include Tanpınar in this list because her focus of interest in that chapter of her book is mainly Tanpınar's poetry and *A Mind at Peace* (1949). Yet, when Tanpınar's attitude towards women in *The Time Regulation Institute* (1961) is discussed, I think it can be regarded as an example of this inclination.

²⁰⁰ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 76.

be claimed that the kind of understanding of the modern the novel is critical of is illustrated via a female character.

Like the depiction of Lenina in *Brave New World*, the characterization of women in Tanpinar's novel, by and large, fails to represent women as full agents; rather they are, in both satirical novels, portrayed as mere tokens which help the implied authors to convey their social criticism. The female characters in both novels can become nothing more than mouthpieces of their "corrupt" societies because they are shown as representatives of the ideas, behavior and rituals which both of the satirical novels aim to criticize: "after John the Savage enters the text, Lenina becomes one of the Huxleyian sexual predators" (Higdon 64). Like Lucy Tantamount in *Point Counter Point*, Lenina becomes obsessed with achieving sexual victory and near the end of the novel, Lenina "in green velveteen shorts, white shirt, and jockey cap" (*Brave New World* 264) gets off the helicopter and approaches the abandoned lighthouse John has made his home. In this scene in the ensuing frenzy of the orgy, John begins to whip her in disgust. Lenina is shown as a representative of a society which, according to the satirist, has gone astray, so at the end of the novel she is punished. In a similar way, the female characters in *The Time Regulation Institute*, along with the male ones, stand for the absurdities or "corruptions" in society: the idea of "break" and conformity and losing individuality and consequently leading delusional lives. Also, the fact that no women in both novels can occupy important positions in their societies is equally significant. Both Linda and Lenina are depicted as "Betas" who perform manual tasks and are seen as objects of intelligent Alphas' desire. Likewise, Halit the Regulator claims that they should hire young girls and women for the positions which are suitable for "girls' nature:"

[i]f you ask my opinion for the proposed regulation station personnel we should limit our choice exclusively to young girls and women. Let us engage no males. A training such as you are contemplating [working like automatons] can be given only to young girls. For males we can find other jobs. Why should we turn a mass of young

men into automatons? Moreover, we could not do it even if we wanted to. (*The Time Regulation Institute* 228)²⁰¹

Neither Huxley's nor Tanpınar's satirical novel spares the female characters from being criticized. Yet, if we re-consider the way women are treated by other characters, particularly by male ones, and which social status the female characters are granted in the novels, the fact that the novelists' tendency to underrate women and their failure to satirize them effectively becomes clearer. It is also interesting that the *The Time Regulation Institute* never mentions the names of Hayri's sisters-in law. These two women, who are mentioned in the novel to exemplify and prove Halit's power, are not even given names. Thus, it can be argued that female characters in both novels are used as tools to criticize the state – along with bureaucratization and institutes – (and interestingly, the state/institute rulers are all male characters) that seeks to submerge the individual in burdensome and soulless duty. Unlike such male characters as Hayri İrdal, his son Ahmet, John the Savage or Watson, neither Pakize nor Lenina, and none of the other female characters in the novels are depicted as misfits, rebels or as characters who question the state and its system. On the contrary, the female characters are depicted as tools that have exceedingly adopted and conformed to the political, economic and social norms and standards depicted in the novels.

To conclude this section, it can be argued that *The Time Regulation Institute*, which is constructed as the autobiography of a protagonist-narrator surviving his country's passage from an empire to a republic, registers Hayri's adventures who ends up as the assistant director of a fictive Time Regulation Institute to synchronize all the private and public clocks in Turkey. As Moran puts it, *The Time Regulation Institute* is a satire of the “notions, attitudes, behavior, and idiocies of our society caught between two civilizations” (“The Time Regulation” 274). Like *A Mind at Peace*, *The Time Regulation Institute* is a novel in which Tanpınar explores Turkish

²⁰¹ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 77.

modernization and the societal effects of this process. Unlike *A Mind at Peace*, however, *The Time Regulation Institute* is a more overtly political novel which questions the very foundations upon which the modernization project of Turkey was placed, such as progressivism, bureaucratization and the belief that there is a binary opposition between modernity and tradition. The state-led Turkish modernization project which problematically deems “Turkish modernization as a linear and continuous process of progress from tradition to modernity, from obscurantism to reason and enlightenment, and from the Empire to the Republic” (Poyraz 434) is depicted in Tanpınar’s novel through a time regulation institute that struggles to “modernize” citizens; and this struggle is epitomized through Hayri and Halit the Regulator’s institute that demands people to synchronize their lives with that of their nation’s. This simplistic account of the narrative of linear progress is satirized in Tanpınar’s novel, which is informed by the idea that “modernization in Turkey is a complex process during which some essential cultural ingredients of the society – the language and the shared norms of interpersonal behavior – are badly damaged” (Poyraz 434). Thus, Tanpınar’s novel’s criticism of the modernization project in Turkey lends itself to a reading of the Multiple Modernities approach. Turkish modernization, as suggested by *The Time Regulation Institute*, is not a process of linear progress but a more complex process including alienation of individuals and displacement of identities. From this perspective, *The Time Regulation Institute* is a novel which reminds us of the significance of the idea of Multiple Modernities and the idiosyncratic characteristics and complexities of Turkish modernization – which is by nature heterogeneous. As one of those complexities, Tanpınar claims the fact that Turkish modernization created a crisis (*buhran*) in the shattering of the cultural connections of Turkish society with its own history. Yet, as mentioned earlier, Tanpınar was not a conservative writer who blindly longed for the past. On the contrary, he did not approach the issue of Turkish modernization from a simplistic perspective: he did not see it as a

dichotomy between modernity/future and tradition/past. By emphasizing the connection between fabrication and the modern, and between invention and tradition, *The Time Regulation Institute* equally parodies “the new” and “the old” in the context of the modernization project of Turkey.

4.1.2.1 The Historical Context of *The Time Regulation Institute*

An analysis of the historical context in which *The Time Regulation Institute* was written and how it was received in society may contribute to our understanding of the novel’s depiction of the Turkish modernization process and of how Tanpınar conceptualized his idea of modernity. *The Time Regulation Institute* was published in 1961 and by then Turkey had started its political era of the multi-party period (1946-present). Like many of his predecessors and contemporaries, Tanpınar anathematized the lack of harmony between Western and Ottoman-Turkish values and mentalities. In one of his letters to Mehmet Kaplan, Tanpınar states “I have seen four eras in this short life of mine: the era of freedom, the era of truce, the era of Republic and the era of democracy. If we add the eras of the *Tanzimat* and of Abdülhamit, which I in some degree know, to this, it makes six eras in total” (“The Letter to Mehmet Kaplan” 110).²⁰² Leaning on this statement of Tanpınar, both secular and Islamic groups of critics such as Mehmet Kaplan and Berna Moran, Beşir Ayvazoğlu and Mustafa Kutlu, respectively, have identified some allegorical elements in the novel in that they point to a correspondence between the major eras in Turkish history (i.e. the time period between the *Tanzimat* and the early years of the Republic) and Hayri İrdal’s life story. In the novel Tanpınar explores the social changes occurring during the process of the Ottoman Empire’s transformation into Turkish Republic; in other words, it tells a story of the Turkish project of modernization: the first chapter, “The Great Expectations,” refers to the beginning of the project before the *Tanzimat*, the second, “Little Truths,” signals the increasing popularity of the project during the *Tanzimat*, its

²⁰² For Turkish see Appendix A, note 78.

falling in the third “Toward the Dawn” and its breakdown in the last “Every Season Has its End.” The titles of the chapters indicate what Tanpınar considers the beginning and the end/failure of the project of modernization in Turkey.

Taner Timur holds that the Time Regulation Institute in the novel represents the State Planning Institute,²⁰³ which was established in Turkey during the years when the novel was written (326-7). Although Timur claims that it is possible to find an exact correspondence between the events in Tanpınar’s novel and real historical deeds and institutions in Turkey, I think Tanpınar’s aim is to critique the dominant attitude of modernity in his day; so the target and scope of his satire is larger than an examination of some political periods or a specific institution. Tanpınar’s novel is a critique of the mentality behind the establishment of this institute in the novel which aims to justify the systematization of labor to increase the efficiency of work; yet, ironically, turns out to be the very symbol of corrupt bureaucratization.

By the early sixties, Tanpınar had a post in the Ministry of National Education and he became a member of the Parliament, so he had a chance to observe the functioning of the state more closely. With the adoption of the Western time as a consequence of the Gregorian Calendar Act (1927), it was believed that Turkey would gain greater economic productivity. The modern Turkish citizen is imagined as a producer and a consumer in modern life which is divided into certain compartments, in which time was carefully allocated for work, study and other activities. According to Tanpınar, to cut Turkish people’s relationship with their past abruptly and to embrace a project of modernization in Turkey which is orchestrated by the government

²⁰³ State Planning Institute (Turkish: *Devlet Planlama Teşkilatı*, DPT), founded in September 30, 1960 and affiliated to the Prime Ministry, was one of the most important governmental organizations in Turkey. Its principal tasks were to provide advice to the government on determination of economic, social and cultural goals of the state, and to design Five-Years Plans according to the goals set by the government. By the increasing liberalization of the Turkish economic policy, the DPT lost its importance, and was incorporated into the newly established Ministry of Development in June 2011 (Web).

caused a crisis in people's identity. Tanpınar's novel in this sense indicates that as a result of this crisis, Turkish people keep waging a war on the concept of time: as a result of the modernization project of Turkey, the modern Turkish citizen feels that s/he fell behind the "modern/Western" time (the feeling of belatedness). To Tanpınar, the feeling of belatedness is such a heavy load for the individual psyche that it leads him/her to experience the feeling of in-between-ness and eventually emotional crises.

The idea of *terkip* upon which Tanpınar's *A Mind at Peace* is founded is not mentioned in *The Time Regulation Institute* because this novel rather indicates that the crisis foregrounded in *A Mind at Peace* deteriorated more, in that the capitalist mode of production became more alienating force, the process of commodifying human feelings worsened, and the split between *alafranga* and *alaturka* became wider in modern Turkey when *The Time Regulation Institute* was written. Moreover, the novel does not allow a solution to the problems created by the modernization project of Turkey, nor does it offer a catharsis at the end. The novel deliberately leaves the ending ambivalent and makes it clear that the solutions to the problems are yet to be found.

The conception of the modern as experienced in "the West" is another point Tanpınar – Huxley as well – satirizes in his novel because it is based on an instrumental view of human beings as things to be manipulated. Therefore, in spite of all historical and cultural differences between the two novels, Tanpınar's novel enters into a dialogue with Max Weber, the Frankfurt School theoreticians and Huxley regarding their critique of the bureaucratic, rational and technological state which posits itself as a threat to life by rendering human beings "specialists without spirit, sensualists without heart; this nullity imagines that it has attained a level of civilization never before achieved" (Weber, *The Protestant Ethic* 182). Weber's statement emphasizes the emergence of formal rationality²⁰⁴ and social

²⁰⁴ "Formal rationality involves the rational calculation of means to ends based on 'universally applied rules, regulations, and laws' (Kalberg 1147). Formal rationality is

transformations, in the twentieth century, especially in the Western industrialized world, such as “the emergence and institutionalization of market-driven industrial economies, bureaucratically administered states, modes of popular government, rule of law, mass media, and increased mobility, literacy, and urbanization” (Gaonkar 2). The formal rationality and social transformations bring forth two opposing ramifications: on the one hand, by the help of rationality human beings can become specialists and in the social environment they gain irresistible efficiency; on the other hand, the same formal rationality and social transformations strip human beings of their quest for the self – spontaneous expression, imagination, authentic experience and free fulfilment of one’s creative and sensual desires – and make them feel entrapped in the deadening routine of an disenchanting world deprived of meaning, or in a Weberian “iron cage” (182) since no attention is paid to self-exploration and self-realization. Tanpınar’s discontent with formal rationality in his novel is aligned with that of Weber, the theorists of the Frankfurt School and Huxley. The novel suggests that the program of societal modernization in Turkey adopted from the West fragments cultural unity and meaning, and it renders human beings helpless “automatons” (*The Time Regulation Institute* 227) which are to serve for the well-being of the state at the expense of such human values as freedom, reasoning and creativity.

Having discussed the historical climate in which Tanpınar wrote his satirical novel, we can now proceed with the exploration of Tanpınar’s understanding of the modern in *The Time Regulation Institute* and its parallelism with Huxley’s in *Brave New World*. In these novels, their

institutionalized in such large-scale structures as the bureaucracy, modern law, and the capitalist economy. The choice of means to ends is determined by these larger structures and their rules and laws. Formal rationality dehumanizes the individual by giving them little flexibility in what decisions they can make. It prepared the ground for institutionalized structures like bureaucracy which ultimately have led to what Weber called the ‘iron cage of rationality.’ What Weber meant by this was that, while bureaucratic systems were intended to make the individual’s life easier, they have become so entrenched and so immovable and inflexible that the individual is trapped and controlled by them” (Ritzer 42-3).

approaches to the modern can be discussed in terms of temporality, a prioritization of the concept of the alternative and plurality.

4.2 The Deconstruction of Temporal Binaries in Huxley's and Tanpınar's Configuration of the Modern: Multiple Experiences of Modernity

Huxley's *Brave New World* and Tanpınar's *The Time Regulation Institute* indicate a similar conceptualization of the modern that challenges the limits of conventional time and deconstructs the binary oppositions like the past and the present, progressive and primitive, and private and public time, and therefore this section of the study argues that their conceptualization of the modern which is defined in terms of time implies that a plural experience of modernity is possible. This section thus explores Huxley's and Tanpınar's approaches to the modern in *Brave New World* and *The Time Regulation Institute* in terms of the concept of time. That is, it argues that in Huxley's understanding of the modern a paradigm shift in the metaphysics of space and time has occurred, which brings his approach to the modern closer to that of Tanpınar's. In fact it was not only Huxley and Tanpınar but the early nineteenth hundreds in Europe witnessed this change which pervaded philosophical, social, scientific discourses and posed fundamental questions about the nature of the universe and the human subject. Ronald Schleifer contends that there is a historical transition that he describes as "the shift from the Enlightenment to the post-Enlightenment" (67) and time as a term is central to this change. What characterizes the modern or in Schleifer's term, "the post-Enlightenment" is the existence of various kinds of complexity. Time before the post-Enlightenment was regarded as continuous, uniform and unchanging – "a stable medium, separate from objects, in which things occur. In the post-Enlightenment, however, time is perceived as a set of complex overlaps and singularities that cannot be separated from objects" (Tratner 596).

Theories of Bergson, Freud and Einstein defied the explanations of the mechanistic determinism of traditional scientific theories as being enough to explain reality, and these theories brought relativized explanations of the world and reality as it was lived. Accordingly, a new realism occurred in the modern novel. Huxley's and Tanpınar's tendency of re-evaluating the modern in terms of time and being critical of the outcomes of the modern can be more fully understood only when they are put into dialogue with literary modernism, in the light of the conceptualizations of time formulated by T.S. Eliot and James Joyce, to mention a few. Like Huxley and Tanpınar, Eliot and Joyce in their art attempted to deal with the deadening features (futility, loneliness, chaos, despair and dissatisfaction) of the modern life, which they observed as a cultural collapse and the end of values and ideals. Tanpınar, Atay, Ağaoğlu, Atılğan, Huxley, Joyce, Eliot, Proust, Forster, Mann, Pound, Housman, Lawrence, Orwell, Waugh and Drabble²⁰⁵ can all be called discontented modernists, or, in Firchow's terms, they are "reluctant modernists" ("Why Reluctant" 4). What makes them discontented/reluctant modernists is their feeling of uneasiness about the ways in which the present is linked with the past, or when it is not, their attempt to find ways in which the past can be reconnected with the present. As Tanpınar puts it, they are anxious about the issue of "settling accounts with the past" (*Günlüklerin Işığında* 301). They sometimes deal with the mythological past and sometimes turn to moral heritage, traditional Christian faith, individual and public memories, psychology and the classics in their art in order to reach a redeemed present. However, it should be emphasized here that calling these writers "reluctant modernists" does not mean that they were reactionaries who simply admire the past. On the contrary to that, in their work there is aestheticism of the absent past or re-invented past, and that is what makes their work a distinctively modern one.

²⁰⁵ The list of writers, with the exception of A. H. Tanpınar, Oğuz Atay (1934-1977), Adalet Ağaoğlu (1929-), and Yusuf Atılğan (1921-1989), mentioned above is put together by me as I rely on information provided by Firchow's various essays in *Reluctant Modernists: Aldous Huxley and Some Contemporaries* (2002).

The reconciliation of the past with the present in their art makes them create “new.” To them, “the making of the new always consists of a remaking of the old. ... [o]nly by reliving the past, only by creating, as it were, a new past for ourselves, can we ever change who we are” (Firchow, *Reluctant* 27; 186). The past and tradition is never “a faceless, unindividual mass to them, it is constituted of new individual talents” (Firchow, *Reluctant* 260). To be able to heal the breach with the past and with the lost ideals, they looked for “new ways of conceiving and representing in art the relation of physical and spiritual existence, and of the transience of immediate experience and the immensity of the distant past” (Parsons 131). And to grasp the new realism of the modern and to foreground the idea of the historical continuity in their art they tend to explain the modern world and existence not in spatial but temporal terms, that is, the concept of time enables them to deal with an inner intellectual and psychological reality. Their work is often based on mental associations and shifts in time. Through literary experimentation, especially in terms of temporal distortion – flashbacks, flashforwards, and stream of consciousnesses – and the employment of musical analogies, they put the reader into a labyrinth of time in which the reader can probe and experience the monolithic nature of time.

To both Huxley and Tanpınar, the space-based explanations of the modern reality bring forth a rupture in the flow of time and dichotomies like the West and the East. To abandon this way of understating the modern reality in their novels however provides Huxley and Tanpınar with an opportunity to find a way to reconnect the rupture in time and attain harmony. Through Bergsonian “pure time,” Eliot’s “all time eternally present” (“Burnt Norton” 4) and Einstein’s theory of relativity, they challenge the limits of conventional time. Both Huxley and Tanpınar were profoundly concerned with finding ways to heal the breach between the past/the old and the present/the modern. However, there is a significant difference between the reasons they identify for this breach: for Huxley, the breach was caused by the catastrophe of the WWI, capitalism, industrialism,

and Americanization, and Tanpinar viewed it as a phenomenon mainly brought about by modernization. So, despite their differences in approaching the factors of the rupture, this part of the chapter will display how, and, if so, to what extent, Tanpinar's understanding of the modern in *The Time Regulation Institute* resembles that of Huxley's in *Brave New World*. It will be argued that in these novels neither the concept of the past nor the present is elevated or idealized. Nor are they treated as mutually exclusive categories. As mentioned, both writers attempt to create ways in which the past may be reconnected with the present so that a sense of harmony can be retrieved, an intuitive, heterogeneous, personal and indivisible conceptualization of time – “pure time” – can be attained, and a third alternative which embraces and reconciles the oppositions between the past/the present, body/spirit, society/culture and the east/the west etc. can be imagined.

As discussed in the preceding chapter, in the early years of the nineteen-thirties, Huxley emphasized the dual character of modernity in the West; that is, it does harm as much as good. As explicated in his *Jesting Pilate* (1926), Huxley compared people living in the Eastern and Western parts of the world, and he prioritized the Western world over the Eastern on the basis of his observation that the Eastern parts of the world lack sanitary conditions and they lead science and technology-deprived lives. In a Eurocentric manner he categorizes the West as the ideal and the pioneer compared to the “primitive” and “religion-inflicted” people of Eastern societies. To him, these social conveniences and comforts are the positive and beneficial aspects of modernity through which, he assumes, one can judge societies as “primitive” or “advanced.” However, as mentioned in the previous chapter, it is the same Huxley who in *Point Counter Point* criticizes modernity for wasting the West's human resources, ignoring the Western heritage of scientific outlook and spoiling the culture with cheap means of entertainment. In *Brave New World* possible dystopian outcomes of Western societal modernization are imagined. The Western societal

modernization indicates the prioritization of economic and scientific progress as a result of the primacy of instrumental rationality, and the emergence of bureaucratically administered states and mass media. All these combined together gave rise to a very pessimistic picture of the present and future, about which Huxley was deeply concerned.

In the novel, the breach in the flow of time, that is, the rupture between the past and the present is emphasized through the use of the counterpoint technique. John the Savage is relocated among the “civilized” people of the World State. Before exploring the climactic discussion scene between the World Controller, Mustapha Mond, and John the Savage, it is necessary to clarify the world views these characters represent. Inspired by the capitalist Henry Ford, Mond claims that “[h]istory is bunk” when he lectures the students, as follows

[h]e waved his hand; and it was as though, with an invisible feather whisk, he had brushed away a little dust, and the dust was Harappa, was Ur of the Chaldees; some spider-webs, and they were Thebes and Babylon and Cnossos and Mycenae. Whisk. Whisk – and where was Odysseus, where was Job, where were Jupiter and Gotama and Jesus? Whisk – and those specks of antique dirt called Athens and Rome, Jerusalem and the Middle Kingdom – all were gone. Whisk – the place where Italy had been was empty. Whisk, the cathedrals; whisk, whisk, King Lear and the Thoughts of Pascal. Whisk, Passion; whisk, Requiem; whisk, Symphony; whisk ... (*Brave New World* 30)

The World State is founded on the idea that history is nonsense and useless. Thus Mond spurns places (Harappa, Chaldees, Thebes, Babylon, Cnossos, and Mycenae), legendary and religious heroes (Odysseus, Job, Jesus, Jupiter and Gotama), ancient civilizations (Athens, Rome, Jerusalem and the Middle Kingdom) and musical terms (requiem and symphony) which remind him of the past and history. Also it is quite interesting that he does not prioritize the Western history over the non-Western one, that is, he despises the entire world history and everything that is associated with the past. Mond views history as the register of the crimes, follies, violence and tragedies of humankind; it is seen as a record of the pre-utopian world as

Mond claims that “old men in the bad old days used to renounce, retire, take to religion, spend their time reading, thinking – *thinking* (49). The World State rejects nature, literature, parenting, art and philosophy and they are banished as a source of economic and psychological instability. Mond hence justifies himself and informs the students “that’s why you’re taught no history” (*Brave New World* 30). The World State views literature, flowers, religions and music as threats to economic and social stability and system of conditioning, and Mond argues that “you can’t consume much if you sit still and read books” (44). So, the community of the World State is expected and forced to consume manufactured goods. The World State thus maintains its power and stability via prohibition, over-consumption and forcing everyone to be infantile, and it fears that “when the individual feels, the community reels” (*Brave New World* 84). Getting rid of the past or rendering things as objects and activities belonging to the past makes the World Controller more powerful over the masses who are rendered ignorant and submissive due to the eradication of cultural and historical memory. Without history, it is easier for Mond to change the state into a totalitarian one and control society “for their own good” because Mond, once a prominent free-minded scientist, believes that the purpose of humankind is happiness and stability, not freedom and thinking. Accordingly, the World State’s motto is “Community, Identity and Stability” (1).

As pointed out earlier, in his satirical novels and critical essays Huxley severely criticizes the mass culture and the forms of popular entertainment, vulgarity of the Hollywood movies and commercial music, and hedonistic society since he sees them as responsible for the “existential experience of alienation and despair associated with living in a disenchanting world of deadening and meaningless routine, [...] in a Sisyphean world of repetition devoid of a subjectively meaningful *telos* [purpose]” (Gaonkar 9). The main question in the novel is whether/how a human being can survive when s/he is provided with only chemical, mechanical and sexual comforts of modernity. To complicate this question more, Huxley depicts the anti-

thesis of this question which is embodied by John the Savage. His is a mode of living which is inspired by the works of Shakespeare (and Huxley was inspired by D. H. Lawrence when he created John). John the Savage represents the pre-modern state of being, “primitivism,” as his name suggests, and “savagery” as opposed to “civilization” and “progressivism.” In the analysis of *Point Counter Point* in this study, I have indicated that Mark Rampion is a character representing D. H. Lawrence’s “vitalism.” In *The Plumed Serpent* (1926) and *Mornings in Mexico* (1927), Lawrence preaches a life closer to one led by New Mexicans as a solution for coping with the soul-crushing effects of modernity. The primitive tends to be a positive figure for Lawrence when it provides a point of criticism for modern civilization. Brought to the World State by Bernard and Lenina, John the Savage, who is raised in a Reservation by his own mother, witnesses the “modern/civilized” people’s mores and deeds, and, out of disillusionment, he regards the World State as bizarre. From John’s perspective, the novel emphasizes that the World State is a totalitarian horror of A. F. 632. “Half-primitive [being raised in Reservation], half-civilized [his parents’ origin], the Savage can be read as a malicious caricature of D. H. Lawrence and a parody of Cipriano, the university educated Indian in *The Plumed Serpent* (1926)” (Meckier, *Modern Satirical* 143). John is modelled on an anti-industrialist like D. H. Lawrence and finds the World State disappointing. While Mustapha Mond sees the individual as a non-spiritual entity, an embodiment of neurological and biochemical machinery, John sees him/her as a composite of feelings. What the novel suggests is that neither of the explanations – that of Mond’s or John’s – is sufficient to define the complicated nature of the human being.

