



TWO RELUCTANT MODERNISTS: HUXLEY AND TANPINAR A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF POINT COUNTER POINT AND A MIND AT PEACE

TEREDDÜTLÜ MODERNİSTLER: HUXLEY VE TANPINAR SES SESE
KARŞI VE HUZUR ROMANLARININ KARŞILAŞTIRMASI

Hilal KAYA

Dr. Öğr. Görevlisi, Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt Üniversitesi,
Yabancı Diller Yüksekokulu, hkaya@ybu.edu.tr

Abstract

This study aims to explore to what extent Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar's *A Mind at Peace* (1949) engages with and/or is in conflict with Aldous Huxley's *Point Counter Point* (1928) in terms of each writer's discontent with modernity and modernization. It is a comparative study of two novels embedded in different contexts, but having similar concerns. The paper basically argues that the selected 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 offer a criticism of modernity and modernization. As the study highlights, despite their similar concerns about and criticism of modernity, the novels display significant differences in terms of their disparate formulations of the modern. More specifically, the paper 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 study emphasizes that despite the difference between the two novels regarding 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.

Öz

Bu çalışma, Aldous Leonard Huxley ve Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar'ın modernite ve modernizasyon bağlamında hoşnutsuzluğu açısından, Huzur'un (1949) Ses Sese Karşı (1928) ile ne ölçüde bağ kurduğunu ve/veya tezat içerisinde olduğunu incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Bu yazı farklı bağlamlarda oluşturulmuş fakat benzer endişeler yansıtan iki romanın mukayeseli bir çalışmasıdır. Temel olarak bu inceleme, Huxley ve Tanpınar'ın romanlarının, onların modernite ve modernizasyona karşı takındıkları eleştirel tavrı sergilediğini öne sürmektedir. Romanlardaki teknik ve tematik benzerlik ve farklılıkların analizi, romanların modernite ve modernizasyon eleştirisini hangi şekillerde yaptıklarını ortaya çıkarmaktadır. Bilhassa, bu çalışma, Huxley'nin moderniteyi Batı ile eş tutan bir bakış açısıyla kavradığını ve bu modernite anlayışını Ses Sese Karşı romanında ön plana çıkardığını iddia etmektedir. Fakat Tanpınar'ın modernite anlayışı Huzur'da sergilediği kadarıyla Huxley'nin romanında belirttiğinden çok farklıdır çünkü Tanpınar'ın romanını da şekillendiren modern felsefesi, 'yerel' ve 'çok-merkezli' bir modernite anlayışına dayanmaktadır. Son olarak, bu çalışma, her ne kadar yazarların modernite anlayışında romanlarında belirtildiği kadarıyla farklılıklar olsa da her iki yazarın da modernite anlayışından hoşnutsuz olduğunu ve romanlarında benzer bir teşhiste bulunmuş olduğunu vurgulamaktadır. Huxley ve Tanpınar'ın teşhisi, modern yaşamdaki harmoni ve bütünlük hissi yoksunluğudur; bu Huxley için Batı dünyasını, Tanpınar için ise ülkesi, Türkiye'yi, işaret etmektedir.

Makale Bilgisi

Gönderildiği tarih: 15 Ağustos 2018
Kabul edildiği tarih: 12 Kasım 2018
Yayınlanma tarihi: 28 Aralık 2018

Article Info

Date submitted: 15 August 2018
Date accepted: 12 November 2018
Date published: 28 December 2018

Anahtar sözcükler

Aldous Leonard Huxley; Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar; Modernite; Modernizasyon; Fikir Romanı; Avrupamerkezcilik; Çoklu Moderniteler; Terkip

Keywords

Aldous Leonard Huxley; Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar; Modernity; Modernization; Novel of Ideas; Eurocentrism; Multiple Modernities; Terkip

DOI: 10.33171/dtcjournal.2018.58.2.19

Introduction

The following analysis will explore both the similarities and differences between *A Mind at Peace* (1949) and *Point Counter Point* (1928). 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. In other words, although *Point Counter Point* and *A Mind at Peace* share similar concerns about the modern and they reflect the writers' discontent with modernity and modernization, this paper will also foreground the differences concerning the various ideas of the modern as reflected in the novels.