It can be claimed that Huxley’s interest in Lawrence’s philosophy of life-worshipping in *Point Counter Point* had waned by the time he wrote *Brave New World*. Modelled on Lawrence, John the Savage, unlike Rampion, represents a newly-discovered personality trait of Lawrence: a man of neuroses and psychological complexes. Joseph Bentley claims that

“it is true that Lawrence was given to emotional scenes and fits of rage” (149) and at the end of *Brave New World*, Lawrence’s neurotic and psychological complexes are demonstrated through a sensational scene in which John the Savage executes self-punishment by whipping himself and finally committing suicide in his rustic solitude. This trait of Lawrence, displaying psychological complexes and unbalances, was of course out of question or had not surfaced yet when Huxley created his first character based on D. H. Lawrence: Rampion, a life-worshipper is the moral center of *Point Counter Point*. Suicide is an idea Rampion can never actualize because it is against his life philosophy. Yet, in *Brave New World* the character inspired by Lawrence, John the Savage, takes his own life as a result of a neurotic experience. John the Savage’s suicide hence indicates Lawrence’s waning influence on Huxley because he “resolved not to let New Mexico furnish a Lawrencian alternative to the Wellsian future” (Meckier, “Aldous Huxley’s” 144), so both worlds of the novel are depicted as madhouses. Furthermore, the theme of *The Plumed Serpent*, which can be expressed in a nutshell as the idea that the powerful and healthy primitivism inherited from one’s ancestors could overcome modern civilizations, is parodied in *Brave New World*. Actually Huxley’s novel deconstructs the binary oppositions between progressivism/civilization and primitivism/savagery. The idea that the modern is equal to the civilized or the contemporary is dismantled because *Brave New World* indicates that brave new worlders are the future’s savages. It is significant to note that the Savage Reservation is not the antithesis of the inhuman Fordian hell of the World State. The Reservation provides a point of criticism for modern civilization, but when the primitive is regarded in itself, or as an actual quality of life, it is found to be repugnant. In the novel, John and Linda experience the racial prejudice of Malpais and theirs is more intolerable in the Reservation than the predicament of Bernard Marx and Helmholtz Watson in the World State. John talks about the racial discrimination that people in Malpais made him live as follows, ““they wouldn’t let me [take

part in rituals]. They disliked me for my complexion. It's always been like that. Always.' Tears stood in the young man's eyes; he was ashamed and turned away" (105). Furthermore, *Brave New World* disrupts the Eurocentric idea of the liberal tradition of modernity which spatially equates "the West" with the modern and "the East" with the non-modern. Neither London can be associated with "the civilized" nor New Mexico with "the primitive" any more in the novel. Which one is "the modern" or "the primitive," is put under scrutiny. Therefore, *Brave New World* aims to prevent those from reading the Savage Reservation as "the human" antithesis of the "inhuman" World State by depicting the Reservation as a repulsive place. When Bernard and Lenina arrive at Malpais in the Reservation, the "Savages" in the New Mexican Reservation are depicted as follows:

[a] dead dog was lying on a rubbish heap; a woman with a goitre was looking for lice in the hair of a small girl. [...] They did what he [their guide] mutely commanded – limbed the ladder and walked through the doorway, to which it gave access, into a long narrow room, rather dark and smelling of smoke and cooked grease and long-worn, long-unwashed clothes. At the further end of the room was another doorway, through which came a shaft of sunlight and the noise, very loud and close, of the drums. (*Brave New World* 100-1)

This description of the "savages" may arouse negative feelings in the reader. The novel thus underlines the fact that it favors neither the autocracy, soma, and Fordism of the World State in London nor the Savage Reservation led by discrimination against the unorthodox behavior, totemism and *mescal*²⁰⁶ of New Mexico. London and New Mexico are further compared in terms of their similar attitude towards religion. That is, religion in both societies is used as a social instrument to make their citizens submissive and both communities also keep their stability by means of religious services which

²⁰⁶ *Mescal* is an alcoholic drink which Linda describes as something which "makes you feel so bad afterwards, the *mescal* does, you're sick with the *peyotl* [the plant from which the hallucinogen mescaline is extracted]; besides it always made that awful feeling of being ashamed much worse the next day. And I was so ashamed" (emphasis original, *Brave New World* 108).

provide people with leading deceptively blissful lives: in the World State there is a pseudo-religion, which can be described as a combination of consumerism and behaviorism: this so-called religion requires the community of the World State to participate in Community Sings and Solidarity Services in which they take soma and sing songs. The purpose of the Solidarity Service, which everyone has to attend about once every other week, is to make the people of the society feel solidarity – to make them feel like they are all connected. When Bernard Marx attends his Solidarity Service, during the service the soma-drugged crowd sings and dances, and eventually the frenzy they experience gets so great that they channel their actions into the “orgy-porgy” (*Brave New World* 75). Their songs contribute to their trance in the orgy and this service is used to keep people in conformity with the State’s dictates because it encourages people from all castes to be committed to consumerism and promiscuity. Likewise, in New Mexico Indian Reservation there is a religion which can be described as a combination of the teachings of Christ and Pookong.²⁰⁷ Their service consists of whipping themselves “for the sake of the pueblo – to make the rain come and the corn grow. And to please Pookong and Jesus. And then to show that [one] can bear pain without crying out” (*Brave New World* 105). The similarity between the religious services in the World State and Savage Reservation is also foregrounded by Lenina, who finds everything in the Reservation “queer,” but “the performance itself – there seemed to be nothing specially queer about that. ‘It reminds me [Lenina] of a lower-caste Community Sing’” (*Brave New World* 102). Here the similarities serve to emphasize an idea: New Mexico and John are not substitutes for or alternatives to London and Mond. The idea of condemning the World State and the Savage Reservation as two examples of failed societies in the novel is elaborated further when John the Savage, along with Bernard Marx and Helmholtz Watson, is arrested and taken to Mustapha Mond’s office. John argues with Mond and states his reasoning as follows:

²⁰⁷ It is a made-up God worshipped by the community in the Savage Reservation.

‘[b]ut I like the inconveniences.’ ‘We don’t,’ said the Controller. ‘We prefer to do things comfortably.’ ‘But I don’t want comfort. I want God, I want poetry, I want real danger, I want freedom, I want goodness. I want sin.’ ‘In fact,’ said Mustapha Mond, ‘you’re claiming the right to be unhappy.’ ‘All right then,’ said the Savage defiantly, ‘I’m claiming the right to be unhappy.’ ‘Not to mention the right to grow old and ugly and impotent; the right to have syphilis and cancer; the right to have too little to eat; the right to be lousy; the right to live in constant apprehension of what may happen to-morrow; the right to catch typhoid; the right to be tortured by unspeakable pains of every kind.’ There was a long silence. ‘I claim them all,’ said the Savage at last. Mustapha Mond shrugged his shoulders. ‘You’re welcome,’ he said. (*Brave New World* 219)

This lengthy quotation indicates the stalemate between John the Savage and Mustapha Mond. It illustrates the fact that humankind cannot “go forward” with Mond’s World State which supports material comforts and precludes inspiration, intuition, liberty and creativity, or the fact that humankind cannot go “backward” with John’s world, which offers a less artificial life but puts restraints on its people by limiting them through religious and social rituals and prejudices. That is, Huxley aims to dismantle the meanings imposed on the terms of “going forward and backward,” and for this reason, the boundary between these terms is blurred and he presents a stalemate between them.

Furthermore, John has troubles with reconciling different worlds, the ones he observed in both the World State and the Savage Reservation and the one he read about in Shakespeare’s plays. There is a section in Chapter Eight in which John mixes these different realms together, and it ends with this: “lying in bed, he would think of Heaven and London and Our Lady of Acoma and the rows and rows of babies in clean bottles and Jesus flying up and Linda flying up and the great Director of World Hatcheries and Awonawilona” (116). In his mind Christianity and Native American religion and myths are all mixed up. He even starts to mix the technology of the World State with the fictitious world of Shakespeare: when the station master boasts that the Bombay Green Rocket can move at “twelve hundred and fifty kilometers an hour,” to which John replies, “still, Ariel could put a

girdle round the earth in forty minutes” (142). As mentioned before, John is portrayed in the novel as a Miranda-like figure, naively open to any influences. John is as “conditioned” as the community in the World State in that both communities impose restrictions on their citizens. So, it can be argued that John’s “conditioning” is imposed “by a life in the Reservation, with its mixture of Christianity and Indian superstition, by a family situation no longer possible in London and, most effectively, by the book Popé gives him, *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare*” (Meckier, “Debunking” 144). To give an example of his conditioning, what soma is for the World State residents, a way of escapism, so is Shakespeare for John. Relying on John’s portrayal in the novel as a target of any influences, Meckier also argues that “John’s case proves that there is no such thing as a noble savage, unspoiled and unconditioned” (“Our Ford” 143). That is, John’s description of savagery completely ruins the concept of noble savage supported by D. H. Lawrence and J. J. Rousseau.²⁰⁸ The very idea of the noble savage is criticized by the novel since a character like John the Savage is employed as a parody of noble savagery. The novel emphasizes the fact that from the debate between John and Mond nothing arises but a philosophical stalemate, a dead end. The question raised by the novel is that which alternative – Mond or John and the ideas they represent – should be chosen: happy and comfortable but authoritative World State or free but restrictive and superstitious world of the Savage Reservation. Therefore, following the example of human predicament, Huxley ends their debate in a draw. It is a choice between “insanity on the one hand and lunacy on the other,” as Huxley himself put in the “Foreword” of the novel written in 1946. Here, Huxley emphasizes the fact that there is no difference between the insanity of the World State and the lunacy of the Reservation.

Seeing the dark side of the Western experiences of modernity in the early thirties, Huxley seems to begin deviating from his temporal and spatial

²⁰⁸ What J. J. Rousseau and D. H. Lawrence hold concerning the idea of noble savage is that a human being in his/her natural state, untouched by modernity and technology is somehow more pure and less corrupted than the civilized individual.

formulations of modernity which previously, in *Point Counter Point* for instance, made him formulate time as a linear, progressive movement from the past to the future, and modernity as moving from the West to the East. He criticizes the spatialization of time by stating that “[t]ime is unbearable. To make it bearable, men transform it into something that is not time, something that has qualities of space [...] Time has been spatialized to its extreme limit” (*Beyond the Mexique Bay* 214, 221). With this critical attitude towards his own earlier conceptualizations of modernity in terms of time and space, it can be claimed that Huxley developed a new perception of both time and space, which consequently defines his new approach to the modern: in *Brave New World* Huxley places the World Controller Mustapha Mond, the representative of the dark side of the Western societal modernization, opposed to John the Savage, the symbol of the pre-modern and tradition in order to challenge and criticize the liberal tradition of modernity’s tendency of defining the modern in terms of the west and the pre-modern in terms of the east. So, it can be argued that Huxley whose earlier writing, such as *Jesting Pilate* (1926), illustrates his critique of Eastern religiosity comes to emphasize in *Brave New World* that unrestricted materialism in the West, which he likens to the unrestricted power of religious leaders in the East, eventually leads to the loss of freedom and creativity. Therefore, it seems that *Brave New World* advocates a new kind of direction, a third alternative, which is embodied by Helmholtz Watson, who unites intellectual motives of both Mustapha Mond and John the Savage.

Helmholtz Watson is a figure combining the philosophies represented by the Procrustean²⁰⁹ philosopher Mustapha Mond and the

²⁰⁹ “Procrustes also called Polypemon, Damastes, or Procoptas, in Greek mythology, was a robber dwelling somewhere in Attica – in some versions, in the neighborhood of Eleusis. His father was said to be Poseidon. Procrustes had an iron bed (or, according to some accounts, two beds) on which he compelled his victims to lie. Here, if a victim was shorter than the bed, he stretched him by hammering or racking the body to fit. Alternatively, if the victim was longer than the bed, he cut off the legs to make the body fit the bed’s length. In either event the victim died. Ultimately Procrustes was slain by his own method by the young Attic hero Theseus, who as a young man slayed robbers and monsters whom he

primitivism-admirer John the Savage. “Helmholtz Watson discovers a path between the utopian and primitive horns” (Meckier, “Debunking” 150); it is a path which contains both going “forward” and “backward” and “inward” simultaneously. Earlier in this chapter, I have discussed the similarities between Helmholtz, Bernard and John the Savage in that they are all aware of their difference from the people who surround them. At the beginning of the novel, Helmholtz tries to express his feelings of discontent to Bernard: “‘Did you ever feel,’ he asked, ‘as though you had something inside you that was only waiting for you to give it a chance to come out? Some sort of extra power that you aren’t using – you know, like all the water that goes down the falls instead of through the turbines?’” (*Brave New World* 61). The extra power he is talking about can be taken as an early sign of his imminent metamorphosis. His first disorderly act takes place at the College of Emotional Engineering, where he works: he recites a poem about “being alone” (*Brave New World* 163) and the students report him to the Authority. Being an Alpha-plus in the World State, Helmholtz for the first time attempts to transgress the rules and regulations of the system and poses a threat by thinking, feeling and writing creatively about being alone. Being alone is considered as one of the biggest crimes in the World State and Mond states that “people never are alone now. We make them hate solitude; and we arrange their lives so that it’s almost impossible for them ever to have it” because solitude may cause people to stop promiscuity, consuming the goods and services produced by the World State so it is considered as the biggest threat to the stability. Watson wants to see the effects of his behavior and he states “‘I feel, [...] as though I were just beginning to have something to write about. As though I were beginning to be able to use that power I feel I’ve got inside me – that extra, latent power. Something seems to be coming to me’” (*Brave New World* 165). That “something coming” to

encountered while traveling from Trozen to Athens. The “bed of Procrustes,” or “Procrustean bed,” has become proverbial for arbitrarily – and perhaps ruthlessly – forcing someone or something to fit into an unnatural scheme or pattern” (*Encyclopedia Britannica Online*)

Helmholtz is an early indication of a new state of existence; he now stands on the threshold of the road to an introspective life. Towards the middle of the novel, it seems that Helmholtz gets closer to John the Savage as they read poems and plays. Yet, John's seeing and formulating the world in terms of Shakespearean rhetoric seems absurd and insufficient for Helmholtz, who even calls Shakespeare "a marvelous propaganda technician" (*Brave New World* 168). With this scene, Huxley displays the difference between Helmholtz and John in that the former needs not a Shakespearean or rather an archaic configuration of the world to address the present realities he lives in. According to Huxley, poetry itself is not the only reason for Helmholtz's growth but "the artist's creative drive becomes the manifestation of an untapped emotional force that underlies and will eventually supersede it" (Meckier, "Debunking" 152). Lacking this emotional creative power, John the Savage thinks that people should, if necessary, give up on happiness, stability and technological progress for the sake of experiencing passion, beauty and freedom. Mond, on the other hand, who also has no clue about the importance of the emotional creative drives latent in human beings, on the other hand, thinks that giving up "beauty, liberty, religion, art and even the science itself and truth are the prices they have to pay and sacrifice for stability, and happiness" (*Brave New World* 201), and comforts. "Art and science chained and muzzled" (*Brave New World* 205) is an idea that Helmholtz cannot comprehend and accept, so he is to be exiled to an island now since he is a threat to both the Word State and the Reservation. Mond's description of the island²¹⁰ is also interesting: "a place where he [the exile] will meet the most interesting set of men and women to be found anywhere in the world. All the people who, for one reason or another, have got too self-consciously individual to fit into community-life. All the people who aren't satisfied with orthodoxy, who've got independent ideas of their own" (*Brave New World* 207). As a person

²¹⁰ Here, Mond's description of the island for the exile can be taken as an early reference to the island, *Pala* in Huxley's last novel, *Island* (1962) which is widely accepted as a depiction of a "realistic utopia."

who is interested in both beauty and harsh reality, manifested through his artistic drives and instincts, Helmholtz has to pay for these interests by leaving the World State. Helmholtz readily chooses an island with a bad climate, the Falkland Islands, because he believes that “one would write better if the climate were bad. If there were a lot of wind and storms, for example ...” (*Brave New World* 209) His decision to live on an island and to have a life full of contemplation and artistic creation imply his further maturation. Huxley pinpoints an idea, which he deals with more in the following works like *Time Must Have A Stop* (1944) and *The Perennial Philosophy* (1945), that the ideal life is not defined in terms of space, but it resides inside people “here and now.”²¹¹ “Helmholtz Watson emerges from his conditioning, as he liberates and reconditions himself” (Meckier, “Debunking” 151).

With such an argument, Huxley’s novel opens itself for a reading of a reconfiguration of the modern defined in terms of time rather than space. The society of the brave new world seems to live in a frozen future time, while the people in the Reservation are seen as backward in time by the World State. In this binary opposition, Helmholtz stands for the hope to set both groups of people free from their loop because he has the potential to be an individual who can lead a mode of existence which contains both the past and present, and transcends these categorizations of time and creates a third alternative. In other words, *Brave New World* suggests that the problem of breach/rupture/dichotomy is solved by opening and widening the concept of time so large that it is able to accommodate both the traditionally-defined concepts of the past and those of the future. Huxley’s reconfiguration of the modern indicates the denial of binary oppositions and the prioritization of the concept of time, and in this respect it implies that Huxley after *Brave New World* abandoned his tendency to formulate the modern in Eurocentric

²¹¹ “Here and now” is the most repeated motto of Huxley’s *Island* which suggests the eternal present.

terms and it paved the way for a new understanding of the modern that embraces plural experiences of modernity.

From the perspective explored above, we can now move on to Tanpınar's understanding of time which is instrumental for him to formulate his idea of the modern both in *A Mind at Peace* and in his satirical novel *The Time Regulation Institute*. Tanpınar's interest in the concept of time is more evident than Huxley's in that Tanpınar explicitly experiments with the notion of time in terms of an attempt of saving life from being the fool of mathematical time; that is, a dull life regulated according to an understanding of modernity which is constructed upon a specific time perception, mathematical or clock-time which brings about the experiences of fragmentation, transitoriness, and loss of stable ground. Thus, Tanpınar investigates the impact of the experience of modernity on temporality. Tanpınar's interest in time, as mentioned before, can be traced both in his novels and poetry, particularly his poems, "Neither am I inside Time" (1961) and "Bursa'da Zaman" (1961) and his novels, *Mahur Beste* ([1944] posthumously 1975) and *A Mind at Peace* (1949) and *Time Regulation Institute* (1962). This part of the dissertation aims to explore the traces of Tanpınar's conceptualization of the modern in *The Time Regulation Institute* in terms of time.

Tanpınar's discontent with the Turkish experience of modernity and modernization stems from what he sees as cultural cancellation, or a cultural non-specificity as a consequence of a rupture in temporality. In other words, he reads modernity as experienced in Turkey in terms of time. In spite of the similarities between Huxley and Tanpınar regarding their approach to the concept of time, as it will be elaborated more, Tanpınar's *The Time Regulation Institute* foregrounds the significance of cultural specificities in his formulation of the modern.

According to some scholars, prior to Tanpınar several literary people failed in producing assessments which were substantial enough to shed light on the complexities of the Turkish experience of modernization. Their

works are often regarded as simplistic analyses of modernity as they either heartily supported Westernization or completely rejected it. Hikmet Kocamaner argues that “while, like his predecessors and contemporaries, Tanpınar also reflected upon the incongruities between Western institutions and values and the Ottoman/Turkish ones, his critique was not limited to this specific analysis restricted by a geo-cultural distinction between the East and the West” (2). For Tanpınar, trying to make a preference between Western and Ottoman/Turkish values and institutions is simply a deficiency in thinking. He does not explore the modern in terms of binaries set between the West and the East; the present and the past; or the forward and the backward. Tanpınar’s critique of the modern in *The Time Regulation Institute* contributes to the critical studies on modernity in that it aims to show that modernity is global and multiple lacking a governing center. Tanpınar’s critique of modernity, at the same time, provincializes the Western discourse on modernity by “thinking through and against its self-understanding” (Gaonkar 15). In this respect, it is a dialectic thinking focusing on both similarities and differences, and particularly, thinking in terms of differences destabilizes the universalist claims of modernity and pluralizes the experience of it. Therefore, Tanpınar formulates a way to examine modernity with a culture-specific reading. Dilip Parameshwar Gaonkar stresses the importance of a culture-specific reading of the modern as follows:

[a] cultural theory [...] holds that modernity always unfolds within a specific cultural or civilizational context and that different starting points for the transition to modernity lead to different outcomes. [...] Different starting points ensure that new differences will emerge in response to relatively similar changes [material changes and institutional arrangements]. [...] In short, modernity is not one, but many. (17)

What many Turkish writers and politicians, until Tanpınar, could not see is this trait of modernity, that is, its multifaceted-ness according to the different starting points in the world. In *The Time Regulation Institute*, Tanpınar reveals his discontent with the process of modernization in Turkey

through his depiction of an imaginary institution, the Time Regulation Institute, which imposes its own concept of time, mathematical time, and intrudes into and regulates individuals' lives. The concept of time represented by the Time Regulation Institute can be defined as mathematical time upon which the project of modernization in Turkey was constructed. This conceptualization of time works according to a rationale – instrumental rationality – that regards people as means to gain economic profits. Seeing from this perspective, Halit the Regulator claims that their mission is very important in that it is a social duty because they “teach people that establishing a relation with time and hours is the very consciousness of time. [This is why] our institute had been established. We are involved with a social issue. We are here to perform a service” (*The Time Regulation Institute* 221).²¹² Halit the Regulator assumes that their institution is beneficial and meets a social need: “laborers, unqualified workers, clerical employees are more fastidious with regard to punctuality. So are the teachers. [...] Time for them is valuable, but it is not for others who lack the concept of time” (220).²¹³ That is, as Halit the Regulator sees it, time regulation, this concept of time, helps both people and the nation develop economically. As a utilitarian and capitalistic man, he maintains that “if Newton had examined the apple which fell on his head in its properties as a fruit, he might well have thrown it away, seeing that it was spoiled. But he acted differently. He asked himself how he could *benefit* from this apple. ‘What *highest benefit can I derive?*’ he said to himself. Do as he did” (emphases added, *The Time Regulation Institute* 203).²¹⁴ Such an understanding of time is a trait of the progressivist narrative of modernity in Turkey. To him, the institute is a public good which saves each and every useful millisecond from slipping through citizens' fingers. As in *Brave New World*, Hayri thus states that “modern life encourages us to keep away from

²¹² For Turkish see Appendix A, note 79.

²¹³ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 80.

²¹⁴ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 81.

the idea of dying” and, one can add here, solitude, because solitude is a state in which one can think, work and feel without the intrusion of the instruments of modern life. Likewise, in *Brave New World* citizens of the World State are not allowed to have solitude because according to the World Controller it is dangerous due to two reasons: solitude both prevents people from contributing to the consumption of the standardized goods and leads people to think/feel and distort “the stability” of society. Therefore, modern life deems solitude a threat to itself since solitude is related to “pure time,” “intuition” and, in Tanpınar’s words, “inner man” (*Yaşadığım Gibi* 24). So, Hayri declares the institute one of the greatest, most innovative, important and beneficial organizations of the era. The tendency of regarding mathematical time as a necessity of the modern age through which modern societies regulate their practices and people’s inclination to neglect or even ignore pure time are the main issues the novel is harshly critical of.

Manifesting itself in both behavioral and psychological spheres of the individual, the sense of absurd (*abes*) is embroidered in every moment of *The Time Regulation Institute* to pinpoint the inconsistencies of Turkish people who experience the project of modernization. The absurd is the emotion that dominates the whole novel. At the beginning of the novel, when Hayri’s daughter was born, Abdüsselam Bey mis-names her Zehra (Abdüsselam’s own mother’s name), while meaning to name her Zahide (Hayri’s mother’s name). Hayri observes that “the chain of disasters that followed one another began with this absurd error” (93). Thus, satire in the novel is created through a series of absurdities, which develop in an unexpected and comic direction and become more complicated. As another absurd moment in the novel, the story of the Sherbet Maker’s Diamond can be given as an example: after Hayri is married off to Emine, they start to live in Abdüsselam Bey’s mansion, and after Abdüsselam’s death, people start rumors that Hayri owns the Sherbet Maker’s Diamond, which in reality does not exist. Yet, things get more complicated and Hayri is called to court because he is accused of stealing the Diamond. After that, he is sent to the

Forensic Medicine Institute because of losing his temper in the court and people think that he has mental problems. Hayri hence meets Dr. Ramiz, who later introduces Hayri to Halit the Regulator. As a result of an innocent joke Hayri told to people about the existence of a diamond (*The Time Regulation Institute* 98), the unexpected series of events develop, become more complicated and reach an absurdity in the novel. This absurd moment in Hayri's life story represents the absurdity of the modernization project carried out in Turkey because the novel suggests that the major underlying reason of all absurdities is related to the logic of the modernization project carried out in Turkey. The absurdities in Hayri's life both parallel and become the ramifications of the absurdities emerging due to the modernization project.

The novel reflects two different attitudes to modernity in Turkey through two characters whose understandings of time differ radically: Nuri Efendi and Halit the Regulator. Hayri himself emphasizes their remarkable roles in his life as follows: "Nuri Efendi and Halit the Regulator were the two poles around whom my life revolved" (*The Time Regulation Institute* 50). To begin with, Nuri Efendi represents the spiritual and philosophical interpretation of time in Turkey before westernization begins. Nuri Efendi is a time setter (*muvakkit*) whose duty is to determine the time of prayer. Hayri emphasizes the importance of time in the life of Muslims in Turkey: "[p]rayers five times a day, breaking fasts during Ramadan, meals taken before dawn, and other prayers depended on the time indicated by watches and clocks" (42). The relationship between Muslim Turkish people and time is defined in terms of a close harmony between their daily routines and spiritual life:

[t]he ticktock they heard had nearly the same evocative power as the water running at the fountain for ablutions in the courtyard of a mosque, and echoed the voice of sublime and eternal beliefs. The ticktocks' properties were *sui generis*, and expanded in both dimensions of life. While on the one hand it arranged your daily affairs and duties, on the other hand it opened the immaculate and

smooth paths that led to the eternal bliss of which one was in pursuit.
(*The Time Regulation Institute* 42)²¹⁵

This passage can be analyzed in the light of both the Sufi understanding of time and Bergson's conceptualization of time as a transcendental way of experience that cannot be constrained by the mathematical and homogenous time. As mentioned before, Bergsonian and Sufi formulations of time, described in terms of *durée* and intuition, have influenced Tanpınar's conceptualization of personal and intuitive time. Particularly, the words in the quotation above such as, "evocative," "echo," "sublime," "eternal," "immaculate," and "bliss," all uncover his understanding of time as duration. All these terms are attached with intuitive pure time because they, like pure time, challenge the liberal tradition of modernity's conventional understanding of time and its universalist claims by providing a transcendental way of experience. Therefore, pure time makes a culture-specific understanding of the modern possible as it prioritizes plurality and heterogeneity over uniformity and standardization. Tanpınar's description of ticktocks in the intuitive concept of time, or "pure time" in Bergson's term (*The Creative Mind* 2) is situated against the mathematical, homogenous and spatial conceptualizations of clock-time which divides and regiments time in the forms of quantifiable symbols, like calendars or clocks, or numbers. Likewise, the Sufi understanding of time, which essentializes the intuitive experience, enables one to comprehend the relative nature of reality. Also, as mentioned in Tanpınar's *Beş Şehir* (1946), the personal, intuitive and heterogeneous conceptualization of time is taken as "another time right next to the one in which we live, laugh, enjoy ourselves, work, and make love – a time much different, a lot deeper, one that has no relation to the calendar and the clock" (80).²¹⁶ Having awareness not only of mathematical time but of intuitive conceptualization of time, Tanpınar

²¹⁵ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 82.

²¹⁶ Translation by Nergis Ertürk in "Modernity and Its Fallen Languages: Tanpınar's Hasret, Benjamin's Melancholy." *PMLA*, 123(1): January 2008. For Turkish see Appendix A, note 83.

prefers the experience of the latter because, to him, the intuitive time exists in another dimension or in “the extra-spatial realm” (Birlik 176). In this respect, one can argue that the ticktocks of the intuitive time do not make the individual feel chased by the hour and second hands or entrapped within the modern life.

Nuri Efendi deems time-adjusting important for two reasons in that it first regulates one’s sense of spiritual life and then gives him/her a schedule for work and productivity. This second function of time-setting attracts Halit the Regulator’s attention because he is described as a materialistic man who knows how to manipulate people with words. He is bothered by the clocks and watches in İstanbul which are either unadjusted or out of order. He argues as follows:

[w]e are losing half of our time because of unadjusted watches. If we assume that each person in the country loses one second per hour every day, this amounts to a loss of eighteen million seconds in an hour. And assuming that the essentially useful part of the day is ten hours, the figure arrived at will be one hundred and eighty million seconds a day, that is, three million minutes, which boils down to a loss of fifty thousand hours a day. And with all these added up, you will see how many people’s fates are sealed in a year. On the other hand, half of the eighteen million people have no watches and most of the existing watches are out of order. Among them are those which are half an hour, or even an hour slow. A deplorable loss indeed! Loss of work, loss of a part of one’s life, loss of time and money! (*The Time Regulation Institute* 51)²¹⁷

As the quotation clearly indicates, Halit the Regulator represents a utilitarian and capitalistic mentality in that time is defined in terms of money. And with this motivation, he decides to found the Institution to regulate all the clocks and watches in İstanbul and then in the entire country in order to ensure that all citizens have a persistent sense of time. The same idea is also emphasized by Kocamaner when he states that “the motive for Halit the Regulator to establish the Time Regulation Institute is the reorganization and synchronization of labor to remedy this self-destructive tendency in

²¹⁷ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 84.

Turkish economic life caused by the ill-set clocks of the citizens of the newly founded Republic” (12). His materialistic attitude to time and the modern is also evident in his use of slogans for the Institute, such as “[c]ommon time is joint work” and “[t]he way to well-being runs through a sound understanding of time” (*The Time Regulation Institute* 207). At this point, one can point out the similar messages of the slogans produced in Tanpınar’s novel and that of Huxley’s. Both novels use similar slogans, which mainly prioritize the idea of instrumental reason, progress and civilization, community and stability over the individual.

Furthermore, one slogan in Huxley’s novel, “ending is better than mending” (*Brave New World* 43), with its emphasis on the activity of “ending,” makes one remember the idea of creating rupture in the conceptualization of time, which is an issue both Huxley’s and Tanpınar’s novels explore. In *Brave New World*, one can argue that Mustapha Mond, who sees history and the past as obsolete, in fact fears the disruptive nature of time: he sees time as a phenomenon flowing in a linear and sequential movement, so for him time needs to be carefully regulated and controlled. Therefore, the activity of “ending” in *Brave New World* refers to Mond’s desire of ending history and freezing temporality. To Mond, ending history indicates rendering the progress (“the true progress” as understood by Adorno, Marcuse and Huxley) irrelevant in the World State. In this sense, Mond’s principal aim of controlling time in a new era reminds one of the subject of time regulation in Tanpınar’s novel. Both novels hence attract attention to the time regulation as a tool in the hands of totalitarian states to accomplish their endeavors of controlling their citizens. By creating a rupture in the conceptualization of time and regulating time, technocrats, such as Mond and Halit the Regulator, would like to force humanity to alter its conceptualization and experience of time. The technological dominance of time provides technocrats with the power of manipulating temporal experience and ending the historical process. The rupture in the conceptualization of time is discussed by Ekrem Işın as follows:

[m]ystical time, constituted with its natural character of the seasons, still preserved its existential quality as a folk calendar directing the life of the neighborhood. But modern time, typified by the hour and second hands, gave birth to the idea of programming daily life as though it demanded obedience to the law which it laid down. The rescue of time from the whirlpool of chance and the programming of its every unit according to different duties enabled the Ottoman person [and later the people in the early periods of the Republic] to acquire modern standards of life. Modern life, lying between the hour and second hands, was more easily able to draw a person into the fast rhythm of daily life in comparison with mystical life which flowed and went by itself. (31)

Modern life, in the late periods of the Ottoman Empire and the early periods of Turkey, was founded on a new concept of time which aimed to regulate the individual according to the needs of modern life by orchestrating life by means of standardization and uniformity. The modern time, or the sense of a homogenous temporality, helped the state-building elites of the Republic create the modern Turkish subject belonging to a national community and sharing a common sense of temporality. Thus, the nation building can be seen as a modern compulsion related to political, economic and social causes as theorized by Benedict Anderson in *Imagined Communities* (1983). He defines the nation as an “imagined political community – and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign” (6). To explain his definition, Anderson first asserts that “the nation is *imaginary* because members [...] will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion” (6). Later he states that “the nation is *limited* because even the largest [...] has finite, if elastic, boundaries, beyond which lie other nations” (7). The members of a national community imagine the existence of boundaries and this suggests that they recognize the existence of separation by culture, ethnicity, and social structure among humankind. As another point, he argues that “the nation is imagined as *sovereign* because the concept was born in an age in which Enlightenment and Revolution were destroying the legitimacy of the divinely-ordained, hierarchical dynastic realm [...] nations

dream of being free, and, if under God, directly so” (7). The sovereign state, therefore, can be the symbol of freedom from traditional religious structures and it provides the sense of organization that does not rely on the weakening religious hierarchies. Anderson also contends that “the nation is imagined as a *community* because it is always conceived as a deep, horizontal comradeship” (7). So, this imagined alliance among people of the same imagined nation makes people willingly die to sacrifice themselves for the nation. Also, Anderson establishes a connection between the emergence of the notion of homogenous empty time and the nation, that is, he argues that it became possible to imagine the nation via the notion of “homogenous empty time” (24). Anderson’s definition of the nation does not fail to explain the nation-building process Turkey has gone through: after the loss of the Empire and with the emergence of homogeneous empty time and print-languages, the nationalist consciousness emerged and the nation came to be used as a discourse in Turkey. Anderson states about Turkey’s nationalism that “[t]o heighten Turkish – Turkey’s national consciousness at the expense of any wider Islamic identification, Atatürk imposed compulsory romanization²¹⁸ [...] thereby hoped to align Turkish nationalism with the modern, romanized civilization of Western Europe” (45-6). Within the discourse of nation in Turkey, the ruling classes, along with “compulsory romanization,” adopted a new comprehension of time which is homogeneous empty time, and so claimed that Turkish nation can move calendrically through this new time. The modern time hence became a political, economic and social tool within the modernization project carried out in Turkey to build both the discourse of nation and the national consciousness.

Tanpınar conceives modernization in Turkey as a project based on a temporal rupture and/or created by the spatialization of time²¹⁹ in order to

²¹⁸ By “romanization,” Anderson means westernization.

²¹⁹ By “spatialization of time,” what is meant is the attempts of identifying “the modern” and “the pre/non-modern” with specific geographical places. To illustrate, the Eurocentric

found a new nation on the ashes of the Ottoman Empire. The novel suggests that the modernization project of Turkey brought about a temporal rupture and two perceptions of time: private and public. While the private time is identified with the “traditional,” “old” and “Eastern” which is represented by Nuri Efendi, the public time is associated with the modern time and its representative is Halit the Regulator. Tanpınar, who conceptualizes time as a monolithic entity and never aims to favor one dimension of time over the other, aims to remind the reader in *The Time Regulation Institute* of the fact that there is this private dimension of time, the intuitive and pure time, which is flowing next to the mathematical time. And he engages with this dimension of time, pure time, by means of two symbols in the novel: a clock, namely, the Blessed One and the world of the coffeehouse at Şehzadebaşı. Firstly, the clock at Hayri’s childhood house, the Blessed One, is attributed some supernatural features, yet what makes it unique is something else, which is described by Hayri as follows:

[w]hat calendar did it mark, what year did it tag after, what was it that suddenly stopped it short for days on end and then what caused it to thunder forth its big important secret quite unexpectedly with a sonorous, grave, and deep note? We did not know. For *this clock admitted no regulation, no setting, and no repair. It was the impersonation of a special time out of the sphere of man.* Sometimes it would abruptly start to strike, and a long time would elapse before it stopped. Then months would pass by with no more than the swing of its pendulum. (emphases added, *The Time Regulation Institute* 44-5)²²⁰

Here it is significant that the Blessed One does not admit regulation and its working and stopping at the times it feels suitable makes it have transcendental qualities and exist in a special time that cannot be comprehended by the rational but the intuitive. So Hayri establishes a relation between the Blessed One and pure time/the intuitive private time because, as implied in the quotation, this clock resists conforming to the

point of view tends to define the Western Europe as “the modern” and the rest as “the pre/non-modern.”

²²⁰ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 85.

rules enforced by mathematical time/the public time. Similarly, Kocamaner too argues that “this clock represents a spiritual or an intuitive perception of time akin to Bergsonian *la durée* (duration), which refers to the ‘uninterrupted transition, multiplicity without divisibility and succession without separation’ [*Duration and Simultaneity* 30]” (19).

The coffeehouse at Şehzadebaşı, is another symbol through which Tanpınar presents how Turkish people are engaged with the pure time/private time. Although visitors of this coffeehouse are presented as they are constantly fooling around with some strange activities, for instance, trying to summon spirits, they stand for the Turkish society which is metaphorically stuck between before and after the *Tanzimat*. Bombarded by both past and present realities, the coffeehouse goers try to cope with the modernization crisis by socializing there. For many critics of the novel, like Moran, Kutlu and Ayvazoğlu, the frequenters of the coffeehouse are the “embodiments of the absurd; they are “idlers” who immerse in “collective dreams” (*The Time Regulation Institute* 131) Agreeing with the main arguments of these critics about the state of the coffeehouse goers, I also argue that Tanpınar’s depiction of the world of the coffeehouse complicates the issues of idleness. Here I would like to emphasize that Tanpınar depicts a world of coffeehouse in his novel to emphasize its function as a way of escape or a shelter where one can take a break from the reality shaped by the modernization project carried out in Turkey. It is like a world of magic, a playground for “idle” dreamers. Idleness attributed to these people at the coffeehouse is a feature which belongs to a reasoning that qualifies people according to their productivity and usefulness. Bertrand Russell argues that “I want to say, in all seriousness, that a great deal of harm is being done in the modern world by belief in the virtuousness of work, and that the road to happiness and prosperity lies in an organized diminution of work” (3). This idea which uses public propaganda required to inaugurate the work discipline preaches working and condemns idleness. Here, by idleness

Russell does not refer to the comfortable laziness, as in the case of the land owners in the feudal Europe because he maintains that

unfortunately, their idleness is only rendered possible by the industry of others; indeed their desire for comfortable idleness is historically the source of the whole gospel of work. The last thing they have ever wished is that others should follow their example. [...] In the past, there was a small leisure class and a larger working class. The leisure class enjoyed advantages for which there was no basis in social justice; this necessarily made it oppressive, limited its sympathies, and caused it to invent theories by which to justify its privileges. [...] Modern technique has made it possible for leisure, within limits, to be not the prerogative of small privileged classes, but a right evenly distributed throughout the community. (4-6)

Tanpınar, as illustrated in the previous chapter in regards to *A Mind at Peace*, thinks like Russell and has a positive attitude to the idea of leisure which helps individuals improve emotionally, spiritually and intellectually. In this regard, it can be asserted that the coffeehouse frequenters, despite their various motivations, go to the coffeehouse and socialize and by means of these conversations and activities at the coffeehouse they feel they are getting in touch with the collective consciousness and their “authentic selves” in Martin Heidegger’s term (276). Hayri’s observations of the life at the coffeehouse foreground the points related to the idleness, the transformation into a magical world and having collective dreams as follows:

[g]radually I got used to this way of life. How carefree and comfortable it was! This docile crowd made one forget everything, including one’s self. No sooner was I through with my daily work than I rushed there, and as soon as I stepped in, I felt *transformed* and far removed from daily sorrows in a world of *illusion*. [...] They [visitors of the coffeehouse] all live in their imagination in totally different worlds. They dream the *collective dreams*. [...] You may also call them those who remained behind the door leading a half-serious and half-farcical *life of idleness* in the bewilderment of their inability to live in modern times. [...] Here everything was somewhat somniferous and sedative. (emphases added, *The Time Regulation Institute* 131-2)²²¹

²²¹ For Turkish see Appendix A, note 86.

In the imaginative world of the coffeehouse its visitors are dreaming collectively about experiencing the pure time, which, they believe, will liberate them from the bondage of the modern mundane.

The Time Regulation Institute is another literary testament of Tanpınar's understanding of the modern explored further in terms of time. Tanpınar's conceptualization of time as a monolithic entity, which rejects any sort of distinctions between the past, the present and the future, or between the private and public time, should be regarded as a tool through which Tanpınar formulates his idea of the modern.

To conclude this chapter, it can be argued that both Huxley's *Brave New World* and Tanpınar's *The Time Regulation Institute* are examples of the modern satirical novel of ideas. Huxley's critique of the totalizing claims of reason, science and the instrumental rationality in *Brave New World* is a way in which he engaged in the question of modernity: by the time he wrote this novel, he had become increasingly critical of Western modernity as failing to justify Enlightenment reason; therefore, he criticized some of the outcomes of modernity; to put it more specifically, the misuse of science, instrumental rationality and the Enlightenment faith in universalism. In the same manner, Tanpınar's novel is critical of the institutes, organizations, agencies and the system of bureaucracy established during and as a part of the modernization project of Turkey. Turkish modernization, as suggested by *The Time Regulation Institute*, is not a process of linear progress but a more complex process including alienation of individuals and displacement of identities. From this perspective, *The Time Regulation Institute* is a novel which reminds us of the significance of the idea of Multiple Modernities and the idiosyncratic characteristics and complexities of Turkish modernization – which is by nature heterogeneous. The novels, as shown previously, share similar structural features such as the use of the onomastic satire, symbols and allegories which intensify the feeling of discontent with modernity and modernization.

In the previous chapter, I have tried to show that, despite the similar technical features, *Point Counter Point* and *A Mind at Peace* demonstrate two different literary attitudes to the conceptualization of the modern and I claimed that while Huxley's *Point Counter Point* relies on a linear/forward movement idea of history and on a Eurocentric understanding of the modern, Tanpınar's *A Mind at Peace* emphasizes, by implication, the necessity of an idea of *terkip* which refers to the idea of creating "a new life particular to a culture." Tanpınar's exploration of *terkip* and his critique of modernity's homogenizing, mathematical time show close affinities to both Bergsonian and the Sufi formulations of time and the theory of Multiple Modernities. The comparative study in this chapter, however, reveals that Huxley's and Tanpınar's discontent with modernity as exposed in *Brave New World* and *The Time Regulation Institute* show close resemblances especially in terms of both novels' critiquing the formulation of time in the liberal vision of modernity and their deeming modernity or modernization based on this vision as a rupture. Thus in this chapter it is also pointed out that a paradigm shift from space to time in Huxley's understanding of the modern has occurred. In this sense, I argue that the distance between Huxley and Tanpınar regarding their understanding of the modern becomes smaller towards the later years of their writing careers. The modern as experienced in "the West" is a point both novels satirize because, as the novels take it, the Western modernity is based on an instrumental view of human beings as things to be manipulated. Therefore, the chapter contends that in spite of all historical and cultural specificities that distinguish *Brave New World* from *The Time Regulation Institute*, Tanpınar's novel enters into a dialogue with Huxley's novel in relation to their critique of the bureaucratic, rational and technological state which posits itself as a threat to life by rendering human beings as mere tools. Their formulations of the modern that inform their novels are similar since they challenge the limits of conventional time and deconstruct the binaries between "the West" and "the East:" the novels, in other words, propose that multiple experiences of modernity are possible.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

The study explores Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar's philosophical and fictional engagement with Aldous Leonard Huxley in relation to the issues of modernity and modernization shaping their novels, *Point Counter Point* (1928), *Brave New World* (1932) and *A Mind at Peace* (1949), *The Time Regulation Institute* (1961). The study has also sought to know whether and to what extent Tanpınar adopts, revises and/or contests Huxley's attitude towards modernity and modernization. Within this context, the study has attempted to answer three main questions:

1. What are the major conceptualizations of the modern, modernity and modernization?
2. Why and how do Huxley and Tanpınar make a criticism of the modern in their novels?
3. Are their critical approaches to the modern in their novels similar to or different from each other?

The main findings regarding Huxley's and Tanpınar's discontent with the modern as discussed in Chapters 2, 3 and 4 are as follows: first, Huxley's understanding of the modern in the nineteen twenties, or as it was reflected in *Point Counter Point*, was in accordance with the liberal vision of modernity, which identifies "the West" with the modern and "the East" with the non-modern. That is, his criticism of the modern at those times was Eurocentric. Second, around the nineteen thirties, or with *Brave New World*, a paradigm shift happened in Huxley's understanding of the modern because the novel is structured around a conceptualization of the modern not in terms of space but of time. This paradigm shift also manifested itself in his conceptualization of the modern and it is significant because it indicates that Huxley's understanding of the modern is now closer to that of

Tanpınar's. Third, throughout his writing career, Tanpınar, as reflected in his novels, tended to conceptualize the modern in terms of time. Next, the tendency of conceptualizing the modern in terms of time for both writers indicates that they are discontented with the ways in which the modern is imagined. Furthermore, their critical attitudes to the liberal vision of modernity, as implied particularly in *Brave New World* and *The Time Regulation Institute*, seem to have motivated them to write novels that can be described as dystopian and/or satirical novels of ideas. This is how their art relates with the critique of modernity: the fact that both Huxley and Tanpınar wrote dystopian and/or satirical novels is indicative of their attachment to modernity because it reveals that Huxley and Tanpınar are not critical of modernity *per se* but the ways in which it was carried out; theirs is a critique of the modernity's tendency to self-cancellation. By means of the satirical mode in their novels, both Huxley and Tanpınar foreground their critiques of the idea of the modern that is constructed on the binary oppositions like the West/the East, the modern/the traditional, and the present/the past. And lastly, they challenge and reformulate the prevailing Western concept of modernity and time by bringing the past and the present together.

Furthermore, the study has shown that Huxley's fiction and his employment of techniques such as the multiplicity of viewpoints and musicalization of fiction may have influenced Tanpınar's fiction. In addition to that, Huxley's critique of the dark side of the Western experiences of modernity in the early thirties – such as the use of technology and science to control society, instrumental rationality, the Enlightenment faith in universalism, and the emergence of a consumer society and of an authoritative state and so on – may have motivated Tanpınar to adopt a critical attitude towards similarly progressivist and positivist aspects of the Turkish modernization project. However, the study has also pointed out that Tanpınar in his fiction revises and contests the type of formulation of modernity shaping Huxley's fiction in the twenties, which tends to idealize

and identify the West with the modern and the rest with the pre-modern. However, as pointed out in Chapter 4, Huxley's Eurocentric ideas in regard to modernity and modernization started to change in the early thirties and, as *Brave New World* clearly demonstrates, he began to formulate an idea of modernity that does not rely on geographical signifiers. So, it can be held that the fiction of both Huxley and Tanpınar are shaped by their discontent with approaches to modernity and modernization developed by the liberal narrative of modernity. Therefore, their fiction reconfigures modernity and modernization in ways that foreground multiple experiences and practices of modernity.

As a comparative study of the novels of an English and a Turkish writer, this dissertation is also connected to some other discussions such as those on the notion of "national" literatures and cultural boundaries across nations and literatures. This dissertation aims to contribute to the kind of studies which seek to "develop new articulations of the connections among literatures and to give a sense of the ways in which literatures and cultures might be like and unlike one another" (Greene, "Preface" vii). The real motive behind any comparative endeavor seems to be "wanting to learn from 'other' experiences that are not one's own" (Radhakrishnan 454). And when a comparison is initiated, the grounds of comparison should be delineated carefully because these grounds are by no means self-evident. The project of comparison thus enables us to see that there is no way to retreat into a single frame, into the safe harbor of a centrism. "The two works to be compared are deterritorialized from their 'original' milieu and then reterritorialized so that they may become cospatial, epistemologically speaking" (Radhakrishnan 456). It is in this context that one example counters another in dialogue and contestation. The new knowledge that emerges out of a comparative study can be more sophisticated, progressive, and cosmopolitan than a form of knowledge that is secure in studies which do not seek new connections among literatures. Furthermore, comparisons can raise a number of fundamental issues like the self/other problematic, the

binary logic of universalism/relativism, tradition/modernity and so on, and comparisons can open up a mobile space of the “between” that is non-sovereign; it is a site that belongs to no one. That is, comparisons should give up on the hegemony of “centrism” by functioning as unsteady and stimulating experiments where every “self” is rendered vulnerable by the gaze of the “other.” As a comparative literary study, this thesis attempts to participate in the work of many other studies aiming to critique and deconstruct the ideological oppositions like the west/the east, tradition/modernity and self/other.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adalı, Murat. "Geleneğin Farklı Bir Yorumcusu: Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar"
Hece No. 61 Ocak 2002.
- Adorno, T. and M. Horkheimer. *The Dialectic of Enlightenment*. (1944)
Trans. John Cumming. New York: The Continuum Publishing,
1994. Print.
- Adorno, T. "Progress" in *Enigriffe: Neun kritische Modelle* (1963) *Critical
Models: Interviews and Catchwords*. Trans. Henry W. Pickford.
New York: Columbia UP., 1998. Print.
- _____. *Prisms*. London: Neville Spearman, 1967. Print.
- Ahıska, Meltem. (2003). 'Occidentalism: The Historical Fantasy of the
Modern' *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, 102 (2/3), 351-379. Print.
- Akün, Ömer Faruk. "Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar" in *Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı
Dergisi*, C.XII, Aralık 1962. Print.
- Amin, Samir. *Eurocentrism*, Trans. Russell Moore. London: Zed Books,
1989. Print.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and
Spread of Nationalism*. London and New York: Verso, 1983. Print.
- Aplin, John. "Aldous Huxley and Music in the 1920s" in *Music & Letters*,
Vol. 64. No.1/2 (Jan. – Apr., 1983), pp.25-36. Stable URL:
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/735358>. 17/09/2012. Web.
- Aydın, Mehmet. "*Kayıp Zamanın İzinde*" *Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar*. Istanbul:
Doğu Batı, 2010. Print.

- Ayvazoğlu, Beşir. “*Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* Yahut Bir İnkıraz Felsefesi”, *Töre*, Sayı: 169-17, Temmuz 1985. Print.
- Bacon, Francis. “Of Truth” in *Bacon’s Essays*. Boston: C. S. Francis & Co., 1857. Print
- Baker, Robert S. *The Dark Historic Page: Social Satire and Historicism in the Novels of Aldous Huxley*. Wisconsin: Wisconsin University Press, 1982. Print.
- _____. *Brave New World: History, Science and Dystopia*. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1990. Print.
- _____. “The Nightmare of the Frankfurt School: The Marquis de Sade and the Problem of Modernity in Aldous Huxley's Dystopian Narrative” in *Now More Than Ever: Proceedings of the Aldous Huxley Centenary Symposium, Münster 1994*, ed. Bernfried Nügel. 245-60. Frankfurt, Berlin, New York: Peter Lang, 1995. Print.
- _____. “Introduction” to *Aldous Huxley Complete Essays Vol. I-II-III-IV-V, 1926-1929*. Baker, Robert S. and James Sexton, eds., Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2000. Print.
- _____. “Science and Modernity in Aldous Huxley’s Inter-War Essays and Novels” in *Aldous Huxley: Between East and West*. Ed. C. C. Barfoot. Amsterdam – New York: Rodopi, 2001. Print.
- Bakhtin, M. M. *Problems of Dostoevsky’s Poetics* ed. and trans. C. Emerson. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984. Print.
- Ballantyne, Glenda. “Western Modernity: One among Many” in *The Australian Sociological Association*. 2010. Print.
- Bannerji, Himani. “Theorizing Modernity”
<http://www.yorku.ca/gradsoci/documents/theorizingModernityexpandedoutline.doc>. 08/09/2014. Web.