As an essayist, critic, poet and novelist, Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar (1901-1962) 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 chronological order parallel to the Turkish history.¹ 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.² 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.

With regard to Aldous Leonard Huxley (1894-1963), it can be stated that 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

¹ Adalı, Murat. "Geleneğin Farklı Bir Yorumcusu: Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar" *Hece* 61 (Ocak 2002); Okay, Orhan. "Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar" *TYB Akademi* 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* 61 (Ocak 2002); Şevki, Abdullah. "Toplumumuza Bakış Açısı ve Siyasi Duruşu Yönünden Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar" *Hece* 61 (Ocak 2002).

² Demiralp, Oğuz. *Kutup Noktası*. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi, 1993; Gürbilek, Nurdan. *Benden Önce Bir Başkası*. İstanbul: Metis, 2010; Dellaloğlu, Besim F. *Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar-Modernleşmenin Zihniyet Dünyası ve Bir Tanpınar Fetişizmi*. İstanbul: Kapı, 2012.

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.

This paper brings Huxley out of the confines of genre-specific and nation-based scholarship and explores his novel along with a Turkish novelist's one of the major novels regarding the similar and different ways in which they formulate and represent their discontent with modernity and modernization. Tanpınar was acquainted with Huxley's work before he wrote his novel,³ 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,⁴ "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).

Tanpınar reveals his admiration for Huxley through Mümtaz who has been considered a character representing the text's message (Moran, *Türk Romanına...* 320). Also, the 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 commit suicide while playing this music in the background. A reason for this interesting similarity will be offered towards the end of this paper. 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.

I. The Novel of Ideas

It should be firstly stated that both Huxley and Tanpınar used the sub-genre known as *the novel of ideas*. The novel of ideas can be called a sub-genre of the novel, and according to Peter E. Firchow, it "is, in a very fundamental sense, a

³ "Tanpınar read Huxley's *Point Counter Point* either in English or in French" (Berksoy 113).

⁴ "The music was a proof; God existed. But only so long as the violins were playing" (Huxley, *Point Counter Point* 292-293).

misnomer because there are no novels without ideas" (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 62). Tanpınar and Huxley used 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 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"* (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 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. 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 Azade 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. (140-141).

A Mind at Peace 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. In *Point Counter Point*, 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 Tantamount⁵. Lady Hilda Tantamount is presented as a member of the upper

⁵ In *Point Counter Point*, the names of several characters like Tantamount, Rampion, Spandrell etc. have either allegorical meanings or they are allusions to real people from Huxley's milieu. In his novels, Huxley uses such allegorical names in order to satirize the characters or the ideas they represent. Also see Meckier's essay titled "Onomastic Satire: Names and Naming in *Brave New World*".

class in society who likes throwing parties and having guests around her. Her husband Lord Edward Tantamount⁶ 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 which are portrayed 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 mouthpiece. 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 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

⁶ 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'*" (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*.

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; a counterpart 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.

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 means 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. Characters in a novel of ideas should be regarded as necessary agents 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 study 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" (Huxley, *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"⁷ 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.⁸ 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 İhsan⁹ 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 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

⁷ Here, I refer to D. H. Lawrence's "philosophy of vitalism."

⁸ "Given Huxley's inclination to draw fictional portraits in the likeness of people he knew" (Nance 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.

⁹ İhsan also stands in for Tanpınar's mentor, Yahya Kemal Beyatlı.

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" (Huxley, *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. Tanpınar, 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 Tanpınar'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 tendency¹⁰ 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 Tanpınar are inherently elitist, we cannot simply call Huxley and Tanpınar elitist writers; because, while their characters are from a restricted social circle, Huxley's and Tanpınar'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 Tanpınar 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

¹⁰ 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" (63).

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 who are idle, degenerate, and egocentric at the expense of others in *Point Counter Point* and a presentation of intellectuals who are 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, 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 following part, Mark Rampion from *Point Counter Point* and İhsan from *A Mind at Peace* will be analyzed and compared in order to reveal how Huxley and Tanpinar formulated their attitudes in relation to the idea of the modern.