- Barfoot, C. C. *Aldous Huxley between East and West*. Amsterdam – New York City: Rodopi, 2001. Print.
- Bayraktar, Levent. “Mevlana ve Bergson’da Ruh Kavramı” in *Mevlana Mesnevi Mevlevihaneler Sempozyumu*, Yay. Haz. Mehmed Veysi Dörtbudak, Manisa 2007, s. 27-31. Print.
- Bayramoğlu, Zeynep. *Huzursuz Huzur ve Tekinsiz Saatler: Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar Üzerine Tezler*. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2001. Print.
- Bedford, Sybille. *Aldous Huxley: A Biography Volume One: The Apparent Stability*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1973. Print.
- _____. *Aldous Huxley: A Biography Volume Two: The Turning Points*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1974. Print.
- Benjamin, Walter “Theses on the Philosophy of History”, in *Illuminations* (1940) Trans. Harry Zohn. Ed. Hannah Arendt. Bungay, Suffolk: Fontana/Collins, 1973. Print.
- _____. *Berlin Childhood Around 1900* (1950). Trans. Howard Eiland. Cambridge: Harvard Uni. Press, 2006. Print.
- _____. *The Arcades Project*, Ed. Rolf Tiedemann. Trans. Howard Eiland and Kevin McLaughlin, New York: Belknap Press, 2002. Print.
- Bentley, Joseph. “Huxley’s Ambivalent Responses to the Ideas of D. H. Lawrence” in *Twentieth Century Literature*, Vol. 13, No. 3 (Oct., 1967), pp. 139-153. Published by: Hofstra University Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/440762>. 12/12/2013. Web.
- Bergson, Henri. *Time and Free Will: An Essay on the Immediate Data of Consciousness* 1910. (Essai sur les données immédiates de la conscience 1889) Dover Publications: 2001. Print.

_____. *Matter and Memory* (1896). (Matière et mémoire 1896). Trans. Nancy Margaret Paul and W. Scott Palmer. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1911. Print.

_____. *Duration and Simultaneity: Bergson and the Einsteinian Universe* (1922). Manchester: Clinamen Press Ltd., 1999. Print.

_____. *The Creative Mind: An Introduction to Metaphysics*. (La Pensée et le mouvant 1934) New York: Kensington Publishing Corp., 1946. Print.

Berkes, Niyazi. *Türkiye’de Çagdaslasma (Secularism in Turkey)*. Istanbul: Dogu-Batı Yayınları, 1978. Print.

Berksoy, Berkiz. “Bir Entellektüel Olarak Tanpınar.” <http://turcologie.u-strasbg.fr/dets/images/Doctorants/b.%20berksoy.%20bir%20entellekt%FCel%20olarak%20tanpınar.pdf>. 10/09/2013. Web.

Bernheimer, Charles. “Introduction: The Anxieties of Comparison” in *Comparative Literature in the Age of Multiculturalism*. Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1995. Print.

Bhat, Yashoda. *Aldous Huxley and George Orwell: A Comparative Study of Satire in Their Novels*. New Delhi: Sterling, 1991. Print.

Birlik, Nurten. “Tanpınar’s Attempts to Go beyond Temporal Reality in ‘The Dance’” *Middle Eastern Literatures*, 10: 2007. Print.

Bloom, Edward A. and Lillian D. Bloom. “Satire’s Persuasive Voice” in *Modern Philology* Vol. 78, No. 4 (May, 1981), pp. 438-441 Published by: The University of Chicago Press. Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/437445>. 09/08/2014. Web.

- Booker, M. Keith. "Introduction" in *The Dystopian Impulse in Modern Literature*. Westport, Connecticut; London: Greenwood Press, 1994. Print.
- Bozdoğan, Sibel and Reşat Kasaba. *Rethinking Modernity and National Identity in Turkey*. Washington DC.: University of Washington Press, 1997. Print.
- Bradshaw, David. "Introduction" to *Brave New World* by Aldous Huxley. London: Flamingo, 1994. Print.
- Buchanan, Brad "Oedipus in Dystopia: Freud and Lawrence in Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*" in *Journal of Modern Literature* 25. 75-89, 2002. Print.
- Burns, John Henry and Aldous Huxley. *A Vision of Education, Being an Imaginary Verbatim Report of the First Interplanetary Conference*. London: Williams & Norgate, 1929. Print.
- Cahoone, Lawrence E. "Enlightenment and Narcissism: Adorno, Horkheimer, and Lasch" in *The Dilemma of Modernity: Philosophy, Culture, and Anti-Culture*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1988. Print.
- Calinescu, Matei. "Modernity, Modernism, Modernization: Variations on Modern Themes" in *Symplokē* Vol. 1, No. 1 (Winter 1993), pp. 1-20 Published by: University of Nebraska Press Article Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40550352>. 05/11/2014. Web.
- Carter, Angela. *The Sadeian Woman. An Exercise in Cultural History*. London: Virago, 1979. Print.

- Chakoo, B. L. *Aldous Huxley and Eastern Wisdom*. Delhi: Atma Ram & Sons, 1981. Print.
- Chakrabarty, Dipesh. *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000. Print.
- Claeys, Gregory. "The Origins of Dystopia: Wells, Huxley and Orwell" in *The Cambridge Companion to Utopian Literature*. Cambridge: CUP, 2010. Print.
- Corrado, Adriana. *Da un'isola all'altra: il pensiero utopica nella narrativa inglese da Thomas More and Aldous Huxley*. Napoli: Scientifiche Italiane, 1998. Print.
- Crowne, John. "The Married Beau; or The Curious Impertinent" (1694) in *The Dramatic Works of John Crowne: The English friar. Regulus. The married beau. Caligula*. London: William Paterson, 1874. Print.
- Cupers, Jean-Louis. *Aldous Huxley et la musique: A la maniere de Jean-Sebastien*. Facultes Universitaires Saint Louis, Brussels, 1985. Print.
- Çakmak, İdris. "The portraits of the artists as critics in the recreation of the modern with tradition: Tanpınar and Eliot." M.A. Thesis. Fatih Üniversitesi, 2008. <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/tezSorguSonucYeni.jsp#top> 2.11/12/2014. Web.
- Dasenbrock, Reed Way. "An Absurd Century: The Varieties of Satire" in *The Cambridge Companion to the Twentieth-Century English Novel*. Ed. Robert L. Caserio. Cambridge: CUP, 2009. Print.
- Dellaloğlu, Besim F. *Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar-Modernleşmenin Zihniyet Dünyası ve Bir Tanpınar Fetişizmi*. İstanbul: Kapı Yayınları, 2012. Print.

Demiralp, Oğuz. *Kutup Noktası*. İstanbul: YKY, 1993. Print.

Ebbinghaus, Hermann. *Memory: A contribution to experimental psychology*. Trans. H.A. Ruger and C.E. Bussenius. Dover, New York: 1913. Print.

Eisenstadt, Shmuel Noah. "Multiple Modernities" in *Daedalus; Winter 2000; 129, 1; Research Library Core*. Print.

Eliot, T. S. "Burnt Norton" in *Four Quartets*. California: Harcourt, 1943. Print.

Erozan, Boğaç. "Turkey and the West: A History of Ambivalence," *Orient III*: 4-15, 2009. Print.

Ertürk, Nergis. "Modernity and Its Fallen Languages: Tanpınar's Hasret, Benjamin's Melancholy." *PMLA*, 123(1): January 2008. Print.

_____. *Grammatology and Literary Modernity in Turkey*. Oxford and New York, OUP, 2011. Print.

_____. "Modernism Disfigured: Turkish Literature and the 'Other West'" in *The Oxford Handbook of Global Modernisms*. Oxford and New York: OUP, 2012. Print.

Farkas, Ákos. "Canon and Canonicity in Huxley's *Point Counter Point*" https://www.academia.edu/5522382/Canon_and_Canonicity_in_Huxleys_Point_Counter_Point. 06/05/2014. Web.

Faure, Bernard. *Double Exposure: Cutting across Buddhist and Western Discourses*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004. Print.

- Feldman, Walter. "Time, Memory and Autobiography in *The Clock-Setting Institute* of Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar" in *Edebiyat* Vol. 8 pp. 37-61. OPA (Overseas Publishers Association), 1998. Print.
- Fietz, Lothar. "Huxley's Acceptance and Rejection" in *The Perennial Satirist*. Herman J. Real and Peter E. Firchow Eds. Münster: Lit Verlag, 2005. Print.
- Firchow, Peter E. "Mental Music: Huxley's "Mental Music: Huxley's *Point Counter Point* and Mann's *Magic Mountain* as Novels of Ideas" in *Critical Essays on Aldous Huxley*. New York: G. K. Hall & Co., 1996. Print.
- _____. "Why Reluctant Modernists?" in *Reluctant Modernists: Aldous Huxley and Some Contemporaries*. Münster, Harburg, London: Lit Verlag: 2002. Print.
- Ford, Henry and Crowther, Samuel. *My Life and Work*, Garden City, New York: Garden City Publishing Company, 1922. Print.
- Freud, Sigmund. *Civilization and Its Discontents*. (1929). London: Hogarth Press, 1949. Print.
- Frye, Northrop. *Anatomy of Criticism*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1957. Print.
- Gaonkar, Dilip Parameshwar. "On Alternative Modernities" in *Public Culture*. Volume 11, Number 1: Issue 27, Winter 1999. Print.
- Giddens, Anthony. *The Consequences of Modernity*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990. Print.
- Göçek, Fatma Müge. *Rise of the Bourgeoisie, Demise of Empire: Ottoman Westernization and Social Change*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996. Print.

Göle, Nilüfer. “Batı-Dışı Modernlik Üzerine Bir İlk Desen”, *Doğu Batı* (iç.), Sayı: 2, 1998, s. 55-62.

_____. “Snapshots of Islamic Modernity” in *Daedalus*. 2000. Print.

_____. “Islam in Public: New Visibilities and New Imaginaries” in *Public Culture* 14(1): 173-190. Duke University Press, 2002. Print.

Greene, Roland. “Preface” to *Tales of Crossed Destinies: The Modern Turkish Novel in a Comparative Context*. Azade Seyhan. New York: MLA, 2008. Print.

Greville, Fulke. “Mustapha” in *The Works in Verse and Prose Complete of the Right Honourable Fulke Greville*. 1870. Print.

Griffin, Dustin H. *Satire: A Critical Reintroduction*. Lexington, Kentucky: The University Press of Kentucky, 1994. Print.

Grossberg, Lawrence. *Cultural Studies in the Future Tense*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2010. Print.

Grosvenor, Peter. “Progress, Elitism and Ideology in *Point Counter Point* as a Novel of Ideas” in *Point Counter Point: A Casebook*, ed. D. G. Izzo and Edward McShane. <http://www.dalkeyarchive.com/product/point-counter-point-by-aldous-huxley/> 05/03/2012. Web.

Günday Rıfat. “Problemes du temps chez Marcel Proust et Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar.” PhD. Diss. Marmara Üniversitesi, 1997. <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/tezSorguSonucYeni.jsp#top> 2. 11/12/2014. Web.

Gündoğdu, Servet. “Huzur ve Ulysses’te derin semantik olarak zaman sorunu.” M.A. Thesis. Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi, 2012.

<https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/tezSorguSonucYeni.jsp#top>
2. 11/12/2014. Web.

Gürbilek, Nurdan. "Dandies and Originals: Authenticity, Belatedness, and the Turkish Novel" in *The South Atlantic Quarterly* 102: 2/3, Spring/Summer. Duke University Press, 2003. Print.

_____. *Kör Ayna Kayıp Şark: Edebiyat ve Endişe*. İstanbul: Metis, 2004. Print.

_____. *Benden Önce Bir Başkası*. İstanbul: Metis, 2010. Print.

Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. *Lectures on the Philosophy of World History*. Introduction, trans. H. B. Nisbet. Cambridge: CUP, 1980. Print.

Heidegger, Martin. *Being and Time*, translated by J. Macquarrie and E. Robinson. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1962 (first published in 1927). Print.

Higdon, David Leon. *Wandering Into Brave New World*. New York: Rodopi, 2013. Print.

Highet, Gilbert. *The Anatomy of Satire*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963. Print.

Hilferding, Rudolf. *Finance Capital. A Study of the Latest Phase of Capitalist Development* (1910). Ed. Tom Bottomore. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1973. <http://marxists.org/archive/hilferding/1910/finkap/>. 17/05/2012. Web.

Hitchens, Christopher. "Foreword" in *Brave New Word and Brave New World Revisited* Aldous Huxley. New York: Harper Perennial, 2005. Print.

Hobsbawm, Eric and Terence Ranger. *The Invention of Tradition*. London: OUP, 1992. Print.

Hodgart, Matthew. *Satire: Origins and Principles*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Publishers, 2010. Print.

Hoffman, Frederick J. "Aldous Huxley and the Novel of Ideas" in *College English*, Vol. 8, No. 3 (Dec., 1946), pp. 129-137. Published by: National Council of Teachers of English. Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/371436>. 16/02/2013. Web.

Hogarth, Basil. "Aldous Huxley as Music Critic" in *The Musical Times*, Vol. 76, No. 1114 (Dec., 1935), pp. 1079-1082. Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/919268>. 17/09/2011. Web.

Honneth, Axel. "Critical Theory" *Critical Theory Today* eds. A. Giddens and J Turner. Cambridge: Polity, 1987. Print.

Horkheimer, Max. *Eclipse of Reason*. New York: OUP, 2004. Print.

Huxley, A. L. "Water Music" in "The Athenaeum" 4712, August 20, 1920. Print.

_____. *Crome Yellow*. London: Chatto Windus, 1921. Print.

_____. *Antic Hay*. London: Chatto Windus, 1923. Print.

_____. *Those Barren Leaves*. London: Chatto Windus, 1925. Print.

_____. *Jesting Pilate: The Diary of A Journey*. London: Chatto Windus, 1926. Print.

_____. *Two or Three Graces*. London: Chatto Windus, 1926. Print.

- _____. *Proper Studies*. London: Chatto Windus, 1927. Print.
- _____. *Point Counter Point*. London: Modern Library, 1928. Print.
- _____. *Do What You Will*. London: Chatto Windus, 1929. Print.
- _____. *Music at Night*. London: Chatto Windus, 1931. Print.
- _____. *Brave New World*. London: Chatto Windus, 1932. Print.
- _____. *Eyeless in Gaza*. London: Chatto Windus, 1936. Print.
- _____. *The Olive Tree and Other Essays*. London: Chatto Windus, 1936. Print.
- _____. *After Many A Summer*. London: Chatto Windus, 1939. Print.
- _____. *Beyond the Mexique Bay: A Traveler's Journey*. London: Chatto Windus, 1934. Print.
- _____. *Time Must Have A Stop*. London: Chatto Windus, 1944. Print.
- _____. *The Perennial Philosophy*. London: Chatto Windus, 1945. Print.
- _____. *Ape and Essence*. London: Chatto Windus, 1948. Print.
- _____. *Themes and Variations*. London: Ayer Co Pub, 1950. Print.
- _____. *Island*. London: Chatto Windus, 1962. Print.
- _____. 10 April 1925 in *Letters of Aldous Huxley*. Ed. Grover Smith. London: Chatto & Windus, 1969. Print.

_____. . 25 March 1945 in *Letters of Aldous Huxley*. Ed. Grover Smith. London: Chatto & Windus, 1969. Print.

_____. . *Along The Road: Notes and Essays of A Tourist*. (1925) London: Granada, 1985. Print.

_____. . *Aldous Huxley Complete Essays Vol. I-II-III-IV-V, 1926-1929*. Baker, Robert S. and James Sexton, eds., Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2000. Print.

_____. . “The Double Crisis” in *Aldous Huxley Complete Essays Vol. V, 1926-1929*. Baker, Robert S. and James Sexton, eds., Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2000. Print.

_____. . “Pleasures,” in *Aldous Huxley: Complete Essays: Volume I*, Baker Robert S. and James Sexton, Eds., 354-357. Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2000. Print.

_____. . “Literature and Modern Life” in *Aldous Huxley Complete Essays Vol. VI*. Ed. Robert S. Baker and James Sexton. Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2002. Print.

Işın, Ekrem. “Ahmet Midhat Efendi ve Gündelik Hayatın Pratik Bilgisi: Adab-ı Muşeret” in *Tarih ve Toplum*. 8: 31-37. (The quotation Trans. Walter Feldman in “Time, Memory and Autobiography”). Print.

Izzo, David Garrett and Kim Kirkpatrick. *Huxley's Brave New World Essays*. London: McFarland & Company, 2008. Print.

İrem, Nazım. “Turkish Conservative Modernism: Birth of a Nationalist Quest for Cultural Renewal” in *International Journal of Middle East Studies* Vol. 34, No. 1 (Feb., 2002), pp. 87-112 Published by: Cambridge University Press
Article Stable URL:<http://www.jstor.org/stable/3880169>.
01/01/2014. Web.

- Jusdanis, Gregory. *Belated Modernity and Aesthetic Culture: Inventing National Literature* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1991. Print.
- Kalberg, S. "Max Weber's types of rationality: Cornerstones for the analysis of rationalization processes in history". *American Journal of Sociology*, 85. 1980. Print.
- Kandiyoti, D. "Bargaining with Patriarchy" in *Gender and Society*, 2 (3), 1988. Print.
- Kant, Immanuel. "An Answer to the Question: 'What Is Enlightenment?'" (1784), in *Practical Philosophy*. trans. Mary J. Gregor. Cambridge: CUP, 1996. Print.
- Kaplan, Mehmet. "Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü," *Çağrı*, Şubat – 49, 1962. Print.
- _____. "Bir Şairin Romanı: *Huzur*," *Türk Edebiyatı Üzerine Araştırmalar*, İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 1997. Print.
- Pavičić-Ivelja, Katarina. "Mindless Pleasure or Constant Pain – *Brave New World* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*: The Comparison." M.A. Thesis. University of Rijeka, 2014.
https://www.academia.edu/Documents/in/Aldous_Huxley?page=4
11/12/2014. Web.
- Kaya, Ayhan and Ayşe Tecmen. "Turkish Modernity: A Continuous Journey of Europeanization," FP7 Project entitled Identities and Modernities in Europe (IME), SSH-CT-2009-215949, 'The state of the art: various paths to modernity' Turkish Case report (2010)
<http://fass.kingston.ac.uk/public/ime/>. 01/01/2012. Web.
- Kellner, Douglas. *Critical Theory, Marxism, and Modernity*. Cambridge and Baltimore: Polity and John Hopkins University Press. 1989. Also available at <http://pages.gseis.ucla.edu/faculty/kellner/papers/fs.htm>

_____. "The Frankfurt School and British Cultural Studies" in *Rethinking the Frankfurt School: Alternative Legacies of Cultural Critique*. Ed. Jeffrey T. Nealon and Carenn Irr. Albany: SUNY Press, 2002. Print.

_____. "Theodor W. Adorno and the Dialectics of Mass Culture" in *Adorno: A Critical Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2002. Print.

Keyman, E. Fuat. "Modernity, Secularism and Islam: The Case of Turkey". *Theory Culture Society* Vol. 24, No. 2: 215-234 London, Thousand Oaks and New Delhi: SAGE, 2007. Print.

_____. Keyman E. Fuat and Ziya Öniş. *Turkish Politics in a Changing World: Global Dynamics and Domestic Transformations*. Istanbul: Istanbul Bilgi University Press, 2007. Print.

Kocamaner, Hikmet. "Reconfiguring Modernity Through Time: A. H. Tanpınar's The Time Regulation Institute." https://www.academia.edu/5645809/Reconfiguring_Modernity_Through_Time-_A._H._Tanpinars_The_Time_Regulation_Institute. 09/03/2014. Web.

Koçak, Orhan. "Kaptırılmış İdeal: *Mai ve Siyah* Uzerine Psikanalitik Bir Deneme," *Toplum ve Bilim*, no. 70 (1996): 94-152. Print.

Kutlu, Mustafa, "Tanpınar'ın Yalan Dünyası," *Yönelişler*, Sayı: 22, Nisan 1983. Print.

Lacan, Jacques. *Écrits: A Selection*. Trans. Bruce Fink. London, W. W. Norton & Company: 2006. Print.

Langer, Susan. *Feeling and Form: A Theory of Art Developed From Philosophy in a New Key*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1953. Print.

Lawrence, D. H. *Sons and Lovers*. London: Gerald Duckworth and Company, 1913. Print.

_____. *The Plumed Serpent* (1926), edited by L.D. Clark, Cambridge University Press, 1987. Print.

_____. *Selected Letters of D. H. Lawrence. Vol I*. Ed. James T. Boulton. Cambridge: CUP, 1979. Print.

_____. *Sketches of Etruscan Places and other Italina Essays* (1932), edited by Simonetta de Filippis, Cambridge University Press, 1992. Print.

_____. *Lady Chatterley's Lover and A Propos of Lady Chatterley's Lover*. Ed. Michael Squires. Cambridge: CUP, 2002. Print.

_____. *Mornings in Mexico and Other Essays* (1927), edited by Virginia Crosswhite Hyde, Cambridge University Press, 2009. Print.

Lekesiz, Ömer. "Tanpınar Nereden ve Nasıl Bakar?" *Hece* No. 61 Ocak 2002.

Lewis, Bernard. *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*. 3rd ed. New York: OUP, 2002. Print.

Lukas, Michael David. "A Multiplicity of Voices: On the Polyphonic Novel." <http://www.themillions.com/2013/02/a-multiplicity-of-voices-on-the-polyphonic-novel.html>. 15/02/2013. Web.

Marcuse, Herbert. *Eros and Civilization: Philosophical Inquiry into Freud*, Boston: Beacon Press, 1955. Print.

_____. *One-Dimensional Man*. Boston: Beacon, 1964. Print.

- _____. “The Realm of Freedom and the Realm of Necessity: A Reconsideration”, *Praxis: A Philosophical Journal* V. 20-25, 1969. Print.
- _____. “Some Social Implications of Modern Technology” in *The Essential Frankfurt School Reader*. New York: Continuum, 1985. Print.
- Mardin, Şerif. “Religion and Secularism in Turkey,” in Ali Kazancıgil and Ergun Özbudun (eds.). *Atatürk: Founder of a Modern State*. London: C. Hurst & Company, 1981. Print.
- _____. *Türk Modernleşmesi Makaleler 4*. Ed. Mümtaz’er Türköne and Tuncay Önder. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 1991. Print.
- Martin, Kirsty. “Introduction” in *Modernism and the Rhythms of Sympathy: Vernon Lee, Virginia Woolf, D.H. Lawrence*. Oxford: OUP, 2013. Print.
- Marx, Karl. *Grundrisse: Foundations of the Critique of Political Economy*, trans. Martin Nicolaus. New York: Vintage Books, 1973. Print.
- _____. *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*. Vol. I. Trans. Ben Fowkes, London: Harmondsworth, 1976. Print.
- _____. and Frederick Engels. *The German Ideology*, Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1968. Print.
- McGiveron, Rafeeq O. “On the Literary and Political Allusions behind Huxley’s Choice of Names” in *Bloom’s Guides: Brave New World*. Broomall: Chelsea House Publishers, 2004. Print.

Meckier, Jerome. "Aldous Huxley: Satire and Structure" *Wisconsin Studies in Contemporary Literature*, Vol. 7, No. 3 (Autumn, 1966), pp. 284-294. Published by: University of Wisconsin Press. Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1207145>. Print.

_____. "Philip Quarles's Passage to India: Jestling Pilate, Point Counter Point and Bloomsbury" in *Studies in the Novel*. 9:4 (1977: Winter) 445-468. Print.

_____. "Debunking our Ford: My Life and Work and *Brave New World* in" *South Atlantic Quarterly*, 78, 1979, 448-59. Print.

_____. *Critical Essays on Aldous Huxley*. New York: G. K. Hall & Co., 1996. Print.

_____. "Prepping for *Brave New World*: Aldous Huxley's Essays of the 1920s." *Utopian Studies* Vol.12, No.2 (2001), pp. 234-245. Print.

_____. "Aldous Huxley's Americanization of the Brave New World Typescript" in *Twentieth Century Literature*, Winter, Vol. 48 Issue 4. 2002. Print.

_____. "On Huxley's Ironic Utopia." *Bloom's Guides Aldous Huxley's Brave New World*. Ed. Harold Bloom. Philadelphia: Chelsea House, 2004. 72-75. Print.

_____. *Aldous Huxley: Modern Satirical Novelist of Ideas*. Ed. Peter E. Firchow. Berlin: Lit Verlag, 2006. Print.

Meeker, Michael. "Review of Bozdogan, Sibel, *Modernism and Nation Building: Turkish Architectural Culture in the Early Republic*." *H-Turk*, H-Net Reviews. April, 2003.

URL: <http://www.h-net.org/reviews/showrev.php?id=7449>. 03/05/2012. Web.

Mencütekin, Mustafa. "Platonic influence on utopian literature: *Republic* and T. More's *Utopia* (16th cen.), J. Swift's *Gulliver's Travels*

(book IV) (18th cen.), A. Huxley's *Brave New World* (early 20th cen.).” M.A. Thesis. Fatih Üniversitesi, 2000.
<https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/tezSorguSonucYeni.jsp>
11/12/2014. Web.

Mirsepassi, Ali. *Intellectual Discourse and the Politics of Modernization: Negotiating Modernity in Iran*. Cambridge: CUP, 2004. Print.

Mitchell, Timothy. “The Stage of Modernity” in *Questions of Modernity*. Minneapolis, the Uni. of Minnesota Press, 2000. Print.

Moran, Berna. *Türk Romanına Eleştirel Bir Bakış Vol. 1*. İstanbul: İletişim, 1983. Print.

_____. “Time Regulation Institute” Preface to *The Time Regulation Institute*. (*Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* 1961). Trans. Ender Gürol. Madison, USA: Turco- Tatar Press, 2001. Print.

Moroz, Grzegorz. “The Narrative Personae of Aldous Huxley’s Travel Books” in *Aldous Huxley Annual*. Vol. 9 (2009). Berlin: Lit Verlag, 2011. Print.

Murti, T. R. V. *The Central Philosophy of Buddhism: A Study of the Madhyamika System*. London: Routledge, 1955. Print.

Nance, Guinevera. *Aldous Huxley*. New York: Continuum, 1988. Print.

_____. *Aldous Huxley Recollected: An Oral History*. David King Dunaway (ed.) London: Sage Publications, 1999. Print.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Nachlass, Werke, Vol. XIV*, Leipzig: 1904. Print.

_____. *The Birth of Tragedy*. Mineola, N.Y.: Dover Publications, 1995. Print.

_____. *The Gay Science*. Trans. Josefine Nauckhoff. Ed. Bernard Williams. California: CUP, 2001. Print.

O'Har, George. "Technology and Its Discontents" in *Technology and Culture*, Vol. 45, No. 2 (Apr., 2004). pp. 479-485. The John Hopkins University Press. Print.

Okay, M. Orhan. "Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar" TYB Akademi No. 5 Mayıs 2002.

_____. "Modernleşme ve Türk Modernleşmesinin İlk Döneminde İnanç Krizlerinin Edebiyata Yansıması" in *Doğu Batı Düşünce Dergisi*. Sayı: 22, 2003, s. 56-57. Print.

Orwell, George. *Animal Farm: A Fairy Story*. London: Secker and Warburg, 1945. Print.

Özbudun, Ergun. "The Nature of the Kemalist Political Regime", in Ali Kazancigil and Ergun Özbudun (eds.), *Atatürk: Founder of a Modern State*, C. Hurst and Co.: London, 1981. Print.

Pamuk, Orhan. "Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar ve Türk Modernizmi" in *Defter*, Bahar 1995. Print.

_____ . and Mary Isin. “A Private Reading of André Gide’s Public Journal” in *Social Research: An International Quarterly* 71.3 (2004): 679-690. Project MUSE<<http://muse.jhu.edu/>>. . 2/05/ 2014. Web.

Parla, Jale. “Car Narratives: A Subgenre in Turkish Novel Writing” in *The South Atlantic Quarterly* 102.2 (2003): 535-550. *Project MUSE*. <<http://muse.jhu.edu/>>. 25/11/2013. Web.

Parsons, Deborah. *Theorists of the Modernist Novel: James Joyce, Dorothy Richardson, Virginia Woolf*. London and New York: Routledge, 2007. Print.

Pollard, Arthur. *Satire*. London: Methuen & Co Ltd., 1970. Print.

Poyraz, Serdar. “Thinking about Turkish Modernization: Cemil Meriç on Turkish Language, Culture, and Intellectuals” in *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East*. Volume 26, Number 3, 2006. pp. 434-445. Print.

Proust, Marcel. *Remembrance of Things Past [À la recherche du temps perdu (1913 - 1927)] Swann’s Way [Du côté de chez Swann (1913)]* Trans. C. K. Scott Moncrieff. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions Limited, 2006. Print.

Riffaterre, Michael. “On the Complementarity of Comparative Literature and Cultural Studies” in *Comparative Literature in the Age of Multiculturalism* ed. Charles Bernheimer. Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1995. Print.

Riker, Martin. “A Ramshackle Modernity: *The Time Regulation Institute* by Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar” Jan.03.2014.

http://www.nytimes.com/2014/01/05/books/review/the-time-regulation-institute-by-ahmet-hamdi-tanpinar.html?_r=0.
19/01/2014. Web.

Ritzer. George. "The Weberian theory of rationalization and the McDonaldization of contemporary society" in *Illuminating social life: Classical and contemporary theory revisited*. Ed. Peter Kivisto. London: Sage, 2005. Print.

Rorty, Richard. "Habermas and Lyotard on Postmodernity" in *Habermas and Modernity*. Ed. Richard J. Berstein. Cambridge and New York: Mit Press, 1986. Print.

Roston, Murray. "The Technique of Counterpoint" in *Critical Essays on Aldous Huxley*. New York: G. K. Hall & Co., 1996. Print.

Russell, Bertrand. *In Praise of Idleness and Other Essays*. New South Wales: George Allen & Unwin, 1935. Print.

Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. London: Penguin, 1977. Print.

Schleifer, Ronald. *Modernism and Time: The Logic of Abundance in Literature, Science, and Culture, 1880-1930*. Cambridge: CUP, 2000. Print.

Schmithausen, Lambert. "Aldous Huxley's View of Nature" in *Aldous Huxley between East and West*. Ed. C. C. Barfoot. Amsterdam – New York City: Rodopi, 2001. Print.

Sexton, James, "Aldous Huxley's Bokanovsky" in *Science Fiction Studies*. March 1989, Vol. 16 Issue 1, p85. Print.

_____. *Selected Letters of Aldous Huxley*. Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2007. Print.

Seyhan, Azade. *Tales of the Crossed Destinies: The Modern Turkish Novel in A Comparative Context*. The MLA: New York, 2008. Print.

Shakespeare, William. "The Tempest" *First Folio*. 1610. Print.

Shayegan, Daryush. *Le Regard mutilé: Schizophrénie culturelle: Pays traditionnels face à la modernité* Paris: Albin Michel, 1989. Print.

Shiach, Morag. "Pleasure too often repeated": Aldous Huxley's Modernity" in *The Modernist Party*. Ed. Kate McLoughlin. Edinburgh University Press, 2013. Print.

Shilliam, Robbie. "Modernity and Modernization." In *IPSA Encyclopedia of Political Science*, 8 vols., edited by B. Badie, D. Berg-Schlosser, and L. Morlini. London: Sage, 2010. Print.

Shohat, E and Robert Stam. *Unthinking Eurocentrism: Multiculturalism and the Media*. London: Routledge, 1994. Print.

Sion, Ronald T. *Aldous Huxley and the Search for Meaning*. Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland & Co., 2010. Print.

Sisk, David W. *Transformations of Language in Modern Dystopias*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1997. Print.

Somay, Bülent. *The Psychopolitics of the Oriental Father: Between Omnipotence and Emasculation*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014. Print.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. "Can the Subaltern Speak?" in *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*. Ed. Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1988. 271-313. Print.

Şahin, İbrahim. *Haz ve Günah: Bir Tanpınar Yorumu*. İstanbul: Kapı Yayınları, 2012. Print.

Şenyıldız, Özlem. “Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar ve Eduardo Mendoza’da mekândan Öte Şehirler: Huzur’un İstanbul’u ile Mucizeler Kenti’nin Barcelona’sı.” M.A. Thesis. İstanbul Üniversitesi, 2009. <https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/tezSorguSonucYeni.jsp#top2>. 11/12/2014. Web.

Şevki, Abdullah. “Toplumumuza Bakış Açısı ve Siyasi Duruşu Yönünden Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar” *Hece* No. 61 Ocak 2002.

Tanpınar. Ahmet Hamdi. *Abdullah Efendi’nin Rüyalari* [*Abdullah Efendi’s Dreams*]. İstanbul: Ahmet Halit Kitabevi, 1943. Print.

_____. *A Mind at Peace*. (Huzur 1949). Trans. Erdağ Gökner. Brooklyn, NY: Archipelago Books, 2008. Print.

_____. “Acıbadem’deki Köşk” [“The Villa in Acıbadem”] in *Âile Mecmuası*, (Autums 1949, Vol. 11). Print.

_____. *19. Asır Türk Edebiyatı* [19th century Turkish Literature], Vol I. İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi. Edebiyat Fakültesi Yayınları, 1956. Print.

_____. “Recai Zade Mahmut Ekrem Bey” in *19. Asır Türk Edebiyatı*, Vol I. İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi. Edebiyat Fakültesi Yayınları, 1956. Print.

_____. *Edebiyat Üzerine Makaleler* [Articles on Literature]. Ed. Zeynep Kerman. İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Devlet Kitapları, 1969. Print.

_____. “Tenkit İhtiyacı” [“The Need to Critique”] in *Edebiyat Üzerine Makaleler* [Articles on Literature]. Ed. Zeynep Kerman. İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Devlet Kitapları, 1969. Print.

- _____ . “Şiire Dair” [“On Poetry”] in *Edebiyat Üzerine Makaleler* [Articles on Literature]. Ed. Zeynep Kerman. İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Başkanlığı Devlet Kitapları, 1969. Print.
- _____ . *Yaşadığım Gibi* [As I Lived]. Haz. Birol Emil. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 1970. Print.
- _____ . “Asıl Kaynak” [“The Real Source”] in *Yaşadığım Gibi* [As I Lived]. Haz. Birol Emil. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 1970. Print.
- _____ . “İnsan ve Cemiyet” [The Human and Society”] in *Yaşadığım Gibi* [As I Lived]. Haz. Birol Emil. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 1970. Print.
- _____ . “Kelimeler Arasında Elli Yıl” [Fifty Years with Words”] in *Yaşadığım Gibi* [As I Lived]. Haz. Birol Emil. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 1970. Print.
- _____ . “Mussolini’ye Dair” [“On Mussolini”] in *Yaşadığım Gibi* [As I Lived]. Haz. Birol Emil. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 1970. Print.
- _____ . “Medeniyet Değiştirmesi ve İç İnsan” [The Civilization Conversion and Inner Man] in *Yaşadığım Gibi* [As I Lived]. Haz. Birol Emil. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 1970. Print.
- _____ . *Aydaki Kadın* [The Woman on the Moon]. Güler Güven. İstanbul: Adam, 1987. Print.
- _____ . *Beş Şehir* [Five Cities], İstanbul, 1987. Print.
- _____ . “İstanbul” in *Beş Şehir* [Five Cities], İstanbul, 1987. Print.
- _____ . *Mahur Beste* [The Song in Mahur]. İstanbul: Dergah, 1988. Print.

- _____ . “Mehmet Kaplan’a Mektup” [“A Letter to Mehmet Kaplan”] in *Kutup Noktası*, Oğuz Demiralp. İstanbul: YKY, 1993. Print.
- _____ . “Yaşar Nabi’ye Mektup” [“A Letter to Yaşar Nabi”] in *Kutup Noktası*, Oğuz Demiralp. İstanbul: YKY, 1993. Print.
- _____ . “Türk Edebiyatında Cereyanlar” [“Movements in Turkish Literature”] in *Edebiyat Üzerine Makaleler*. [Articles on Literature] Ed. Dr. Zeynep Kerman. İstanbul: Dergah, 1998. Print.
- _____ . “Milli Bir Edebiyata Doğru” [“Toward A National Literature”] in *Edebiyat Üzerine Makaleler* [Articles on Literature]. Ed. Dr. Zeynep Kerman. İstanbul: Dergah, 1998. Print.
- _____ . “Eşik” [“Threshold”] in *Şiirler* (1961). İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1999. Print.
- _____ . “Ne İçindeyim Zamanın” in *Şiirler* (1961) İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1999. Print.
- _____ . “Bursa’da Zaman” [“Time in Bursa”] in *Şiirler* (1961). İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1999. Print.
- _____ . *The Time Regulation Institute. (Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü 1961)*. Trans. Ender Gürol. Madison, USA: Turco- Tatar Press, 2001. Print.
- _____ . *Mücevherlerin Sırrı*. [The Secret of Jewels] Ed. İlyas Dirin, Turgay Anar and Şaban Özdemir. İstanbul: YKY, 2002. Print.

_____. *Günlüklerin Işığında Tanpınar'la Başbaşa*. [In the Light of Diaries] Eds. İnci Enginün-Zeynep Kerman. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2007. Print.

_____. ed. İnci Enginün and Zeynep Kerman. "Hatıra Defteri" *Günlüklerin Işığında Tanpınar'la Başbaşa* [In the Light of Diaries]. İstanbul: Dergah, 2007. Print.

_____. "Neither Am I Inside Time" ("Ne İçindeyim Zamanın" 1961) Trans. Erdağ Gökner. *Northwest Review*; 2010, Vol. 48 Issue 2, p102. Print.

Timur, Taner. *Osmanlı-Türk Romanında Tarih, Toplum ve Kimlik*. İstanbul: İmge Press, 1991. Print.

Toynbee, Arnold J. *Survey of International Affairs 1931*. London: OUP, 1932. Print.

Tratner, Michael. A Review to *Modernism and Time: The Logic of Abundance in Literature, Science, and Culture, 1880-1930* in *James Joyce Quarterly* Vol. 39, No. 3 (Spring, 2002), pp. 595-598 Published by: University of Tulsa. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25477909>. 12/07/2013. Web.

Tunç, Mustafa Şekip. *Yaratıcı Tekamül* [Henri Bergson's *The Creative Mind* 1944] İstanbul: Dergah, 1946. Print.

Turinay, Necmettin. "Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar: 1932 Öncesi ve Sonrası" *Hece* No. 61 Ocak 2002.

Uçar, Ramazan. "Abdullah Cevdet'in Batı Medeniyeti ve Batılılaşma Anlayışı" in *Toplum Bilimleri Dergisi*. Temmuz - Aralık 2011. 5 (10): 7-30. Print.

Urgan, Mina. *Ses Sese Karşı* [Aldous Huxley's *Point Counter Point* 1928]. İstanbul: İletişim, 1961. Print.

Uyanık, Necmi. "Batici Bir Aydın Olarak Celâl Nuri İleri ve Yenileşme Sürecinde Fikir Hareketlerine Bakışı" <http://www.turkiyat.selcuk.edu.tr/pdfdergi/s15/uyanik.pdf>. 23.10.2014. Web.

Vibbert, Samantha. "The Influence of Freud's Beyond the Pleasure Principle on Huxley's *Brave New World*" in *Aldous Huxley Annual: A Journal of Twentieth-Century Thought and Beyond*, Berlin: Lit Verlag, 2006. Print.

Voltaire, *Candide: or, All for the Best*. [*Candide, ou l'Optimisme*]. 1759. Print.

Weber, Marx. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. Trans. Talcott Parsons. London: Allen& Unwin, 1930. Print.

Wells, H. G. *The Outline of History*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1920. Print.

_____. *Men Like Gods*. New York : Macmillan, 1923. Print.

_____. *The Open Conspiracy: Blue Prints for a World Revolution*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1928. Print.

Wolin, Richard. "Introduction to the Discussion of 'Need and Culture in Nietzsche'" in *Constellations Volume 8*, No 1. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd., 2001. Print.

Yavuz, Hilmi. "Tanpınar'ın Estetiği" in *Yeni a*, S. 15, Haziran 1973. Print.

_____. *Modernleşme: Parça mı, Bütün mü? Batılılaşma: Simge mi, Kavram mı? Modern Türkiye'de Siyasi Düşünce Modernleşme ve Batıcılık* (Cilt 3). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2004. Print.

Yıldız, Ali. "Tanpınar'a Göre Doğu ile Batı Arasında Terkip" in *Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*. Sayı: 7, Yıl: 1996. Pp. 413-425. Print.

Yoleri, Burcu. "Reading Valéry through Tanpınar: The analysis of an influence." M.A. Thesis. Sabancı Üniversitesi, 2011.
<https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/tezSorguSonucYeni.jsp#top2>. 11/12/2014. Web.

"Bektashi." <http://global.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/58980/Bektashi>. 14/07/2014. Web.

"Islahat." *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Encyclopædia Britannica Online Academic Edition. Encyclopædia Britannica Inc., 2012.
<<http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/582884/Islahat>>. 03/11/2012. Web.

"Mevlevi." <http://global.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/370328/Mawlawiyah>. 06/04/2014. Web.

"Procrustes." *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Encyclopædia Britannica Online Academic Edition. Encyclopædia Britannica Inc., 2014
<<http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/477822/Procrustes>>. 08/03/2014. Web.

“*Tanzimat.*” *Encyclopædia Britannica*. *Encyclopædia Britannica Online Academic Edition*. Encyclopædia Britannica Inc., 2012.
<<http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/582884/Tanzimat>>. 03/11/2012. Web.

“*Stretto.*” *Encyclopædia Britannica*. *Encyclopædia Britannica Online Academic Edition*. Encyclopædia Britannica Inc., 2014.
<<http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/568995/stretto>>. 20/03/2014. Web.

“*Scientific Method*” (http://scientificmethod.com/sm5_smhistory.html). 23/11/2013. Web.

“*An Interview with Huxley*” *The Paris Review*.
<http://www.theparisreview.org/interviews/4698/the-art-of-fiction-no-24-aldous-huxley>. 12/12/13. Web.

“*The absurd in Existentialism*” *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. A Peer-Reviewed Academic Resource.
<http://www.iep.utm.edu/existent/#SH1f>. 13/10/2014. Web.

“*State Planning Institute*”
[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/State_Planning_Organization_\(Turkey\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/State_Planning_Organization_(Turkey))) 16/10/2014. Web.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

CITATIONS FROM TANPINAR'S WORK IN TURKISH

1. “[Doğu’dan Batı’ya olan] bir medeniyet deęiřtirmesi hi řüphesiz ki kendisini gerek bir buhran olarak aıka gstermektedir...” (“Türk Edebiyatında Cereyanlar” 103)
2. “Günümüz edebiyatındaki bir eksiklikten dolayı hoşnutsuzum. Milli řiir, halk řiiri ve milli hayatımız hakkında yazılan romanlar... aędař edebiyatımızda bütün konular – politik, iktisadi ve sosyal – mevcut ve ok baskın. Milli bir edebiyat üretiliyor. Fakat ortada özölmeyen bir sorun var... [...] Bu ruhlarımızdaki ikilikle ilgili bir sorun.” (“Milli Bir Edebiyata Doęru” 90-91)
3. “Türk toplumu ya yok olacak ya da Batılılařacaktır ve ok makuldür ki hayatta kalma içgüdüřü nedeniyle batılılařmayı seti. Bu řekilde ve geliřmeler ve reformlarla birlikte Türk toplumu yeni bir edebiyat arayışı içine girdi. Batılılařmış Türk Edebiyatı sorumluluklarını bir ölçüye kadar yerine getirdi. Fakat mesele bu kadar basit olamaz.” (“Milli Bir Edebiyata Doęru” 91)
4. “Gemişinde ok da olgun sanatsal ve edebi gelenekleri olan bir medeniyetten kim nasıl derhal yepyeni bir sanat ve edebiyat üretmesini bekleyebilir? Aslında bir toplumun sanatı ve Edebiyatı kendi geleneklerine dayandıęı zaman geliřir ve yeniden yapılır. Dıřardan [faklı kültürlerden] gelen etkiler bir toplumun sanat ve edebiyatını zenginleřtirir, geniřletir ve tamamlar, fakat bu etkiler zaten var olan gelenek ve göreneklere eklenildięinde olur bu. [...] Bunun zıddı toplumdaki bütönlüęü sadece yok edecektir.” (“Milli Bir Edebiyata Doęru” 91)

5. “Tanzimat’tan önce bilimsel ve beşeri hayatı durmuş, Rönesans ve onun fiziksel sonuçlarını yaşayan Avrupa’yla mukayese edilince iktisadi hayatı yok olmuş, kapalı bir Osmanlı İmparatorluğu vardı.”
(19. Asır Türk Edebiyatı 8)
6. “Tanzimat dönemi Osmanlı İmparatorluğu ve yeni-kurulmuş Türkiye Cumhuriyeti’ni modernleştirecek/Batılılaştıracak reformlar eleştirel olarak ne düşünüldü ne de incelendi, [...] bunlar sanki değişmez kurallar ve gerçeklermiş gibi olduğu gibi kabul edildi.”
(“Asıl Kaynak” 41)
7. “Bilhassa 1850’den sonraki devirde, medeniyet ve terakki kelimelerinin gittikçe artan bu sihir ve füsununu bizim edebiyatımızda da takip etmek mümkündür. [...] Medeniyet ve terakki yirminci yüzyılın en büyük masalı, mitidir!” (“Kelimeler Arasında Elli Yıl” 83)
8. “Cesaret edebilseydim, Tanzimat’tan beri bir nevi Oedipus kompleksi, yani bilmeyerek babasını öldürmüş adamın kompleksi içinde yaşıyoruz, derdim.” (“Medeniyet Değiştirmesi ve İç İnsan” 38)
9. “Millet ve kitlenin arasında büyük bir fark vardır. Millet hayatın muvazenesidir. Kitle ise bu muvazenenin bozuluşundan çıkar. Millet adamı bu muvazenenin dehasını kendinde duyar. Kitle adamı kudretini zümreden alır ve onun sayesinde hükmeder. Birisi yapıcıdır, öbürü yapsa bile sonunda kendi eliyle gene yıkar.”
(“Mussolini’ye Dair” 74)
10. “Sadece zihinsel olarak özgür olan insanlar doğal bir millet, kültür ve medeniyet kurabilirler [...] bunun zıddı, yani medya, devlet ve otomasyon eliyle birörnek insanlar yaratılması durumunda, sadece buhran oluşur.” (“İnsan ve Cemiyet” 22)
11. “Solcu gizli, musır, cahil. Sağcı, milliyetçi geçinenlerin hepsi cahil ve kupkuru. Ortadakiler darmadağın. Hemen hepsi zevksiz ve

tahammülü güç. Biraz zevki ve anlayışı olanlar kıskanç. Yarabbi ne kadar yalnızım.” (*Günlüklerin Işığında* 203)

12. “Ben bir entelektüelim. Aşka, hayata, insana ve düşünceye inanıyorum. Ama bunları bir görüş kısıtlaması içerisinde anlamalıyım diye düşünmüyorum. Toplumdan olduğu kadar kendimden de sorumluyum.” (*Günlüklerin Işığında* 260)
13. “Mazi bir milleti bugün olduğu şey yapan ve karşılıklı münasebetleri olan dinamik ve etkilerin bir bütünüdür.” (“Milli Bir Edebiyata Doğru” 92)
14. “Şurası bir gerçektir ki geçmiş zaman, bizim onun hakkında bugün kafamızda ürettiğimiz anlayışla daima bir çatışma içindedir. Eşyayı anlayışımız yardımıyla kendi gerçekliğimizi yaratırız, aynı şekilde maziye [gelenekleri] de kendi düşünce, his ve değer yargılarımızla yaratır veya şekillendirir ve bunlara göre maziye değiştiririz.” (*Beş Şehir* 100)
15. “Devam ederek değişmek, değişerek devam etmek.” (*Yaşadığım Gibi* 16-35)
16. “Rıza Tevfik ve özellikle Şekip’in çalışmalarıyla Durkheim’a kıyasla Bergson Dergâh’ta baya bir ehemmiyet kazandı. [...] Bir keresinde Yahya Kemal Şekip Bey’e ‘Şekip, biz hepimiz Bergson’un takipçileriyiz demişti.’ [...] Bergson’u sadece onun felsefesinden etkilenmiş olanlardan değil, ondan etkilenmiş olan yazarlardan da [Proust’u kastederek] okuduk.” (*Mücevherlerin Sırrı* 134-5)
17. “Mazi bizi kendisine tam da mazide kaldığı için ve bazı şeyleri yerlerinde bulamadığımız için çekiyor. İzler [mazide] kalmış veya silinmiş olsun, iç hesaplaşmamızda kaybetmiş olduğumuzu düşündüğümüz, eksik ve yitik olan parçamızı hala mazide ararız.” (“İstanbul” 111)
18. “Ne içindeyim zamanın,
Ne de büsbütün dışında;
Yekpare, geniş bir anın
Parçalanmaz akışında.” (“Ne İçindeyim Zamanın” 1-4)

19. “Bir zafer müjdesi burda her isim:
Sanki tek bir anda gün, saat, mevsim
Yaşıyor sihrini geçmiş zamanın
Hâlâ bu taşlarda gülen rüyanın.
Güvercin bakışlı sessizlik bile
Çınıyor bir sonsuz devam vehmiyle.
...
Bu hayâle uyur Bursa her gece,
Her şafak onunla uyanır, güler
Gümüş aydınlıkta serviler, güller
Serin hülyasıyla çeşmelerinin.
Başımdayım sanki bir mucizenin,
Su sesi ve kanat şakırtılarından
Billûr bir avize Bursa'da zaman.” (“Bursa’da Zaman” 11-16; 24-30)
20. “Ve bir kadın beyaz, sakın, büyüdü
Göğsünde kanayan bir zaman gülü
Mahzun bakışlarla dinler derinde
Olup olmamanın eşiklerinde.” (“Eşik” 25-8)
21. “Coğrafya, kültür, her şey bizden bir yeni terkip bekliyor; biz
misyonlarımızın farkında değiliz. Başka milletlerin tecrübesini
yaşamaya çalışıyoruz.” (*Huzur* 176)
22. “Ben şarka bağlı değilim; eskiye de bağlı değilim; bu memleketin
hayatına bağlıyım.” (*Mahur Beste* [1944] 108); “Ne şarka, ne garba,
ne falan, feşmekana bağlıyım; bize bağlıyım; hayata yani ölmeyen
şeye bağlıyım.” (*Mahur Beste* 111)
23. “Fakat sıçrayabilmek, ufuk değiştirmek için dahi bir yere basmak
lazım. Bir hüviyet lazım. Bu hüviyeti her millet mazisinden alıyor.”
(*Huzur* 118)
24. “Ben bir çöküşün esteti değilim. Belki bu çöküşte yaşayan şeyler
arıyorum. Onları değerlendiriyorum...” (*Huzur* 118)
25. “Acaba öbürlerinde ne duyuyordu? Bach'ı, Beethoven'ı dinlerken de
böyle mi olmuştu? Huxley, -Allah var ve görünüyor; fakat sade
kemanlar çalarken...- diyor. Bunu çok sevdiği romancı La Mineur
kuvarteti için söylemişti. Fakat Mümtaz bu kuvarteti kitabı
okumadan çok daha evvel dinlemişti.” (*Huzur* 195)