II. Huxley's Idea of the Modern in *Point Counter Point*

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 Ironic Utopia” 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 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, 481-482).

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”* (Huxley, *Point Counter Point* 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”* (Huxley, *Point Counter Point* 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. (Huxley, *Point Counter Point* 355-356).

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.¹¹ 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, titanotheriums, 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. (Huxley, *Point Counter Point* 247-248).

¹¹ Criticism towards Americanization and machinery is dealt more in Huxley's next novel, *Brave New World* (1932).

Huxley criticizes these people and the ideas they stand for. Modern progressivist thought has its origins in a “scientific method,”¹² after which, according to the above-mentioned thinkers and business people,¹³ 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” (Huxley, *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,

¹² 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.

¹³ 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*”.

Rockefeller and Wanamaker, to come to a contemporary 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. (248-249).

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" (Huxley, *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 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" (Huxley, *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. (357-358).

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" (Huxley, *Point Counter Point* 134, 231) from institutionalized Christianity. The art of integral living, "*which is damnably difficult,*" (Huxley, *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" (Huxley, *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. 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.

Huxley's criticism of and discontent with modernity as reflected in *Point Counter Point* are underlined in the preceding paragraphs. At this point we should try to understand on what basis and how Huxley formulates an understanding of the 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.

In the late nineteen-twenties Huxley, then, was an anti-progressivist thinker with what might be called Eurocentric tendencies.¹⁴ 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. The idea of equalizing the modern with "the West" is foregrounded by some characters, several times in *Point Counter Point*, 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*

¹⁴ 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.

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 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. 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. (Huxley, *Point Counter Point* 166).

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 part 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 Quarleses' 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 (Huxley, *Jesting Pilate*... 156).¹⁵ 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" (Huxley, *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!" (Huxley, *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. (Huxley, *Point Counter Point* 469).

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 (Huxley, *Jesting Pilate*... 42). Huxley's Eurocentric

¹⁵ "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" (Huxley, *Jesting Pilate*... 155-156). 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.

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" (Huxley, *Jesting Pilate...* 42) – and Rampion's idolization of a 'sane, harmonious Greek' (Huxley, *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.

III. Tanpınar's Idea of the Modern in *A Mind at Peace*

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 that 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* 105-106).

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. The Multiple Modernities approach underscores diverse experiences of modernity all of which are characterized to be local, polycentric and respectful to the multiplicity of identities. 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).

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 to 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.”

Unlike Huxley, Tanpınar's formulation of the modern in his novel does not rest on any Eurocentric tendencies and since Tanpınar reconfigures a new state of the modern or "a new life" in Turkish context and comes up with the term *terkip* for this state, his idea of modern enables us to explore his formulation under various lights and paradigms. Besides, unlike Huxley's novel, because Tanpınar's understanding of the modern has much to do with time, his novel opens itself for a reading of a configuration of the modern defined in terms of a temporal paradigm. Thus, 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 (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" (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). 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).

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* meetings. The transcendental experience of music 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). 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? Tanpınar, through Mümtaz, 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). The responsibilities that Mümtaz is ready to take up involve the tasks, the novel 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 the study, 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 paper 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 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 mouthpiece (Rampion in *Point Counter Point* and Tanpınar's mouthpiece (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, which Tanpınar portrays 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 Suad 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).

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

Conclusion

This paper explored and underlined both the similarities and differences between 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. It has been emphasized that although they share similar concerns about the modern and they are discontent with modernity and modernization, 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.

WORKS CITED

- Adalı, Murat. "Geleneğin Farklı Bir Yorumcusu: Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar." *Hece* 61 (Ocak 2002): 84-90.
- Baker, Robert S. "Science and Modernity in Aldous Huxley's Inter-War Essays and Novels." *Aldous Huxley: Between East and West*. Ed. C. C. Barfoot. Amsterdam – New York: Rodopi, 2001. 35-58.
- Bergson, Henri. *The Creative Mind: An Introduction to Metaphysics*. (La Pensée et le mouvant 1934). New York: Kensington Publishing Corp., 1946.
- Berksoy, Berkiz, "Bir Entelektüel Olarak Tanpınar.", *Doğu Batı Entelektüeller III*. 9. 37 (Mayıs, Haziran, Temmuz 2006): 111-131.
- Dellaloğlu, Besim F. *Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar-Modernleşmenin Zihniyet Dünyası ve Bir Tanpınar Fetişizmi*. İstanbul: Kapı, 2012.