26. “İnsan denen bu saz parçası... ” (*Huzur* 8)
27. “Fakat Müslümanlıkta başlangıç günah fikrinin bulunmaması, şu cennetten kovulma hadisesi üzerinde Hristiyanlıkta olduğu gibi durulmaması, bence teolojiden sanata kadar her sahada tesir yapmış bir keyfiyettir. Bilhassa ruhi tahaffuza pek az yer vermişiz. Bence bizim alemimizi olduğu gibi almalıdır. [...] Bence bu iki dünya arasında münakaşa zemini bile yoktur. Dinde, cemiyetin bünyesinde ayrılış daha ilk adımlarda başlar. Dikkat edin ki, garp medeniyetinde her şey bir kurtulma, bir azat edilme fikri üzerine kurulur. Suat üçüncü kadehini bitirmiş, ona bakıyordu. -Yahut başıbozuk. -Hayır, evvela hür. Sitede esirin bulunmamasına rağmen dahi hür. Fıkıh insanın hürriyeti üzerinde ısrar ediyor. Suat ısrar etti: -Şark hiçbir zaman hür olmamıştır. O daima sıkı kadrolar içinde adeta anarşist bir fertçilikte kalmıştır. Hürriyetten o kadar çabuk vazgeçeriz ki... ve her vesile ile.” (*Huzur* 198)
28. “Her eserimin başında, hatta en kısa şiirde bile, ister batıdan ister de bizden bir musiki parçası kullanırım. Ve belki de, bizi ancak gittiğimizde fikir sahibi olduğumuz yerlere götüren ve beni ben yapan şey musikidir. Yazmama gelince, tekniğim ve ilham kaynağım musikidir.” (“Yaşar Nabi” 63)
29. “Biz şimdi bir aksülamel devrinde yaşıyoruz. Kendimizi sevmiyoruz. Kafamız bir yığın mukayeselerle dolu; Dede'yi, Wagner olmadığı için, Yunus'u, Verlaine, Baki'yi, Goethe ve Gide yapamadığımız için beğenmiyoruz. Uçsuz bucaksız Asya'nın o kadar zenginliği içinde, dünyanın en iyi giyinmiş milleti olduğumuz halde çı çıplak yaşıyoruz. Coğrafya, kültür, her şey bizden bir yeni terkip bekliyor; biz misyonlarımızın farkında değiliz. Başka milletlerin tecrübesini yaşamaya çalışıyoruz.” (*Huzur* 252)
30. “Debussy'yi, Wagner'i sevmek ve Mahur Beste'yi yaşamak, bu bizim talihimizdi.” (*Huzur* 328)

31. “Dede Efendi ile beslenmiş bir ruh için Bach kardeştir.” (*Yaşadığım Gibi* 352)
32. “Korkuyla Suat'ın tekrar ve bir yudumda boşalttığı kadehine baktı. Suat'ın ata benzediğini düşününce gülerdi. Fakat bu sefer gülmedi; demek ki ortada rahatsız edici bir vaziyet vardı. Bunu Mümtaz da sezdiği için içmiyordu. O halde kendisi de içmeyecekti... Hâlbuki içmeye o kadar ihtiyacım var ki... -Bu musıkî beni saatlerce çiğnedi. Bazen kendimi ilahi bir hamur haline girdim sanıyordum...- İçkinin değişikliği lazımdı.” (*Huzur* 197)
33. “Düşünceleri bal gibi eritir, kendi cevherime benzetirim. Ben hayatın efendisiyim. Bulduğum yerde yeis ve hüznün olamaz. Ben, şarabın neşesi ve balın tadıyım- diyordu.” (*Huzur* 18)
34. “Sanat, insanın realitesidir, fakat sanat eserlerinin rüyalarımıza refakat eden ruh haline ihtiyacı vardır. Benim rüya estetiğim nesrime tesir etti; [...] Bu estetikte müzik esastır [...] çünkü musıkî durmadan değişerek içimizde âlemini kurar. Bunu yaşadığımızdan başka bir zamana gitmek diye tarif edebilirim. Başka türlü ritmi olan ve mekânla eşya ile içten kaynaşan bir zaman.” (*Edebiyat Üzerine Makaleler* 30)
35. “Gül den kurulmuş bir Pazar
Gül alırlar, gül satarlar
Gül den terazi tutarlar
Alanlar gül, satanlar gül...” (*Huzur* 214)
36. “Siz de seviyorsunuz galiba? -Bana bakmayın... Bizde eski musıkî aile yadigârıdır, dedi. Baba tarafından Mevlevî, anne tarafından Bektaşîyiz... Hatta annemin dedesini İkinci Mahmud, Manastır'a sürmüş. Eskiden evimizde küçükken her akşam fasıllar yapılır, büyük eğlenceler olurdu. [...] Genç kadın bu hatıra ile olduğu yerden o kadar gerilere atlayacağını hiç sanmamıştı. Babasını elinde ney, büyük sofanın sediri üstünde gördü. -Gel, otur...- diye sanki ona işaret ediyordu.” (*Huzur* 81)

37. “İstanbul bizim nesile, dedelerimize veya hatta babalarımıza ifade ettiği şeyden çok daha farklıdır. Ne sultanların kaftanlarındaki altın sırmalarla ne de dini çerçeveye bizim hayalimize girmez İstanbul. Bu kelimededen [İstanbul] dışarı saçılan ışık bizim için zihinlerimiz tarafından şekillenen bir anı ve hasret ışığıdır.” (*Beş Şehir* 41)
38. “Bazen genç kadına bu eski şeylerin meftunu çocuğun kendisini zorla bir katakomba tıkmak istediği şüphesi geliyordu. Bu dünyada türlü türlü hazlar, başka çeşit düşünceler de vardı. Üsküdar’ı seviyordu, fakat halkı fakir, kendisi bakımsızdı. Mümtaz bu biçarelikler arasında acemaşiran, sultaniyegah diye rahatça yaşıyordu. Ama hayat, hayatın daveti nerede kalıyordu? Bir şeyler yapmak, bu hasta insanları tedavi etmek, bu işsizlere iş bulmak, mahzun yüzleri güldürmek, bir mazi artığı halinden çıkarmak... -- Yoksa çocukluğuna dair anlattığı şeyler, sandığından daha fazla mı içine içlemiş... Ben ölümün zapt ettiği bir ülkede mi yaşıyorum... Mümtaz koluna girerek onu çeşmenin önünden ayırdı: -Biliyorum, dedi. Yeni bir hayat lazım. Belki bundan sana ben daha evvel bahsettim. Fakat sıçrayabilmek, ufuk değiştirmek için dahi bir yere basmak lazım. Bir hüviyet lazım. Bu hüviyeti her millet mazisinden alıyor.” (*Huzur* 118)
39. “Kanuni ya da Sokullu’nun İstanbul’unda 10 dakikadan fazla yaşayabileceğimi sanmıyorum. Bunun için kimliğimin çok önemli parçalarından vazgeçmiş olurdum. Süleymaniye’nin inşa edilmesini görmek bugünün aşına olduğumuz, Boğazın sularında oynayan ve sonsuz zamandan bize kadar gelmiş olan sevgili Süleymaniye’sinden kendimizi mahrum etmek demektir. Süleymaniye’nin 4 asırlık bir süre zarfında kimliğimizde damıtarak elde ettiğimiz güzellik olarak tadarız.” (*Huzur* 27)
40. “Burada hayatın, taklidi güç olan, tenimize yapışmadan ve içimize yerleşmeden yanaşmayan iki ucu birleşirdi. Gerçek fukaralıkla, gerçek debdebe veya artığı... [...] Kasabadan kasabaya, aşiretten

aşirete, devirden devire değişen eski zaman elbiseleri, nerede dokunduğunu söyleseler bile unutacağı, fakat motiflerini ve renklerini günlerce hatırlayacağı eski halı ve kilimler, Bizans ikonlarından eski yazı levhalarına kadar bir yığın sanat eseri, işlemler, süsler, hulasa yığın yığın sanat eşyası, hangi geçmiş zaman güzelinin boynunu, kollarını süslediği bilinmeyen bir iki nesle ait mücevherler, bu rutubetli ve yarı karanlık dünyada hüviyetlerine eklenen uzak zaman ve bilinmez cazibesiyile onu saatlerce tutabilirdi. Bu eski şark değildi, yeni de değildi. Belki iklimini değiştirmiş zamansız hayattı.” (*Huzur* 26)

41. “Harp olacak, diyordu, Bu herhangi bir seferberlikten başka türlü; daha emin, daha kat'i bir hazırlanıştı. Bu yüzde yüzün, yüzde binin kat'iliği idi. Demek bütün bu dükkânların içinde bu sessiz hazırlanış vardı; telefonlar işliyor, bir lahzada kalay, kösele, boya ve makine eşyası kalkıyor; rakamlar değişiyor; sıfırlar çoğalıyor, imkânlar azalıyordu. Harp olacak.” (*Huzur* 43)
42. “Hasta bir yol...- diye düşündü; bu manasız bir düşünceydi. Fakat işte zihnine eklemiştir. -Hasta bir yol...-, bir nevi cüzzama yakalanmış, onun tarafından iki yana sıralanmış evlerin duvarına kadar yer yer oyulan bir yol...” (*Huzur* 41)
43. “Mademki düşünüyorum. O halde varım, mademki duyuyorum, o halde varım, mademki harp ediyorum, o halde varım, mademki ıstırap çekiyorum, o halde varım! Sefilim varım, budalayım varım! Varım, varım!- diyordu.” (*Huzur* 45-6)
44. “Burası küçük camili, bodur minareli ve kireç sıvalı duvarları o kadar İstanbul semtlerinin kendisi olan küçük mescitli köylerin, bazen bir manzarayı uçtan uca zapt eden geniş mezarlıkların, su akmayan lüleleri bile insana, serinlik duygusu veren ayna taşları kırık çeşmelerin, büyük yalıların, avlusunda şimdi keçi otlayan ahşap tekkelerin, çıraklarının haykırışı İstanbul ramazanlarının uhreviliğini yaşayan dünyadan bir selam gibi karışan iskele

kahvelerinin, eski davullu, zurnalı, yarı milli bayram kılıklı pehlivan güreşlerinin hatırasıyla dolu meydanların, büyük çınarların, kapalı akşamların, fecir kızlarının ellerindeki meşalelerle maddesiz aynalarda bir sedef rüyası içinde yüzdükleri sabahların, garip, içli aksi sadaların diyarıydı.” (*Huzur* 78)

45. “-Birbirimizi mi, yoksa Boğaz'ı mı seviyoruz?- Bazen çılgınlıklarını ve saadetlerini eski musikinin getirdiği coşkunuğa yorar, -Bu eski sihirbazlar bizi ellerinde oynatıyorlar...- diye düşünür ve Nuran'ı onlardan ayrı düşünmeye, yalnız başına ve kendi güzellikleri içinde aramaya çalışırdı. Fakat halita onun zannettiği kadar sathi olmadığı, Nuran, hayatına birdenbire gelişiyse kendisinde öteden beri mevcut olan, ruhunun büyük bir tarafını yapan şeyleri aydınlattığı adeta kendisini kabule hazır şeylerin arasında saltanatını kurduğu için, artık ne İstanbul'u, ne Boğaz'ı, ne eski musikiyi, ne de sevdiği kadını birbirinden ayırmaya imkan bulurdu.” (*Huzur* 144)
46. “Böylece Boğaz'ın seçtikleri her yerine bir ad veriyorlar, hayallerinde İstanbul manzaralarıyla eski musikimiz birleşiyor, sestem, hayalden bir harita gittikçe büyüyordu.” (*Huzur* 115)
47. “Halbuki kendimize mahsus yeni bir hayat şekli yaratmak devrindeyiz. Zannederim ki Suat'ın dediği budur. -Evet, bir adımda eski yeni ne varsa hepsini silkip, fırlatmak. Ne Ronsard, ne Fuzuli... -İmkani mı var? [...] Suat, Nuran'ın saçlarından habersiz onu dinliyordu: -Neden imkansız olsun?.. -Şundan imkansız ki... [...] - Çünkü, evvela siyah tahtayı beyhude yere temizlemiş oluruz. Bu inkarla ne kazanacağız sanıyorsun? Benliğimizi. Benliğimizi kaybetmekten başka. Suat çok yumuşak bir bakışla: - Yeniye... yeni bir alemin masalını kurarız. Amerika'da, Sovyet Rusya'da olduğu gibi. -Onlar her şeyi, hepsini unuttular mı sanıyorsun [...]İhsan kadehini kaldırdı: -Evvela içeceğiz... dedi. Sonra bu güzel denizin bize hediye ettiği şu balıkları yiyeceğiz. Ve şu bahar saatinde bu lokantada, bu denizin karşısında olduğumuza şükredeceğiz. Sonra da

kendimize mahsus, şartlarımıza uygun yeni yeni bir hayat kurmaya çalışacağız. Hayat bizimdir; ona istediğimiz şekli vereceğiz.” (*Huzur* 61)

48. “Çünkü musıkî zamanın üzerinde çalışıyordu. Musıkî zamanın nizamı idi; hali yok ediyordu.” (*Huzur* 195)
49. “-Devam etmesi lazım gelen, işte bu türküdür. Çocuklarımızın bu türküyü söyleyerek, bu oyunu oynayarak büyümesi; ne Hekimoğlu Ali Paşa'nın kendisi, ne konağı, hatta ne de mahallesi. Her şey değişebilir, hatta kendi irademizle değiştiririz. Değişmeyecek olan, hayata şekil veren, ona bizim damgamızı basan şeylerdir.” (*Huzur* 11)
50. “Hâlbuki neyin sesi ve üslubu eski ve yeni diye hiçbir şey tanımıyor, zamansız zamanın, yani cevher halinde insanın ve kaderin peşinde koşuyordu. Bununla da kalmıyordu. Çünkü zaman zaman neye ve insan sedasına çok derinlerden, adeta toprağın derinliğinden gelen kudümün sesi, o unutma ve unutulma dolu uyanış, -bin uykunun küllerini silkererek, yahut beş on medeniyetin arasından- kendini buluş karışıyordu.” (*Huzur* 189)
51. “Ben yükümün derecesine yükselebilirim. Yükselsemezsem altında ezilmeye razıyım.” (*Huzur* 278)
52. “-Hazin tarafı şu ki, bu cins azapları bütün dünya bir asır evvel yaşadı, bitirdi. Hegel, Nietzsche, Marx geldiler, geçtiler. Dostoyevski Suat'tan seksen sene evvel bu azabı çekti. Bizim için yeni nedir bilir misiniz? Ne Eluard'ın şiiri, ne de Comte Stravogvine'in azabıdır. Bizim için yeni, en ufak Türk köyünde, Anadolu'nun en ücra köşesinde bu akşam olan cinayet, arazi kavgası veya boşanma hadisesidir. Bilmem, fikrimi anlıyor musunuz? Suat'ı itham etmiyorum. Fakat onun meselelerinin bugünümüzün, kendi günümüzün çerçevesine giremeyeceğini söylüyorum.” (*Huzur* 212)
53. “Daha o gün Doktor Ramiz'in bu tedavi sistemine, hastası çıkınca tatbik edilecek bir usulden ziyade bütün dünyayı ıslah edecek tek

vasita, ancak dinlerde görülen o tek kurtuluş yolu gibi baktığını anladım. Ona göre bu yeni ilim her şeydi. Cürüm, cinayet, hastalık, ihtiras, parasızlık, sefalet, talihsizlik, sakat doğma, düşmanlık, hulâsa insan hayatını bizim irademizin dışında cehennem yapan şeylerin hiçbiri yoktu. Yalnız psikanaliz vardı. Hepsi dönüp dolaşıp ona geliyorlardı. O hayat muammasının biricik anahtarı idi.” (*Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* 98)

54. “Sizde tipik bir baba kompleksi var. Babanızı beğenmemişsiniz... Bu o kadar mühim değil. Reşit olmak için belki de en kısa yoldur. Fakat siz daha mühim bir şey yapmışsınız... [...] ‘Sizden hastalığınıza daha uygun rüyalar görmeyi istiyorum. Anladınız mı?’ dedi. ‘Bütün gayretinizi sarf edip öyle rüyalar görmeye çalışın! Evvelâ sembollerden kurtulmalısınız. Babanızı rüyanızda kendi çehresiyle gördünüz mü iş değişir, her şey düzeler...” (*Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* 106, 113)
55. “Orijinal ve yeni... Dikkat edin, yeni diyorum. En büyük harflerle yeni! Yeninin bulunduğu yerde başka meziyete lüzum yoktur.” (*Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* 217)
56. “Beni tanıyanlar, öyle okuma yazma işleriyle büyük bir ilgim olmadığını bilirler. Hatta bütün mütalâalarım, çocukluğumda okuduğum Jul Vern ve Nik Karter hikâyelerini ortadan çıkarırsanız, Arapça ve Farsça kelimelerini atlaya atlaya gözden geçirdiğim birkaç tarih kitabıyla, Tûinâme, Binbir Gece, Ebu Ali Sinâ hikâyeleri gibi eserlerden ibarettir. Daha sonraki zamanlarda, enstitümüz kurulmadan evvel işsizlikten evde çocukların mektep kitaplarına zaman zaman göz attığım gibi, bazen bütün günümü geçirdiğim Edirnekapı veya Şehzadebaşı kahvelerinde gazeteleri hatme mecbur kaldığım zamanlarda ufak tefek tefrika parçaları ve makaleleri de okudum.” (*Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* 6)
57. “Sırtıma daha ilk geçirdiğim günde bütün varlığımın değiştiğini gördüm. Birdenbire ufkum, görüş zaviyem genişledi. Hayatı onun

gibi bir bütün olarak mütalâaya alıştım. Değişme, koordinasyon, çalışmanın tanzimi, zihniyet değişikliği, üst düşünce, ilmî zihniyet gibi tabirlerle konuşmağa, kendi isteksizliğime "zaruret", "imkânsızlık" gibi adlar koymağa, şarkla garp arasında ölçsüz mukayeseler yapmağa, ciddiliğinden kendim de ürktüğüm hükümler vermeğe başladım. Onun gibi, insanlara "Acaba ne işe yarar?" diyen bir gözle bakıyor, hayatı kendi teknemde yoğuracağım bir hamur gibi görüyordum. Bir kelime ile onun cesareti ve icat kudreti bana aşılammış gibiydi. Sanki bu elbise değil bir büyü idi." (*Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* 15-6)

58. "İkilik evvela umumi hayatta başlamış, sonra cemiyetimizi zihniyet itibariyle ikiye ayırmış, nihayet amelîyesini derinleştirerek ve değiştirerek fert olarak da içimize yerleşmiştir." (*Yaşadığım Gibi* 34)
59. "Beğenmedikten sonra kendiniz onun yerine geçeceğiniz yerde, kendinize durmadan baba aramışsınız... Yani reşit olamamışsınız. Hep çocuk kalmışsınız! Öyle değil mi?" (*Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* 107)
60. "Bizi sadece yaptığımız işlerden değil, onların hız aldıkları prensiplerden de şüphe ettiren, mühim ve hayati meselelerimiz yerine bir şaka denilebilecek kadar hafif şeylerle uğraştıran, yahut bu mühim ve hayati meselelerin mahiyetini değiştirip bir şaka haline getiren bu buhranın sebebi, bir medeniyetten öbürüne geçmemizin getirdiği ikiliktir." ("Medeniyet Değiştirmesi ve İç İnsan" 34)
61. "Mesele şimdi bu kompleksin neticelerinden kurtulmanızda. Zaten şuur altında bir hâdise olduğu için kendi kendisi kaldıkça ehemmiyetsiz bir şeydir. Ehemmiyetsiz ve hatta tabî bir şey. Bilhassa bugünkü cemiyetimizde. Çünkü içtimaî şekilde bu hastalık hemen hepimizde var. Bakın etrafa, hep maziden şikâyet ediyoruz, hepimiz, onun la meşgulüz. Onu içinden değiştirmek istiyoruz. Bunun manası nedir. Bir baba kompleksi değil mi? ... Büyük, küçük

hepimiz onunla uğraşmıyor muyuz?..” (*Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* 111)

62. “Devam ederek değişmek, değişerek devam etmek.” (*Yaşadığım Gibi* 16-37)
63. “Evvelâ bu bir kalabalık işidir. Kalabalık neyi sever, neyi sevmez? Bunu kimse bilmez. Sonra bu mesele ümitsiz bir kalabalığın işidir. [...] Radyo devrindeyiz. Musikîyi nadir bir şey gibi dinlemiyoruz. O, romatizma, nezle, para sıkıntısı, harp ihtimali, çok geçimsizlik gibi günlerimizin tabîî arkadaşı oldu. Bu işe bir de kalabalığı ilâve edin... Hayır, ben eminim ki bahsettiğimiz hanımefendi birkaç gün içinde yepyeni bir şöhret olarak İstanbul'u fethedebilir. Bakın!” (*Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* 216-7)
64. “-Aman beyefendi, dedim, hangi artist, hangi büyük... Arz ettim, sesi çirkin, sonra kabiliyetsiz... Sonra cahil. Daha İsfahanla Mahuru, Rastla Acemaşiranı birbirinden ayıramıyor. [...] Fakat o sesle musikisi beğenilsin! Buna imkân yok. Kulağı yok efendim, hiç yok. Sesleri ayıramıyor.” (*Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* 216)
65. “Olur şey değil... diyordu. Böyle bir adam, aramızda bulunsun... Monşer, bu tam filozof, hem de muhtaç olduğumuz filozof... Zaman felsefesi... Anladınız mı? Zaman, yani çalışma felsefesi... Siz de filozofsunuz Hayri Bey, hem hakikî bir filozofsunuz! diyordu.” (*Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* 213)
66. “Toparlamağa çalışalım: Çirkin, diyorsunuz, binaenaleyh bugünün telâkkilerine göre sempatik demektir. Sesi kötü, diyorsunuz, şu hâlde dokunaklı ve bazı havalara elverişli demektir. Kabiliyetsiz diyorsunuz, o hâlde muhakkak orijinaldir. Yarın baldızınızla meşgul olurum... Yarından itibaren baldızınız sahnededir, meşhurdur, gazetelerde ismi sık sık geçer...” (*Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* 220)
67. “Hayri İrdal, bu şark Faust'unun modern hayatımızda yeni baştan görünüşünden başka bir şey değildi.” (*Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* 270)

68. “Müessesemizin Halit Ayarcı'nın teşebbüs kudretinden, velut düşüncesinden çıktığını hiçbir zaman inkâr edecek değilim. O her manasıyla benim velinimetim, büyük dostum oldu. Fakat Saatleri Ayarlama Müessesesi'ndeki vaziyetim hiç de dışardakilerin zannettikleri ve sık sık ima ettikleri gibi, öyle sadece bir âletin, uysal bir vasıtanın alâkası değildir. Halit Ayarcı onu düşüncesinden bulduysa, ben de bütün hayatımda onu doğuran tesadüfleri, hattâ büyük ıstıraplar pahasına yaşadım. O hayatımın bir meyvasıdır.”
(*Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* 19)
69. “Saat bir vasıta, bir âlettir. Tabîî mühim bir âlettir, terakki saatin tekâmülüyle başlar. İnsanlar saatlerini ceplerinde gezdirdikleri, onu güneşten ayırdıkları zaman medeniyet en büyük adımını attı. Tabiattan koştı. Müstakil bir zamanı saymağa başladı.” (*Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* 242)
70. “çalışmak zamanın efendisi olmaktır ve onu nasıl kullanacağını bilmektir. Öncüler olarak biz yolu açacağız. İnsanların kafasına zaman bilincini sokacağız. Havaya kelimeler ve fikirler atacağız. Ve insanın her şeyden daha önemlisi olduğu için çalışması gerektiğini ve çalışmanın da zaman olduğunu ilan edeceğiz.” (*Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* 222)
71. “-Nasıl olur? diyordu. Sizin gibi bir zat, hastalığına uygun bir tek rüya görmüş olmasın! Bari bundan sonra biraz gayret etseniz... [...]- Sizden hastalığınıza daha uygun rüyalar görmeyi istiyorum. Anladınız mı? dedi. Bütün gayretinizi sarf edip öyle rüyalar görmeye çalışın! [...] O kadar kolay değil. Bu işler siz farkında olmadan olur. Onun için iradenizi toplayıp, babanızın büründüğü sembollerden kurtulmağa çalışın. Onlar ortadan kalkınca babanızdan kurtulmak kolaylaşır. Yani babanızdan gelme aşağılık duygusundan... Size bu hafta görmeyiz lâzım gelen rüyaların listesini veriyorum.” (*Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* 113-4)