- Demiralp, Oğuz. *Kutup Noktası*. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi, 1993.
- Eisenstadt, Shmuel Noah. "Multiple Modernities." *Daedalus* 129.1 (2000):1-29. Web. 05. May 2018.
- Firchow, Peter. "Mental Music: Huxley's 'Point Counter Point' and Mann's 'Magic Mountain' as Novels of Ideas." *Studies in the Novel* 9. 4 (1977): 518-536. Web. 05. May 2018.
- Grosvenor, Peter. "Progress, Elitism and Ideology in Point Counter Point as a Novel of Ideas." *Point Counter Point by Aldous Huxley: A Casebook*. Ed. Edward McShane. Web. 05. May 2018.
- Gürbilek, Nurdan. *Benden Önce Bir Başkası*. İstanbul: Metis, 2010.
- Hoffman, Frederick J. "Aldous Huxley and the Novel of Ideas." *College English* 8.3 (Dec., 1946): 129-137. Web. 05. May 2018.
- Huxley, Aldous Leonard. *Jesting Pilate: The Diary of A Journey*. London: Chatto Windus, 1926.
- . *Point Counter Point*. London: Modern Library, 1928.
- . *Do What You Will*. London: Chatto Windus, 1929.
- . *Brave New World*. London: Chatto Windus, 1932.
- Lekesiz, Ömer. "Tanpınar Nereden ve Nasıl Bakar?" *Hece* 61 (Ocak 2002): 75-84.
- Martin, Kirsty. "Introduction." *Modernism and the Rhythms of Sympathy: Vernon Lee, Virginia Woolf, D.H. Lawrence*. Oxford: OUP, 2013.
- Meckier, Jerome. *Critical Essays on Aldous Huxley*. New York: G. K. Hall & Co., 1996.
- . "On Huxley's Ironic Utopia." *Bloom's Guides Aldous Huxley's Brave New World*. Ed. Harold Bloom. Philadelphia: Chelsea House, 2004. 72-75.
- . "Onomastic Satire: Names and Naming in Brave New World." *Aldous Huxley Annual: A Journal of Twentieth-Century Thought and Beyond* 3 (2003): 155-203. Web. 05. May 2018.
- . Moran, Berna. *Türk Romanına Eleştirel Bir Bakış Vol. 1*. İstanbul: İletişim, 1983.
- Nance, Guinevera. *Aldous Huxley*. New York: Continuum, 1988.
- Okay, Orhan. *Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar*. İstanbul: Şule Yayınları, 2005.

- Schmithausen, Lambert. "Aldous Huxley's View of Nature." *Aldous Huxley between East and West*. Ed. C. C. Barfoot. Amsterdam – New York City: Rodopi, 2001. 151-173.
- Seyhan, Azade. *Tales of the Crossed Destinies: The Modern Turkish Novel in A Comparative Context*. The MLA: New York, 2008.
- Shohat, E., and Robert Stam. *Unthinking Eurocentrism: Multiculturalism and the Media*. London: Routledge, 1994.
- Şevki, Abdullah. "Toplumumuza Bakış Açısı ve Siyasi Duruşu Yönünden Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar." *Hece Arafta Bir Süretilik Olarak Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar Özel Sayısı 61* (Ocak 2002): 93-96.
- Tanpınar, Ahmet Hamdi. *A Mind at Peace*. (Huzur 1949). Trans. Erdağ Gökner. Brooklyn, NY: Archipelago Books, 2008.
- Turinay, Necmettin. "Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar: 1932 Öncesi ve Sonrası." *Hece Arafta Bir Süretilik Olarak Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar Özel Sayısı 61* (Ocak 2002): 84-91.
- Wells, H. G. *The Outline of History*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1920.
- Woodcock, George. *Dawn and the Darkest Hour: A Study of Aldous Huxley*. London: Faber & Faber, 1972.