72. “Ramiz Bey kendisiyle ilk karşılaştığı insan üstünde daha ziyade anlaması güç bir aksaklık duygusu bırakıyordu. Sonradan, kendisine iyice alışınca, bu duygunun ileriye doğru çıkık alnı ve kemikli yüzün düzgün mimarisiyle bütün çizgileri kaçmak istiyormuş gibi birdenbire bitiveren çenenin arasındaki uygunsuzluktan geldiğini anladım. Bu kaçış hâlindeki çene onun yüzünü hiç de tabîî şekilde bitirmiyordu. Sesi de böyleydi. Garip ve açık aksanlarla başlıyor, sonra bir çeşit mırıltıda âdeta izini karıştırmak ister gibi kayboluyordu. Nedense bu çehre, bu ses bana daima gayri muntazam kavislerle yapılmış helezonları hatırlatıyordu. Tahsilini yaptığı Viyana'dan yeni dönmüştü.” (*Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* 97)
73. “Yani bir nevi otomatizm... [...] Öyle bir şey buldunuz ki... Tam çalar saat gibi konuşup susacak insanlar, değil mi? Plak insan... Harika!” (*Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* 248)
74. “Nasıl bir insanmış bu? ... Halit Ayarcı bu sefer de ceketinin düğmeleriyle oynamaya başlamıştı. Bu demekti ki, iş bana düşüyordu. Bütün kuvvetimi, cesaretimi topladım. "Ya pîr!" Fakat yalancıların piri kimdi acaba? Uzun boylu, sarışın, kumral sakallı, siyah gözlü bir adammış! Dili gençliğinde biraz peltekmiş. Fakat kendi kendine, iradesiyle düzeltmiş, diyorlar. Daha doğrusu hocam rahmetli Nuri Efendi böyle söylerdi. Garip huyları varmış. Meselâ çok iyi meyve yetiştirdiği hâlde üzümünden başkasını yemezmiş. Bal ve şeker gibi şeyler de kullanmazmış. Mevlevî tarikatındanmış. Zengin bir adamın çocuğuymuş. Birden fazla kadın almanın aleyhinde bulunduğu için devrinde pek sevilmezmiş... - Demek modern bir adam... Âdeta bizden!” (*Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* 262-3)
75. “Pakize'de aksayan bir taraf vardı. Bunu anladığım zaman kollarımın arasında sıkıştığım, hayatımın mesuliyetlerini paylaştığım insan bana imkânsız şekilde yarım ve sakat görünmeğe başladı.” (*Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* 48)

76. “Pakize saatle, psikanalizle, yüksek bilgi ile alâkası olan insan değildi. O modern kadındı. Sinemayı seviyordu. Kâinata beyaz perdeden bakıyordu. [...] Bu kadın deli ve budala... dedim. Üstelik yalan söylüyor.” (*Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* 272, 274)
77. “Bana kalırsa bu ayar istasyonları personelini sadece genç kızlara ve kadınlara inhisar ettirelim. Hiç erkek almayalım. Sizin dediğiniz şekilde bir terbiyeyi ancak genç kızlara verebiliriz. Erkekler için başka işler ararız... Bir yığın delikanlıyı otomat hâline ne diye sokalım! Zaten yapamayız.” (*Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* 249)
78. “Bu kısa ömrümde dört dönem gördüm: hürriyet dönemi, ateşkes dönemi, Cumhuriyet ve demokrasi dönemleri. Bunlara Tanzimat ve bir kısmını bildiğim Abdülhamit dönemlerini de eklersek, toplamda hatta altı dönem yapar.” (“Mehmet Kaplan’a Mektup” 110)
79. “Çünkü bunu yazmazsak saat ve zamanla alâkanın asıl yaşama şuuru olduğunu nasıl öğreteceğiz? Ne garip, siz daha enstitümüzün niçin kurulduğunu bilmiyor gibi konuşuyorsunuz. Biz içtimaî bir dâvanın üzerindeyiz hizmet için buraya geldik.” (*Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* 241)
80. “Meslekler arasında saat ayarı daima değişiyor. Meselâ bakın buraya, ameleler, küçük işçiler, küçük memurlar saat ayarlarında daha titiz oluyorlar. Hocalar da öyle. [...] Fakat ötekilerde saat mefhumu azalır...” (*Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* 239-40)
81. “Newton başına düşen elmayı, elma olmak haysiyetiyle mütalâa etseydi belki çürümüş diye atabilirdi. Fakat o böyle yapmadı. Şu elmadan nasıl istifade edebilirim? diye kendine sordu. Azamî istifadem ne olabilir? dedi. Siz de öyle yapın!” (*Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* 218)
82. “Saat sesi bu yüzden onlar için şadırvanlardaki su seslen gibi hemen hemen iç aleme, büyük ve ebedî inançların sesiydi. Onun, kendisine mahsus. İm alın her iki buudumda genişleyen hassaları vardı. Bir taraftan bu günümüzü ve vazifelerinizi tayin eder, öbür taraftan da

peşinde koştuğunuz ebedî saadeti, onun lekesi/, ve ân/ası/ yollarını size açardı.” (*Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* 23)

83. “[Halis zaman] içinde yaşadığımız, güldüğümüz, eğlendiğimiz, çalıştığımız ve seviştığımız zamanın hemen yanında akar – çok daha farklıdır, derindir, takvim ya da saatle ilişkisi yoktur.” (*Beş Şehir* 80)
84. “Ayarı bozuk saatlerimizle yarı vaktimizi kaybediyoruz.. Herkes günde saat başına bir saniye kaybetse, saatte on seki/ milyon sani ve kaybederiz. Günün asıl faydalı kısmını on saat addetsek, yüz seksen milyon saniye eder. Bir günde yüz seksen milyon saniye yani üç milyon dakika; bu demektir ki, günde elli bin saat kaybediyoruz. Hesap et artık senede kaç insanın ömrü birden kaybolur. Halbuki bu on sekiz milyonun yarısının saati yoktur; ve mevcut saatlerin çoğu da işlemez. İçlerinde yarım saat, bir saat gecikenler vardır. Çıldırırtıcı bir kayıp... Çalışmamızdan, hayatımızdan, asıl ekonomimiz olan zamandan kayıp.” (*Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* 34)
85. “Hangi takvimle hareket eder, hangi senenin peşinde koşar, neleri beklemek için birdenbire günlerce durur, sonra ağır, tok, etrafı dolduran sesiyle hangi gizli ve mühim vak'ayı birdenbire ilân ederdi? Bun u hiç bilmezdik. Çünkü bu bağımsız saat ne ayar, ne ıslah ve ta mir kabul ederdi. O başını almış giden, insanlardan tecerrüt hâlinde yaşayan hususî bir zamandı. Bazen durup dururken tisi tiste çalmağa başlardı. Sonra aylarca yalnız rakkasının gidiş gelişleriyle kalırdı.” (*Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* 26)
86. “Yavaş yavaş bu hayata ben de alıştım. Ne kadar hafif ve rahattı. Uysal kalabalık insana başta kendisi olmak üzere her şeyi unutturuyordu. İşimden çıkar çıkmaz bir soluk oraya uğruyor, daha ilk adımda, sanki bir başkası oluyor, günlük üzüntülerden uzak, yalnız şakadan bir âleme giriyordum. [...]Hepsi hayallerinde büsbütün başka bir âlemde yaşıyor. Topluluk hâlinde rüya görüyorlar. [...]Bu kahve hakkında sizi dinlerken ben, çoğunu

tanıdığım bu insanları hep bir çeşit aralıkta yaşıyorlarmış gibi düşündüm, isterseniz onlara kapının dışında kalanlar da diyebiliriz. Muasır zamana girememiş olmanın şaşkınlığı içinde yarı ciddî, yarı şaka, tembel bir hayat! Öyle bir mâzi falanla pek alâkası olmasa gerek!” (*Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* 129-130)

APPENDIX B

TURKISH SUMMARY

Bu çalışma Aldous Leonard Huxley'nin *Point Counter Point* (1928) ve *Brave New World* (1932) ile Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar'ın *Huzur* (1949) ve *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* (1961) adlı romanlarını mukayeseli bir biçimde çözümler ve Huxley ile Tanpınar'ın modern fikrinden kaynaklanan hoşnutsuzluk hissi nedeniyle, modern hiciv fikir romanları yazdıklarını iddia eder. Tez roman çözümlenmesi bölümlerinde, yazarların modernite ve modernleşme sorunsallaştırmasının, romanları tarafından kavramsallaştırıldığını öne sürmektedir. Bu iddia ekseninde, tez ayrıca Huxley ve Tanpınar'ın modern hiciv fikir romanlarının, toplumsal ve politik konulara fazlasıyla değinmeleri ve “modern” fikrine yeni bir bakış, yeni bir tanımlama getirmeleri nedeniyle çağdaşlarının romanlarından farklılıklar sergilediğini de iddia etmektedir.

Yazarların eserlerine yansıyan kültürel özgünlüklere duyarlı bir şekilde yaklaşan bu tez, Huxley ve Tanpınar'ın modern hiciv fikir romanları yazarak, “liberal modernite söylemine” (Mirsepassi 2) dayanan bir modern anlayışının eleştirisini ürettiklerini öne sürmektedir. Theodor Adorno (1903-1969), Max Horkheimer (1895-1973) ve Herbert Marcuse (1898-1979) gibi Frankfurt Okulu düşünürleri tarafından sonradan üretilen bazı kuramsal kavramlar, hem Huxley ve Frankfurt Okulu düşünürlerinin nasıl aynı modernite tartışmasına riayet ettiklerini göstermeleri hem de Huxley'nin modernite sorunsallaştırması tartışmasını zenginleştirmeleri bakımından bu çalışmada tartışılacaktır. Henri Bergson (1859-1941), Walter Benjamin (1892-1940), Tasavvuf ve Çoklu Moderniteler tarafından üretilen fikirler ve kavramlar Tanpınar'ın modernite yaklaşımını tartışmak için kullanılacaktır. Bunların yanı sıra, bu çalışma sadece Tanpınar'ın edebiyatı etrafındaki eleştirel literatüre değil, aynı zamanda eserleri çok nadiren uluslararası bir

perspektifle çalışılan Huxley'nin etrafındaki eleştirel tartışmalara da katkıda bulunmayı hedeflemektedir.

Modernite ve Modernleşme Kavramlarının Kuramsallaştırılması:

Modern fikri bir hayli belirsiz bir kavramdır ve bu en çok da “modern” kelimesinin tek ve kesin bir tanımının olmasının imkansızlığında kendini belli eder. Modern fikri modern-öncesi (*pre-modern*), gelenek, modernleşme, modernite, modern-sonrası (*post-modern*) ve hatta aşırı-modern (*hyper-modern*) gibi çok çeşitli kavram, disiplin ve kültürel trendi birbirine bağlar. Bu kavramlar modernite-gelenek, gelişmiş-gelişmemiş, endüstrileşmiş-endüstrileşmemiş gibi bir grup ikili zıtlıklara bile bağlanırlar.

“Modernite, insan deneyiminin geçmişteki her türlü şekilden farklı olan toplumsal var olma durumu anlamına gelir (Shilliam 1). Öyleyse modernite bugünü anlatmamıza yarayan zamansal/tarihsel bir terimdir. Modernite modern olma durumu, yani günümüzle örtüşmüş olma durumudur. Modernite kavramı ile geçmişten daha “gelişmiş” olma durumu da ima edilir. Bu açıdan bakıldığında, modernite kavramını “gelişme,” Aydınlanma Çağı “ilerleme” (*progress*) kavramlarıyla örtüştürmek ve açıklamak oldukça yaygın bir durumdur diye iddia edilebilir. Aydınlanma Çağın'dan bu yana modernite ve ilerleme arasında güçlü bir ilişki kurulmuş ve “modernitenin, çağdaş deneyimlerin her türüsüne açık olan, her türlü olasılıkları içeren, bir günümüz sosyal ve kültürel deneyim tarzı olduğu iddia edile gelmiştir” (Mirsepassi 1). Öyleyse modernite bir açıklık ve kapsayan özellikte bir durumun vaadi olarak algılanabilir. Modernite kendini rasyonel, evrensel ve aydınlanmış olarak tanımlar ve zamansal ve coğrafik kavramlardan bağımsız olan evrensel ve birörnek standartlara sahip olduğunu varsaymaktadır.

“Modernleşme kavramı, ‘geleneksel’ veya ‘ilkel’ topluluklardan modern topluluklara geçiş sürecini kastetmektedir” (Shilliam 1). Modernleşmek günümüze getirmek, bir şeye yeni veya modern bir görünüş vermek, ya da daha modern bir görüş benimsemek demektir. Öyleyse modernleşme İkinci Dünya Savaşı sonrasında Batı-dışı ülkelerdeki Batı-

tarzı endüstrileşmesine yakın olmak adına atılan adımlar için kullanılan bir örtmece (*euphemism*) kelimedir. Bu Batı-dışı ülkeler kolonyal yönetimden kurtulmuş bağımsızlıklarını elde etmiş ülkelerdir. “Vatandaşlarının çoğunun çeşitli geleneksel sosyal çevrelerde yaşadığı, bu ülkeler için ekonomik gelişme ve büyüme arzulan hedefler olmuştur” (Calinescu 13). Modern ve geleneksel arasındaki çatışmaya vurgu yapan modernleşme projesi, modernleşmeyi tarihteki diğer bütün toplumsal modelden daha iyi diye görür ve yine modernleşmeyi rasyonel ve evrensel bir sosyal proje olarak tanımlar.

Modernite ve Modernleşme Kavramlarının Bu Çalışmadaki Kuramsallaştırılması:

“Modernite kavramı günümüzün çok çeşitli felsefi yorumlarını ve anlamlarını – ister olumlu (modernite iyi ve arzulan) ister de olumsuz (modernite travmatik veya trajik bu yüzden ona direnebilmeli ve onu aşabilmeli) – içinde muhafaza edebilen bir kavramdır” (Calinescu 4). Modernite hakkındaki bu iddia modernitenin birden fazla anlamının olabileceğini göstermektedir. Yukarıda da belirtildiği gibi, modernite genellikle gelişimsel ve ilerlemeci terimlerle eşleştirilmiş ve anlatılmıştır. Üstelik Aydınlanma'nın (*Enlightenment*) ilerlemeye (*progress*) olan inancı modernitenin ve tarih sürecinin hem olumlu/iyimser hem de olumsuz/kötümser anlamlandırılmasına sebep olmuştur. Bu bölüm ve tüm tezde (Huxley, Tanpınar ve Frankfurt Okulu teorisyenleri tarafından üretilen) olumsuz ve kötümser modernite ve tarih süreci anlamlandırılması ele alınmaktadır. Çalışma, modernite, modernleşme ve tarih sürecinin kötümser ve eleştirel söylemini ön plana çıkarmaktadır çünkü bu söylem bilginin, özgürlüğün ve sosyal eşitliğin yayılması gibi Aydınlanma'nın ütopyik vaatlerinin yerine getirilmesinde başarısız olduğuna inanır. Bu yüzden, bu düşünürler ve onların söylemleri, insani ve doğal kaynakları acımasızca sömüren modern ilerleme düşüncesinin, rasyonalitenin iflasına sebebiyet verdiğine inanmaktadırlar. Bu yüzden bu çalışmanın kuramsal bölümünde modernite ve modernleşme kavramları eleştirel bir lensle

inceleme altına alınır ve bu inceleme de Huxley, Tanpınar ve Frankfurt Okulu düşünürlerinin aynı modernite eleştirisi tartışmasına ait olduklarını ve buna riayet ettiklerini göstermeyi hedeflemektedir.

Modernite, yukarıda da belirtildiği gibi, kendini rasyonel, evrensel ve aydınlanmış olarak modernleşme ise kendini Batı-dışı ülkelerin Batı-tarzı endüstrileşmesi akımları olarak tanımlamaktadırlar. Ancak günümüzde bu modernite ve modernleşme tanımları ve kavramlarına karşı çıkmaktadır çünkü Edward Said, Ali Mirsepassi, Dipesh Chakrabarty, Samir Amin, Timothy Mitchell ve Gayatri Spivak gibi düşünürler bu modernite ve modernleşme kavramlarının ve tanımlarının özgürleştirici veya baskıcı olup olmadığını sorgulamaktadırlar. Laiklik, devrimci hümanizm, ilerleme fikri ve dünyaya eleştirel ve rasyonel olarak yaklaşma fikirleri üzerinden tanımlanan modernitenin özgürleştirici vaatlerine rağmen, modern endüstriyel burjuva toplumun insan aklını onun özgürleştiricisi kılmak yerine, onun ele geçireni kıldığı için bu iyimser iddialar reddedilmektedir. Ayrıca, ırkçılık-karşıtı ve feminist eleştiri çalışmaları ve post-kolonyal ve post-modernist yazılar modernite ve modernleşmeyi özgürleştirici görmüyorlar çünkü “modernist epistemolojiler kendilerini enstrümantal ve teknolojik rasyonalite, pozitivism, ilerlemecilik (*progressivism*) ve doğayı ve insanı baskı altına alan diğer bütün ideolojiler ve onların uygulamaları ile özdeşleştirmişlerdir” (Bannerji, web).

Geçtiğimiz yüzyılda Frankfurt Okulu düşünürleri, Adorno ve Horkheimer, *Aydınlanmanın Diyalektiği* (1944) adlı kitapta, modernite ve modernleşmenin eleştirisini üretmişlerdir. Bu tez, Adorno, Horkheimer ve Marcuse’un ürettiği – kitle kültürü, ilerleme, enstrümantal rasyonalite, iş-boş zaman, zevk ve kültür endüstrisi – eleştirel terminolojiye iki amaçla başvurmuştur: öncelikle Huxley’nin romanlarında ve makalelerindeki fikirlerin daha sonra Frankfurt Okulu tarafından üretilen kuramsal kavramlar üzerinde nasıl etkili olduğunu ön plana çıkarmak ve diğer amaç, Huxley ile Frankfurt Okulu arasındaki bu bağlantının bizim Huxley’nin romanlarını okumamızda sağladığı zenginleştirmeyi göstermektir. Bu

yüzden Huxley ve Frankfurt Okulu düşünürlerinin fikirleri arasında bağlantı kurmak ve bunu tezde kullanmak kronolojik okumayı hiçe sayan bir yaklaşım değildir. Tam tersine, böyle bir yaklaşım Huxley ve teorisyenlerin Batı modernitesini benzer bir terminoloji çerçevesinde eleştirdiğini göstermektedir ve bu açıdan bakıldığında, bu çalışma Huxley'nin moderniteye yönelik argümanlarının Frankfurt Okulu düşünürlerinin modernite kavramsallaştırmasını etkilediğini ve Huxley ile teorisyenlerin modernite ve modernleşme eleştirisinin aynı modernite eleştirisi söylemine riayet ettiğini iddia etmektedir.

Bu bölüm ve tüm tez boyunca, liberal modernite söyleminden bahsedilmektedir çünkü Tanpınar Batı modernite ve modernleşme eleştirisini, evrenselci iddialar öne süren bu modernite söyleminin, yani liberal modernitenin anti-tezi olarak inşa etmiştir. Ali Mirsepassi'nin *Intellectual Discourse and the Politics of Modernization* (2004) adlı kitabı – içerisinde İran modernitesi hikayesini açıklar ve çözümler – bu tezin kuramsal çerçevesini oluşturan kavramları analiz eder. Liberal modernite söylemi “moderniteyi Batılı kültürel ve tarihsel deneyimler üzerinden tanımlar” (Mirsepassi 1), Avrupa'yı modernite ile özdeşleştirir ve endüstriyel kapitalizmin yükselip yayıldığı bölge olarak görür. Bu söylemde, Batı'nın eşanlamlısı olarak görülen, akıl ve rasyonalite bölgeleri modernle bağdaştırılır. Böyle bakıldığında, modernitenin mekanlaştırıldığı (*spatialization of modernity*), özellikle de Batı ile eşitlendiği, iddia edilebilir. Hatta mekanlaştırılmış bir modernite, Batı ile özdeşleştirilmiş bir modernite anlayışı, kendini sağlamlaştırmak için karşıtlarını yaratmaya ihtiyaç duymuştur. Bu durumda eğer Batı modernite ise, Batı-dışı (*non-West*) modern-olmayan (*non-modern*) yada geleneksel (*traditional*) ile bağdaştırılmış ve “modern/Batı”nın karşıtı olan “modern-olmayan/Doğu” fikri üretilmiştir. Bu bağlamdan türemiş olan modernleşme fikri ise bir “yetişme” veya “ayak uydurma” mantalitesini öne sürmektedir ve bir ülke diğerinin rol-modelidir mantığına vurgu yapmaktadır. Bu bakış

açısına göre, “Batı-dışı’nın kaderi ‘Batı’ tarafından yaşanılmış tarihi, tam başarılı bir şekilde olmamakla birlikte, taklit etmek olmuştur” (Mitchell 1).

Tez modernitenin Avrupa-merkezci (*Eurocentric*) tanımına ve modernite-geleneksel arasında çatışma olduğunu ileri süren iddialara meydan okur ve modernleşmenin bir gün tüm endüstriyel toplumların aynı noktada birleşeceği iddiası ve varsayımına da karşı çıkar. Bu çalışma, bu yüzden modernite sadece mekansallaştırılmış bir kavram olarak kalmaz hatta zamansallaştırılmıştır da diye iddia etmektedir ki bu iddia Huxley ve Tanpınar’ın modernite ve modernleşme tanımları hakkında hoşnutsuz olmalarının da altında yatan nedendir. Diğer bir deyişle, modernite ve modernleşmenin mekan-/zaman-laştırılması Huxley ve Tanpınar’ın bu kavramların tanımlanması hakkında hoşnutsuz olmalarına ve romanlarında modernite ve modernleşme için yeni kavramsal formüller aramalarına neden olmuştur.

Çoklu Moderniteler Fikri

Romanlarında modernite ve modernleşme ile sürekli ve eleştirel olarak meşgul olmuş olan Huxley ve Tanpınar için bir “modern” teorisi tanımlamak vazgeçilmez bir dava olmuştur. Tanpınar’ın tüm yazarlık kariyeri boyunca, Huxley’nin ise 1930lardan sonra, modern coğrafik (doğu, batı, Avrupa, Avrupa-dışı) ve zamansal (geçmiş, şimdiki, gelecek, yeni ve geleneksel) terimlerle anlatmamaları bağlamında ürettikleri modern eleştirisi evrimi, Çoklu Moderniteler kavramı ile benzerlikler sergilemektedir. Huxley ve Tanpınar modern, modernite ve modernleşme kavramlarının kendilerini eleştirmeseler de, modern ikilikler açısından açıklayan (batı-doğu veya modern-geleneksel) ve zamanın akışında bir kırılma (*rupture in the flow of time*) olarak gören bakış açılarını eleştirmektedirler.

Çoklu Moderniteler fikri Aydınlanmanın getirdiği ve modernite modernleşme projesini etkisi altına alan güya evrensel olan kavramların sonunda tüm modernleşen ve modern toplumlarda aynı olacağı iddiasını reddeder çünkü Çoklu Moderniteler fikrine göre bu “evrensel” kavramlar

tek ve eşsiz olan ülkelere ulaştığında, bu kendine özgü ve eşsiz ülkeler modernitenin “evrensel” kavramlarından kendilerine özgü moderniteler üretirler. Çoklu Moderniteler fikrinin öne sürdüğü en önemli iddia şöyledir: “modernite ve Batılılaşma aynı değildir, modernitenin Batı modelleri tarihsel olarak bir öncelikli olma durumu ve diğer ülkelere bir örnek olma durumu yaşasalar da, tek ‘gerçek’ (*authentic*) modernite olma iddiasında bulunamazlar” (Eisenstadt 3). Bu açıdan bakıldığında Çoklu Moderniteler fikri modernite ile Batıyı aynı görmediği için liberal modernite söyleminin homojenize eden ve bastırıcı olan iddialarını reddeder. Bu anlayışa göre, modernite ne Batılı, ne Avrupalı ne de Amerikalıdır. Çoklu Modernite, modern, modernite ve geleneksel gibi kavramların farklı kurumsal ve entelektüel ortamlarda farklılaşabileceği için bu kavramların eleştirel bir şekilde ele alınması gerektiğini öne sürer. Bu durumda geleneksel olan, modernite ve modernleşme ile yan yana bulunabilir.

Huxley ve Tanpınar’ın Romanlarında Modernite ve Modernleşme

Huxley ve Tanpınar’ın modernite ve modernleşme anlayışına eleştirel yaklaşımları hiciv romanlarına bir huzursuzluk olarak yansımaktadır. Diğer bir deyişle, modern tarihin bir aşaması olduğu için değil; modern, tarih yaratma aracı olarak kullanıldığı için Huxley ve Tanpınar tarafından eleştiriliyor. Onların modern eleştirisi ikili zıtlıkları aşmış ve modernite için yeni tanımsal formüller üretmeye çalışan bir bakış açısı içermektedir. Bu açıdan bakıldığında onların modernite eleştirisi Bergson’un “ari zaman” (*pure time*) yaklaşımından etkilenmektedir.

Huxley’nin romanlarında modernin zamansal-kavramlar (*temporal-concepts*) üzerinden yeniden tanımlanması eğilimi, zamanı mekanikleştiren ve bireyi canavarlaştıran bir modern dünya eleştirisi üzerinden kendini göstermektedir. Huxley’e göre mekanik- veya (Bergson’un deyimiyile) “matematiksel-zaman” insan yaratıcılığını yok eder ve kişiyi sıkıcı, tekrarlanan iş kısır döngüsüne ve yabancılaşmaya mahkum eder. Huxley’nin fikirlerinin Frankfurt Okulun ürettiği kuramlar üzerindeki etkisinden daha

önce de söz edilmişti ve bu bağlamda, Huxley'nin romanları kitlesel üretim, ilerlemecilik, ve Aydınlanma miti hicvi olarak okunabilir.

Tanpınar'ın romanlarında yeni bir modern formülü, hoşnutsuzluk hissi ve Türkiye'nin modernleşme projesi eleştirisi üzerinden kendini göstermektedir. Aynı zamanda, Tanpınar “değişerek devam etmek” fikri ya da “evrim ile geçmişin muhafazasının yan yana bulunuşu” fikri (terkip) ile yeni bir modern formülünün müjdesini vermektedir. Bergson'un zaman anlayışı Tanpınar'ı etkilemiştir çünkü Tanpınar bunu romanlarında Türkiye'nin modernleşme projesinin zaman anlayışını eleştirirken kullanmıştır. Ayrıca, Tanpınar'ın geleneği Türkiye modernitesinin ilk fikirlerini oluştururken, geleneğin bugünü zenginleştirmek için kullanılması iddiası, onun fikirleri ile Çoklu Modernite fikri arasında bir düşünsel köprü, diyalog oluşturmaktadır. Geleneğin/geçmişin modernle bağdaştığı/hesaplaştığı bir modernite anlayışı, “Türkiye modernitesi” diye tanımlanabilecek bir modernite çeşidinin ilk tohumlarının Tanpınar romanlarında atılmış olduğu anlamına gelmektedir. Bu bakış açısı aynı zamanda Tanpınar'ın romanlarında sergilemiş olduğu modernite anlayışının yerel, geleneksel, kültürel ve çok-merkezli bir modernite anlayışına işaret ettiğini de açıkça göstermektedir.

Neden Mukayeseli Bir Çalışma?

Bu tez her türlü baskıcı merkezciğe karşı olan çok-boyutlu bir bakış açısı oluşturma çabası adına mukayeseli bir çalışmayı üstlenmiştir. İki farklı kültürde kendine özgü farklılıkları bastıran, evrenselci bir modelin dayatılmasının tehlikesinin farkında olan bu çalışma iki metodolojik zorlukla karşılaşmaktadır: ilki, Huxley ve Tanpınar'ın edebi dünyalarının “temelde bir bütünlük” arz ettiğinin algılanmasıdır. Bu algı Michael Riffaterre'nin şu açıklamasında altını çizdiği gerçeği işaret etmektedir: “bir metin ancak bağlamından çıkarıldığında (*decontextualized*) tam olarak edebi olabilmektedir [... öyleyse] bir metin meseleleri aştığı, sebeplerin ve cevaben yazıldığı durumların üzerine çıktığında hayatta kalabilmektedir” (68). Öyleyse bu görüş bize romanları bağlam-dışı düşünerek kültürler arası

bir tavırla incelemeyi önerir ve Charles Bernheimer'in "kültür çalışmalarının ilgilenmesi gerekir" (10) dediği kültürel ve tarihsel farklılıklar hakkında endişeler taşımadan sadece edebiyat fikrinin ön plana çıkarıldığı bir yaklaşımı vurgular. Bu görüş tezin romanlardaki teknik benzerlikleri incelemesinde yararlı olmaktadır. İkinci çaba ise Huxley ve Tanpınar'ın romanlarında yansıttıkları modern anlayışlarının oluşmasında farklı bağlam ve tarihsel anlar gerçekliklerinin tartışılması ile ilgilidir. Bu bağlamda, farklılıkları ön plana çıkarmak özel kültürel formların benzersizliğine saygılı olmayı gerektirmektedir. Görünüşte bu iki çaba birbiriyle uyumsuz gibi olsa da, tez bu iki yaklaşımdan da Bölüm 3 ve 4'te roman çözümlemelerinde yararlanacaktır. Bernheimer'in da sözünü ettiği gibi, bir mukayeseli çalışmada "bu iki bakış açısı [yani hem benzerliklerin hem de farklılıkların incelenmesi] aslında birbirine girmiş ve birbirini tamamlayan iki yaklaşımdır"(16).

Metodoloji

Bu çalışma Huxley ve Tanpınar'ın liberal modernite söylemine dayanan bir modernite anlayışının eleştirilerini ve bundan kaynaklanan hoşnutsuzluğunun sebeplerini açıklamak amacıyla kuramsal bir bölüm ile başlar. Bölüm 2 Huxley ve Tanpınar'ın modern, modernite ve modernleşme kavramlarına yaklaşımlarını inceleyen kuramsal bir çerçevedir. İki ana bölümden oluşmaktadır. Birincisi Huxley'nin makale koleksiyonları olan *Jestin Pilate* (1926), *Proper Studies* (1927) ve *Do What You Will* (1929) adlı kitaplarında yansıttığı şekliyle modernite ve modernleşme yaklaşımını inceleyecektir ve bu inceleme Huxley'nin *Point Counter Point* (1928) ve *Brave New World* (1932)'de modern ve moderniteye dair fikirlerini yansıttığı ölçüde tezin analitik bölümlerinin incelemelerini zenginleştirecektir. Huxley'nin 1920 ve 30'lar arasında yazdıkları onun kariyerindeki 3 farklı süreci işaret etmektedir: öncelikle 20'lerin başında Batı modernite söylemine duyduğu hayranlık, 20'lerin sonuna doğru Avrupa-merkezli bakış açısını bırakmamış olsa da bu söyleme getirdiği eleştiri ve son olarak da 30'ların başında liberal modernite söyleminin eleştirel

bir yaklaşımda bulunması. Daha önceden de bahsedildiği gibi, Huxley ve Frankfurt Okulunun kitle kültürü, ilerleme, iş-boş zaman, zevk ve kültür endüstrisi gibi konularda benzeşen fikirleri Huxley'nin romanlarının incelerken kuramsal çerçeveyi çizmektedir.

Bölüm 2'nin diğer kısmı ise Tanpınar'ın *Huzur* (1949) ve *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü*'nde (1961) işlediği, Türkiye'nin modernite ve modernleşme deneyimlemelerinin sonuçları ve geçmiş, gelenek, medeniyet değiştirmesi ve zaman gibi meseleler hakkında bilgi sunmaktadır. Bu yüzden, çalışmanın bu kısmı Tanpınar'ın hoşnutsuzluğu, modernite fikrinin kendisinden mi yoksa onun Türkiye'deki uygulanma biçiminden mi kaynaklanıyor diye anlamak için Türkiye özelinde modernite ve modernleşme tartışmalarını inceler. Bu yüzden, Türkiye'nin modernleşmesini anlatan farklı söylemler – liberal moderniteye dayanan modernite söylemi ve modernite yerel ve çoklu olarak gören modernite söylemi ki bunlar Tanzimat, Meşrutiyet ve Cumhuriyet'in ilk yıllarında ortaya çıkmışlardır - bu bölümde açıklanmaktadır. Tanpınar'ın kültürel olarak özgül moderniteye ve değişerek devam etmek (terkip) gibi fikirlere yaptığı vurgulamaları onun genellikle muhafazakâr veya gerici bir yazar olarak algılanmasına sebep olmuştur. Tanpınar hakkındaki bu görüş ve iddiaların da son 20-30 içerisinde çürütülmüş olduğu bu bölümde tartışılmaktadır. Henri Bergson'un Tanpınar ve Walter Benjamin üzerinde iz bırakan zaman ile ilgili görüşlerine değinen çalışmanın bu kısmı gösterir ki, Tanpınar'ın zaman, tarih, kültürel çoğulculuk ve lokaliteye değinen fikirleri Çoklu Modernitenin öne sürdüğü fikirlerle nerdeyse birebir örtüşmektedir. Tanpınar için zaman çizgisel-ileri doğru (*linear/forward-moving*) akmaz; onun için zaman mefhumu sonsuz ve yekpare bir bütündür. Tezin bu kısmı Tanpınar'ın Bergson ve Tasavvuf felsefelerini neden ilgi çekici bulduğunu ve eserlerinde kullandığını da açıklamaktadır. Tanpınar romanlarında Türkiye'deki modernite ve Türkiye modernleşmesinin Avrupa-modernitelerinin evrensel bir uzantısı olmalıdır fikrini destekleyen bakış açısına meydan okumaktadır. Bu açıdan bakıldığında, değişim ve geçmiş

geleneklerin bir arada bulunması fikrinin altını çizen, moderniteye getirmiş olduğu yeni bir bakış açısı olan terkip fikri Tanpınar'ın Türkiye modernitesine dair düşüncelerini yansıtan bir ilk modernite kuramı olarak alınabilir.

Bölüm 3 farklı bağlamlarda ama benzer kaygılarla yazılmış, Huxley'nin *Point Counter Point*'i ile Tanpınar'ın *Huzur*'unun mukayeseli bir şekilde çözümlendiği bölümdür. Huxley ve Tanpınar'ın modernite ve modernleşme konularında hoşnutsuzluğu bağlamında, bu bölüm Tanpınar'ın romanının Huxley'nin romanı ile iletişim ve diyalog kurup kurmadığını veya onunla uyumsuzluk içinde olup olmadığını incelemektedir. Bu yüzden romanların benzeşen ve farklılaşan yönleri tartışılmıştır. Daha en başta neden bu iki romanın bir araya getirildiği açıklanmıştır: Tanpınar romanında Huxley'nin romanına açık seçik bir referansta bulunmaktadır ve bu ilgi çekicidir. Benzerlikler olarak her iki romanın da roman türünün bir alt türü olan fikir romanı çerçevesinde yazılmış olmaları, “counter-point” ve “romanın müzikelleştirilmesi” (*musicalization of fiction*) gibi edebi teknikleri kullanmaları sayılabilir. Her iki roman da ana fikir olarak dünya görüşlerinin çoğulcu olduğu ve “doğru” kavramının ise hiçbir zaman dondurulamayacağı; doğru mefhumunun sübjektif bir olgu olduğu iddialarında bulunurlar.

Bu bölüm boş zaman ve zevk konuları bağlamında, romanlardaki mekan olgusunun bir tartışmasını da üretmektedir. Huxley'nin romanında zevk insanı aptallaştıran bir konu olarak alınmasına rağmen Tanpınar romanında zevk insan ruhunu zenginleştiren, insanları maneviyatta bir araya getiren bir olgudur. Marcuse gibi, Huxley de modern zevkin korkunçluklarından, modern teknoloji sayesinde kitleler için üretilen ve kitleler tarafından tüketilen zeka köreltici eğlenceyi (*entertainment*) eleştirmektedir. Ancak Tanpınar Türkiye bağlamında zevk için daha olumlu bir tutum izlemektedir yani onun için zevk mefhumu bireyin ruhunda estetik bir boyut açabilecek, kişiye zekâ ve hayal gücü katabilecek, bir potansiyele sahiptir. Romanda karakterler fasıllar ve İstanbul'un farklı semtlerindeki

gezintiler sayesinde bir araya gelir ve farklı zaman boyutlarında yaratıcılığın ve zevkin farklı dehlizlerinde yüzerler.

Huxley'nin *Point Counter Point*'i ile Tanpınar'ın *Huzur*'u roman karakterlerini çiftli gruplar halinde hayatın değişik boyutlarını temsil edecek şekilde tartışmalara sokarlar. Huxley'nin Rampion adlı karakteri modernite ve modern insanoğluna dair en sert eleştirileri üretir. Huxley'e göre Batı medeniyetini temsil eden, Londra üst tabakası ve onların alışkanlıkları en ağır eleştirileri hak etmektedir. D. H Lawrence'ı temsil eden Rampion Batı modernitesini alt üst etmenin yolunun Lawrence'ın "canlılık" (*vitalism*), "kendiliğindenlik" (*spontaneity*) ve "duygu yoğunluğu" gibi fikirlerinden geçtiğini düşünür ve bunları ön plana çıkarır. Her ne kadar Batı modernitesinin insana ve doğaya yaptığı zalimliği eleştirse de Huxley'nin romanı hala Avrupa-merkezli bir bakış açısını desteklemekte ve bu bakış açısıyla yazılmıştır. Onun *Point Counter Point*'te öne sürdüğü modernite fikri, modernin tam olarak Batılı bir kavram olduğunu ileri süren liberal modernite söylemine dayanmaktadır. Böyle olunca da romanda Batı, Doğu'ya göre daha üstün olarak ve zaman anlayışı da çizgisel/ileri- doğru olarak tanımlanmış olmaktadır. Bu kısımda ayrıca Tanpınar'ın modernite fikri romanında yansıdığı şekliyle çözümlenir ve Huxley'nin romanındaki modernite fikri ile örtüşmediğinin altı çizilir. Tanpınar'ın modernite formülasyonu zamansal kavramlara, onun terkip fikrine dayanmaktadır. Çoklu Moderniteler fikri ile paralellikler taşıyan terkip kavramı yerel, çok-merkezli ve kimliklerin çoğulluğuna saygı duymayı vaaz etmektedir. Türkiye'de uygulanan modernleşme projesi Tanpınar'a göre "kırılma" (*rupture, break*) ve buhran (*crisis*) yaratmıştır ve terkip ise bu buhranı çözebilecek bir yöntemdir. Huxley'den farklı olarak, Tanpınar *Huzur*'da modernite anlayışını, tasavvuf ve Bergson'un felsefeleri ile özdeşleştirmiştir.

Bölüm 3'ün son kısmı, Huxley ve Tanpınar'ın romanlarından birer karakterin benzer şekilde intihar etmesini tartışmaktadır. *Huzur*'un Suad'ının *Point Counter Point*'in Spandrell'inin intiharına öykünmesi,

“çeviri bir intihar” düzenlemesi, aslında Tanpınar’ın altını çizmek istediği bir konuyu ön plana taşımaktadır: Türkiye’deki modernleşme projesi sonucunda “çeviri ya da ödünç alınmış hayatlar” yaşayan bir sürü insanın türemesi Tanpınar’ın romanının eleştirdiği bir gerçektir.

Bölüm 4 de Huxley’nin *Brave New World*’i ile Tanpınar’ın *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü*’nün yazarların modernite ve modernleşme hoşnutsuzluklarını ön plana çıkararak ve romanların benzer ve farklı yönlerini tartışan mukayeseli bir çalışmadır. Bir önceki Bölüme benzemeksizin, bu bölüm yazarların modern anlayışlarındaki farklılıkların ve mesafelerin romanlarında gösterildiği kadarı ile gitgide kapandığını iddia etmektedir. Yani liberal modernite söyleminin ortaya attığı zaman formülasyonlarını eleştirmeleri bakımından yazarların romanlarındaki modernite eleştirilerinin benzerlikler gösterdiği bu bölümde öne sürülmektedir. Bu açıdan bakıldığında, bölüm *Brave New World* ile Huxley’nin modern anlayışında bir paradigma değişimi yaşadığını iddia eder çünkü Huxley 1930’ların başlarında artık modernite anlayışını mekânsal (*spatial*) ifadeler üzerinden değil, zamansal (*temporal*) ifadeler üzerinden tanımlamaya başlamamıştır. Bu paradigma değişimi öncelikle Huxley’i Tanpınar’ın fikirlerine yakınlaştırması, sonra da her iki yazarın da moderniteyi zamansal kavramlarla ifade etmesi, onların modernitenin kendisiyle değil, modernitenin uygulanma yöntemleri ile sorunları olduğunu yansıtmaları bakımından iki şekilde önemlidir.

Bu bölüm her iki romanı da modern hiciv romanı örneği olarak ele almaktadır. Öncelikle hiciv ve hiciv romanını açıklayan bu bölüm, Huxley ve Tanpınar’ın romanlarında neden bu edebi modu seçtiklerini izah eder. Huxley ve Tanpınar’ın romanlarında modernite eleştiri üretmeleri için hiciv en uygun edebi moddur. Her ikisinde de modernite eleştirisi ön plana çıkmakla birlikte, Huxley’nin *Brave New World*’ü distopik fikir romanı, Tanpınar’ın *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* ise hicivsel bir alegoridir. Huxley ve Tanpınar’ın romanlarındaki eleştirel fikirleri daha iyi anlamamızı sağlayacak, birer tarihsel arka plan anlatımından sonra, bu bölüm öncelikle

Huxley'nin 1930'larda yazdıklarının Frankfurt Okulu daha sonra ürettiği temel kuramların alt yapısını oluşturduğu iddiasını açıklar. Daha sonra bu bölüm, Tanpınar'ın romanının Türkiye'deki modernleşme projesinin bir sonucu olarak geçiş sürecinde bir Türkiye portresi çizdiğini iddia eder. Romanın başlığının da belli ettiği gibi ana fikir modernleşmenin bir enstitü, bir bina ya da bir isim olarak ya da ülkenin ilerleme düşkünlüğünü sömürmek olarak algılanmaması gerektiği mesajını vermektedir. Tanpınar'ın *Huzur*'undan *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitü*'nün farkı bu romanın *Huzur*'dan açıkça daha politik oluşudur çünkü *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitü* Türkiye modernleşme projesinin üstüne kurulduğu bazı temelleri sorgular: bu temeller ilerlemecilik, bürokrasileşme ve gelenek ile modernite arasında bir ikilik olduğuna inanç gibi düşünceler *Saatleri Ayarla Enstitü*'nde sorgulanmaktadır. Bu roman Türk modernleşmesi meselesine modernite/gelenek ve şimdiki/geçmiş gibi karşıt ikilikler çerçevesinden bakmamaktadır. Roman modernleşme projesi bağlamında “yeni” ve “eski” gibi kavramları eşit derecede eleştirir. İkilikle boğuşan bir Türk toplumu, Türkiye bağlamında bir modernite nedir bunu anlamayı başarmak için bir potansiyel sahibi değildir ve bu yüzden de başarısız olmaya mahkûmdur diye acı bir sosyal ve politik eleştiride bulunmaktadır. Bu yüzden, *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitü* iş gücünü arttırmak için iş sistemizasyonunu dayatmayı hedefleyen – ama ilginç bir şekilde yozlaşmış bürokrasileşmenin sembolü olan – romandaki enstitünün arkasındaki zihniyeti eleştirir.

Bölüm 4'ün son kısmı, Huxley ve Tanpınar'ın *Brave New World*'de ve *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitü*'nde ikili karşıtlıkları yapı-bozuma uğratmaları çabalarını incelemektedir ve romanların çoklu modernite deneyimi anlayışının önemini vurguladıklarını göstermektedir. Romanlar geleneksel zaman kavramının limitlerine ve geçmiş/şimdiki, ilerlemeci/ilkel, özel/kamusal zaman gibi ikili karşıtlıklara meydan okuyan benzer bir modernite algısının altını çizmektedirler. Bu bölümün ilk kısmında 1930'ların başında batı modernitesinin karanlık yönünü gören Huxley *Point Counter Point*'te yaptığı gibi Batı'dan Doğu'ya doğru gelişen

mekânsal kavramlarla açıkladığı bir modernite algısından *Brave New World*'de vazgeçmiştir. Hem Huxley hem de Tanpınar'a göre, modernitenin mekânsal terimlerle açıklanması zaman akışı mantığında bir kırılmaya ve "Batı" "Doğu" gibi ideolojik kavramların doğmasına sebep olmaktadır. Romanlarında Bergson ve Tasavvuf felsefelerinin zaman algılarından yararlanarak geleneksel/matematikselsel zamanın bunaltıcı kısıtlamalarından kurtulmayı başaramışlar ve ikilikler arasında bir köprü oluşturmayı hedeflemişlerdir.

Brave New World'de zamanın akışında meydana gelen kırılma yani geçmiş ve şimdiki arasındaki uçurum fikri yine "counter-point" tekniği ile ön plana çıkarılmaktadır. "İlkel" John, "modern" Mustapha Mond'un karşısına yerleştirilir ve roman bu kategorik düşünme eğilimini bu iki karakter üzerinden her ikisini de eşit derecede eleştirir. Birbirine tamamen zıt olan iki dünya görüşü arasında okuyucu sıkışıp kaldığını ve ne Mond'u ne de John'u "ideal"/"doğru" olarak seçemeyeceğini anlar. Bu tam bir çıkmazı olmayan tartışmadır. Tam bu aşamada roman bir çıkar yol olması adına üçüncü bir karakteri tanıtır: Helmholtz Watson hem John'un "ilkel" hem de Mond'un "modern" dünyalarına alternatif bir dünya sunmak için romana yerleştirilir. Watson sayesinde *Brave New World* zamanın akışındaki kırılma problemine bir çözüm sunmaktadır: zaman kavramı hem geçmiş, geleneği, ilkeli hem de geleceği, modern, gelişmiş kapsayacak kadar geniş bir algı olarak ele alınmalıdır der Huxley'nin romanı Watson karakteri ile. Böylece Huxley moderniteyi zamansal kavramlar üzerinden, ikili karşıtlıkları aşarak ve Avrupa-merkezci bakış açısından vazgeçerek yeniden tanımlar ve modernitenin bu yeni tanımını çoklu modernite deneyimleri fikrini kucaklayabilecek niteliktedir.

Bu bölümün ikinci kısmında, Tanpınar'ın *Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü*'ndeki modern fikrini formülize etmesini sağlayan zaman anlayışına değinilmektedir. Bu bölümde Tanpınar'ın Türk modernleşmesi projesine yönelttiği eleştirilerin onun kültürel-iptal etme ya da kültürel özgünlüğü-yok etme olarak algılanmasından kaynaklanmakta olduğu iddia

edilmektedir. Tanpınar modernî dođu-batı veya Őimdiki-geçmiŐ gibi ikilikler aısından anlamamaktadır. Bu bađlamda romanlarındaki modern eleŐtirisini moderniteyi kresel ve ok merkezli alması bakımından modernite sylemi hakkındaki eleŐtirel sylemlere de katkıda bulunmaktadır. Onun modern anlayıŐı evrensel iddiaları reddeder ve bu yzden modernite deneyimini ođullaŐtırır. Romanda, enstit symbol ile matematiksel zamanı dayatarak bireylerin hayatını “ayarlamaya”/“dizayn etmeye” alıŐan zihniyeti eleŐtirir. Matematiksel zaman insanları ekonomik ıkarlar edinilebilecek enstrmanlar olarak gren bir zihniyete gre alıŐmaktadır. Byle bir zaman algısı Trkiye’deki ilerlemeci modernite syleminin dođurduđu bir sonutur. Roman ayrıca Trkiye’deki moderniteye ynelik iki yaklaŐımı da yansıtmaktadır: modernleŐmeyi batılılaŐma olarak gren anlayıŐtan nceki Nuri Efendi tarafından temsil edilen manevi ve felsefi zaman anlayıŐı ve modernleŐmeyi batılılaŐma olarak gren anlayıŐtan sonraki Halit Ayarı tarafından temsil edilen yararı ve kapitalist zihniyetin zaman anlayıŐıdır. Tezin bu kısmı ayrıca modern zaman – homojen zaman – anlayıŐının ulus inŐa eden elitlerin, ulusal topluluđa ait olan ve ortak zaman algısını paylaŐan modern Trk bireyini yaratmalarında iŐlevsel olduđunu iddia etmektedir. Benedict Anderson’un *Imagined Communities* (1983)’de de bahsettiđi gibi ulus inŐası politik, iktisadi ve toplumsal meseleleri ieren modern bir zorunluluk olarak grlmektedir. Tanpınar’ın her trl zıtlıđa meydan okuyan, zamanı yekpare bir varlık olarak kavramsallaŐtırması modern fikrini rettiđi bir ara olarak grlmelidir.

Blm 5 bu alıŐmanın sonularının aıklandıđı bir blmdr. ncelikle tez boyunca yapılan argmanların genel ana hatları izilmektedir. Bunu ardından tezin neminden bahsedilmektedir. Ve sonu olarak tez, Huxley ve Tanpınar’ın edebiyatları etrafında retilen eleŐtirel bir tartıŐma n plana ıkarmaktadır.

APPENDIX C

CURRICULUM VITAE

PERSONAL INFORMATION

Surname, Name: Kaya, Hilal
Nationality: Turkish (TC)
Date and Place of Birth: 10 March 1983, Amasya
Marital Status: Married
Phone: +90 542 212 53 41
email: hkaya07@yahoo.com

EDUCATION

Degree	Institution	Year of Graduation
MA	METU English Literature, Ankara	2009
BA	Ankara Uni. English Language and Literature, Ankara	2006
High School	Gazi Osman Paşa Super High School, Tokat	2001

WORK EXPERIENCE

Year	Place	Enrollment
2012- Present	Yıldırım Beyazıt University	English Instructor
2008-2012	TOBB University	English Instructor
2007-2008	Ufuk University	Research Assistant

FOREIGN LANGUAGES

Advanced English

PUBLICATIONS

1. **Kaya, H.** (2010). EPIPHANY Online Academic Journal- International University of Sarajevo. Early Intimations of Colonialism in the 17th century: William Shakespeare's *Othello* and *The Tempest*, John Fletcher's *The Island Princess*, Aphra Behn's *Oroonoko*. No. 4 (2010): Epiphany – Spring 2010.
2. **Kaya, H.** (2010). METU Annual Novelists Book 18th METU BRITISH NOVELISTS CONFERENCE: Jane Austen and Her Works- Middle East Technical University- Ankara "Language and Silence in Jane Austen's *Sense and Sensibility*."
3. **Kaya, H.** (2009). **LITTERA Ortak Kitap- Edebiyat Dergisi (Hakemli Yayın)** Oğuz Atay'ın *Tehlikeli Oyunlar* ve Samuel Beckett'in *Üçleme (The Trilogy)* Adlı Romanlarında Dil, Metinlerarasılık ve Üstkurmaca- Aralık 2009- Cilt 25.

APPENDIX D

TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU

ENSTİTÜ

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü

Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü

Enformatik Enstitüsü

Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü

YAZARIN

Soyadı :

Adı :

Bölümü :

TEZİN ADI (İngilizce) :

TEZİN TÜRÜ : Yüksek Lisans

Doktora

1. Tezimin tamamından kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir.

2. Tezimin içindekiler sayfası, özet, indeks sayfalarından ve/veya bir bölümünden kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir.

3. Tezimden bir bir (1) yıl süreyle fotokopi alınamaz.

TEZİN KÜTÜPHANEYE TESLİM TARİHİ: