

## Chapter I: Introduction

### East and West: Difference in Perspectives

The thesis intends to study the issue of hegemonization of western over eastern countries. The technological breakthrough of the western world has made them feel superior to eastern countries. Westerners think that they are superior in culture, religion, scientific discoveries and inventions, and so on to eastern countries. The traditional concept focuses on the super power of western countries like the USA and England. Most of the literary texts are written highlighting their superiority in all aspects. However, some of the critics like Michel Foucault, Chinua Achebe, and Edward Said do not agree with this concept. They argue that time has changed; the systems are made new. No concept remains the same all the time. Their depiction of eastern people as weak, inferior, object of study and so on should be redefined. Whatever they have interpreted, it is based on bias and prejudice. Hence, there should be multiple interpretations of the text. According to them the history and texts should be rewritten covering all spheres not only their one-sided view. The new historicism and cultural studies will help to interpret the text and comprehend the real situation.

Edward Said's history breaking book *Orientalism* (1978) is an example of Post-colonial Studies. Post-colonial studies is the areas of knowledge in which responses are given against colonization. In this book, Said analyzes the cultural representations that are the basis of Orientalism. Grounding much of this thesis in his knowledge of colonial literature such as the fiction of Conrad, and in the post-structuralist theory of Foucault, Derrida and others, Said's *Orientalism* and following works prove influential in literary theory and criticism, and continue to influence several other fields in the humanities. *Orientalism* affected Middle Eastern studies, transforming the way practitioners of the discipline describe and examine the Middle

East. Said came to discuss and vigorously debate the issue of Orientalism with scholars in the fields of history and area studies, many of whom disagreed with his thesis, most famously Bernard Lewis. Said argues:

Orientalism is not a mere political subject matter or field that is reflected passively by culture, scholarship, or institutions; nor is it a large and diffuse collection of texts about the Orient; nor is it representative and expressive of some nefarious "Western" imperialist plot to hold down the "Oriental" world. It is rather a distribution of geopolitical awareness into aesthetic, scholarly, economic, sociological, historical, and philological texts. (*Orientalism* 28)

Therefore, for Said, Orientalism is not only political subject, or collection of texts but it is distribution of economic, sociological, historical and similar awareness in texts.

Consequently, the researcher, in the thesis, studies into traditional concept of western sense of superiority over eastern countries based on situations in the novel. The characters in this novel are seeking for the drastic change and they intend to make everyone know that in real sense, western concepts are not different from the eastern concepts. They may be ahead in technological ways, but in other aspects eastern are also ahead of them. The novel does not agree with the man-made myth that the two worlds have disparity: one superior and another inferior.

### **Pamuk and *The White Castle***

Literature of the twentieth century is characterized by a multiplicity and novelty of experimentations. The latter half of the century saw a plethora of literary outputs which are genuinely interesting and varied in terms of their treatment of novel themes, of blending of mythologization and present day reality to make political comments. One such bold experimenter is Orhan Pamuk. Born as Ferit Orhan Pamuk

in Istanbul in 1952, with a bourgeoisie upbringing, he finally turned up as a Nobel Prize-winning Turkish novelist. Having established himself as a post-modern writer, Pamuk has earned critical acclaim the world over.

Pamuk's novels and other writings are characterized by a confusion or loss of identity brought on in part by the conflicts between European and Islamic values. The deep-rooted tension between east and west, traditional communalism and modern secularism and such binary concepts often get elaborate treatment in Pamukian literature. They are often startling, disturbing and unsettling or even mysteriously exhilarating, as is the novel undertaken in this thesis. His novels include complex, intriguing plots and characters of great depths.

On October 12, 2006 the Swedish Academy announced that Orhan Pamuk had been awarded the Nobel Prize of the year in literature for *Istanbul*, an autobiographical work. In its citation *The New Yorker* the Academy said: "In the quest for the melancholic soul of his native city, [Pamuk] has discovered new symbols for the clash and interlacing of cultures" (25). Pamuk held his Nobel Lecture on December 7, 2006, at the Swedish Academy, Stockholm. The lecture, delivered in Turkish, reviewed the relations between eastern and western civilizations in an allegorical upper text:

What literature needs most to tell and investigate today are humanity's basic fears: the fear of being left outside, and the fear of coming to nothing, and the feelings of worthlessness that come with such fears: the collective humiliations, vulnerabilities slights, grievances, sensitivities, and imagined insults, and the nationalist boasts and inflations that are their next of kind . . . . We have often witnessed people, societies and nations outside the Western world – and identify

with them easily – succumbing to fears that sometimes lead them to commit stupidities, all because of their fears of humiliation and their sensitivities. (Pamuk, Nobel Lectures, 2)

Thus as the Nobel lecture of Pamuk reveals, his subjects are the perennial themes of human weaknesses and stupidities, and superiority complex.

*The White Castle* begins with a preface that acts as a framing device for the rest of the story, as a manuscript is discovered by fictional historian Faruk Darvinoglu. Once the historical and fictional framework has been set up in the preface, we are put into the manuscript, written from the point of view of a captured Italian scholar. At first his knowledge of Western medicine helps him as he can bribe the guards to leave and visit rich Turkish patients, but after a while he is then sold to a man only known as Hoja, or Master, throughout the story.

In the novel, the scholar and Hoja are said to be doubles of each other and it is the tension between the two caused by this strange likeness that fuels the plot of the novel through to the very end. At first it appears that it is only the main character that is doing the teaching but the tables turn as the savant Hoja quickly learns all the lessons the scholar has to teach and for a time they are equals. While Hoja may nominally be the master, the story is told from the scholar's perspective and so we see the way in which he can rule over Hoja with ideas and concepts, from trying to get him to explain why he is "superior" to normal people to coming up with the ideas Hoja claims as his own with the pasha and later the Sultan.

His historical third novel *The White Castle*, published in Turkish in 1985, won the 1990 Independent Award for Foreign Fiction and extended his reputation abroad. It is a short novel, all narration and no dialogue, about modernization and its ironies. According to Victoria Holbrook, Pamuk is compared to other famous western writers

like Thackeray. In his own words:

It is a role-reversal tale, having affinities with some of the established works of the western writers such as Louis Borges, Gustave Flaubert and William Makepeace Thackeray. At some point in the seventeenth century, as the story begins as a straightforward first-person narrative about the misfortunes of a young Italian scholar who, reroute from his native Venice to Naples sometime in the 17<sup>th</sup> century, is captured by Turkish pirates. The Venetian, the narrator of the novel, is a scholar and an engineer, is brought to Istanbul, and is imprisoned there. (2)

Thus, Pamuk, having convinced his captors that he was trained in Italy as a doctor, he finds himself called upon to heal everyone from fellow prisoners to a pasha.

Holbrook further adds that Pamuk is a man of high intelligence and common sense; he manages in most cases to affect a cure. Slowly, he wins the favor of the pasha, who presents him as a slave to his friend, Hoja by name. The captive makes a declaration of his knowledge of western science which makes Hoja curious in him. Hoja takes him as a companion, and as the plot progresses, a strange and often sadomasochistic relationship unfolds between the two characters. Hoja, as his name suggests, is a master, a scientist. He is obsessed with restoring the superiority of the Ottoman Empire over the Europeans by mastering their science. He is also the unnamed narrator's exact physical double. Hoja forces his captive to teach him science, which the narrator does, starting with the true, the Ptolemaic astronomy.

From then on the two proceed to the construction of orderlies, musings on weapons of mass destruction, fireworks for the infant Sultan, and the head games and the mutual oral abuse which occupy the core of the novel. But now he is determined to discover what makes people different and what constitutes the Self: how is this

westerner different from myself, or how are the Christians different from the Ottomans? But also he wants to trace how the people in the Sultan's court "fool", as he terms them, different from himself and the Venetian who are interested in science. One of the most striking points in the novel is that Hoja and the narrator resemble each other, in appearance, like twin brothers. Thus at the end of the book, as the Ottomans are in war with the Poles, a switch takes place: Hoja escapes to Italy where he assumes the identity of the Venetian and Venetian stays back assuming the identity of Hoja. The two are fully immersed their new roles: the Venetian becomes the Imperial Astrologer and a well-known Ottoman scholar, and Hoja lectures in Italian Universities about the Ottoman Empire, at a time as the author tells us satirizingly, when it was fashionable to do so. Pamuk in his interview with Ángel Gurrá- a Quintana says:

. . . this theme of impersonation is reflected in the fragility Turkey feels when faced with Western culture. After writing *The White Castle*, I realized that this jealousy—the anxiety about being influenced by someone else—resembles Turkey's position when it looks west. You know, aspiring to become Westernized and then being accused of not being authentic enough. Trying to grab the spirit of Europe and then feeling guilty about the imitative drive. The ups and downs of this mood are reminiscent of the relationship between competitive brothers.

(4)

The writer is also conscious about east and west division. He is jealous of the idea that western documents are known as authentic more than eastern ones.

Bernard Paul, a prominent critic, argues that *The White Castle* begins with a preface signed by one Faruk, explaining that the story to come was dug up from a

seventeenth-century archive in a village outside Istanbul, has been rendered into modern idiom, and should not be weighed down with too many speculations about contemporary politics and East-West relations-which is, of course, a backhanded invitation to try out precisely those speculations, and indeed speculations of every sort. He says:

It is an amusing preface. It is a sort of theater curtain, dangling to arouse anticipation. And if it mystifies the American reader on small points-who is this Faruk, and who is the grandfather he invokes, or the dead sister whom he dedicates the book? It also gets out of the way quickly, and we are soon enough in a Venetian galley in the seventeenth century, where we are about to be captured by the Ottoman navy and flung into slavery, and all is well, at least for the reader eager for narrative. (Paul)

In this way, the book has been analyzed by various critics and argue that it deals with the east west dichotomy.

### **Critiques on *The White Castle***

Commenting on the story of a seventeenth century Italian captured by pirates who ultimately ends up with being an assistant of the Turkish Sultan in designing a war machine, the critic Savkar Altinel writes that human being have no fixed or essential identity. Identity is a matter of contingency and coincidence, not an essence at all. To quote him:

What lies behind all this is the idea that one can become Italian or Turkish or anything else, because in the innermost core of one's being one is neither Italian nor Turkish nor anything else. Whatever one is in the world, one is also outside the world, merely looking on. Just as at a

crucial point in the story the war engine fails, preventing the Turkish army from taking a gleaming white fortress, pointedly named Dippo, this duality remains unresolved and redundant “I” lives on. It is indeed clearly this “I” that turns its owner and the world into what they apprehend as being, with the result that what appears to be merely given is always in fact deliberately constructed. (54)

It generates somehow a quiet ecstasy. For the exchange of identities, the mutual introduction to a new life, a new way of thinking, a new language.

Likewise, the critic Jay Parini appreciates Pamuk as a new star in the east, who has earned the right to comparisons with Jorge Luis Borges and Italo Calvino, whose influence on him is apparent. He writes:

*The White Castle* is a fable of identity; a postmodern tale that explores the murky and recessive byways of Cartesian self-consciousness. At this point, many readers of this review will yawn: not another second-rate philosopher pretending to be a novelist. You can relax. Mr Pamuk is a storyteller with as much gumption and narrative zip as Scheherazade. ( Parini 4)

Pamuk succeeded all too well in evoking the miasma of frustration, delay, claustrophobia, irrelevance and futility in which his characters live and move and have their being. It is, indeed, extremely good at what it sets out to do, and simply ignores what is beside its task. Hence one gets absolutely no feel at all for Istanbul, despite its being one of the most temptation locales in the world for a writer of fiction to exploit. Hoja and the narrator spends a lot of their time trying to get inside each other's heads and drive each other crazy and exchange places, which is supposed to complement the East-meets-West theme, but the mind-games are so much more vivid



than the latter that completely overpower it. This is perhaps just as well, since the whole ironies of modernization business are much too facile, and leaves out the fact that, in the long run, Hoja was absolutely right:

The Ottomans lost first superiority over and then equality to the Europeans because they did not master or match the Europeans in their new sciences and practical techniques. Pamuk would have had a very different story had the narrator been the pupil of Prof. Galilei of Padua. Thus, the cultural associations determine what one more vivid than the latter that becomes. (Parini 6)

*The White Castle* is an oriental text which emphasizes the fact that western superiority is not more than myth. Edward Said, in his book *Orientalism* says that western superiority should be discontinued. The western concept always puts them in the higher position than the eastern. According to him:

In a quite constant way, *Orientalism* depends for its strategy on this flexible positional superiority, which puts the Westerner in a whole series of possible relationships with the Orient without ever losing him the relative upper hand. And why should it have been otherwise, especially during the period of extraordinary European ascendancy from the late Renaissance to the present? The scientist, the scholar, the missionary, the trader, or the soldier was in, or thought about, the Orient because he could be there, or could think about it, with very little resistance on the Orient's part. (*Orientalism*, 24)

Similarly, New Historicism is the concept, which does not accept traditional one-way interpretation. It asserts that so far history is written in the subjective way. History is only the series of events from only one perspective. However, modern

writers like Foucault, Said, Achebe, so on believe that history should be re-written as traditional history cannot bring objective idea through one perspective saying that it is subjective

Traditional historians believe that history is a series of events that have a linear, causal relationship. They opine that we are perfectly capable, through objective analysis, of uncovering the facts about historical events and those facts can sometimes reveal the spirit of the age, the worldview held by the culture to which those facts refer. Some of the most popular traditional historical accounts have offered main concept that explains the worldview of a given historical population. Moreover, traditional historians generally believe that history is progressive, that the human species is improving over the course of time, advancing in its moral, cultural, and technological accomplishments.

In this way, the novel is about the conflict between west and east. The west believes that it is superior to the east. The western people claim that they are the leaders of the world, the civilizations originated from them. They are forward in science, technology, ideas, and many more. However, when one goes finding out the difference between them and the easterners or non-westerners there is not such clear cut distinction between these two poles. In the second chapter the researcher explores the related theory of historicism and new-historicism in order to prove his/her theory. Then, the researcher analyzes the text in detail related to the theory in the chapter three.

## Chapter II: Orientalism

### Introduction to Orientalism

The emergence of multiple post-colonial literary theories has provided us numerous opportunities to interpret a text from various views and perspectives. Orientalism is also a recent postcolonial theory propounded by Edward Said, a Palestine born English writer. Orientalism is a discourse formed by West about the non-west. It is a created reality of the orient by the occident. It is a discourse which is made by the west to govern the non-western countries. The authors who write such discourse are Orientalist, as Said defines it "Anyone who teaches, writes about or researches the orient is an Orientalist and what he or she does is Orientalism" (*Orientalism 2*). Orientalism represents the first phase of colonialism i.e. generally later part of 14<sup>th</sup> century to early part of 16<sup>th</sup> century.

The publication of this theory is regarded as the principal catalyst and reference point of post colonial theory. It is the western experience of East or western thought about the Orient. In this regard, Said defines it as a "style of thought based upon ontological and epistemological distinction made between the orient and the occident" (*Orientalism 2*). Here, Said clarifies that Orientalism is the western taste of the orient. It differentiates between the orient and the occident. While differentiating these two contestants, the former one is placed in inferior position and the latter is placed at superior position. It creates hierarchy between the whites and the non-whites. It marginalizes the Orientals.

During the colonial period, westerners visited the non-western countries for various purposes and later on they make discourse about those countries on the basis of their own understanding and own imagination. Orientalism, according to Said, is not an airy European fantasy about the orient but a created body of theory and

practice in which, for many generations, there has been considerable material investment. Post-colonial criticism like Orientalism attempts to reexamine the colonial relationship and colonial perspective employed in discourse of cultural representation and the text dealing with colonial relations. According to Orientalist view, western values and traditions of thought and literature, including versions of post-modernism, are guilty of repressive ethnocentrism because models of west thought and literature have dominated world culture, marginalizing or excluding non-western traditions and forms of cultural life and expressions.

The colonial critics and writers have deconstructed the reality of non western and produced colonizing myths about Laziness, deceit and irrationality of the non-western people. The post colonial theory deals with the issues like images, representation, hybridity, diaspora, nationalism, problem of migration and so on. Regarding issues under the study of postcolonial theory, the Ascroft et al write: "Migration, slavery, suppression, resistance, representation, difference ,race gender, place and responses to the influential master discourse imperial Europe . . . and the fundamental experiences of speaking and writing by which all these come into being" (2). This means that postcolonial theory is not a single index of linguistic, philosophy, literature and culture. It is, rather, a mixed identity of these items all together. So far as this research is concerned, it is based on the theoretical terms like 'Representation' and 'Other'. These terms are relevant to the theory Orientalism. That's why the common ideas and definitions of Orientalism have been discussed above. The author under study of this research is mostly presented as the hater of imperialism but the research shows his mixed attitude to the colonized, especially to the Burmese people. It demonstrates the mixed representation of the Burmese people and it also confirms author's Eurocentric prejudices. In this connection the relevant terms are discussed

below:

### **Representation in Post-Colonial Discourse**

The concept of representation is connected with the basic issues of cultural theory. The postcolonial theory, Orientalism, incorporates the problem of representation in colonial writings under its subject of study. In all cultural representation and promotion, the role played by content organization as well as by the use of specific techniques and forms of representation, is of great significance in the distinction between the 'original' or the 'authentic' and the 'copy' or the 'simulacrum'. Since the term is directly connected with culture, it signifies cultural identity. But the signification may not be the real one. So far as the importance of the term representation in this research is concerned, it is directly relevant to the hostility between the West and the East.

In the contemporary theory of postcolonialism, representation is connected to the Foucauldian concept of discourse as representation. According to Foucault we can find a chain or network of power in discourse. Discourse is power. Every discourse bases on certain knowledge which helps to form power. The discourses by West about East base on the knowledge they have gained about East during the period of colonization. Said shares similar attitude when he writes, "Orientalism is the generic term that I have been employing to describe the western approach to the orient; Orientalism is a discipline by which the orient was (and is) approached systematically as a topic of learning, discovery, and practice" (Orientalism 71). Here also Said acknowledges Foucauldian concept and argues that western discourses always form images and stereotypes about the East and aim at ruling and dominating over the orient. Orientalism is also meant the similar kind of discourse which attempts to represent the orient from western perspectives. It always creates the hierarchy of

superior and inferior or the creator and the created. The non-westerners get their identities only by the mercy of their creators, i.e. Westerners. The Easterners are not what they are but what the westerners represent them. Edward Said in his theory Orientalism also explores how the East-the orient, is created through western discursive, practices, which can, however, be known by the dominant discourse of the west and thus assimilated in practices pronounced as inferior or as 'the other' as it does not come up to representations. As Said writes:

. . . orientalism can be discussed and analyzed as a corporate institution for dealing with orient by making statement about it describing it teaching it, setting it and ruling over it. In short, orientalism, is western style for dominating restructuring and having authority over the orient." (*Orientalism* 3)

Postcolonial criticism, which attempts to reexamine the colonial relationship, emerged in resistance to colonial perspectives employed in discourses of cultural representations and the text dealing with colonial relations.

The history of representation goes back to the Greek period when the great writer Homer in his *Illiad* and similarly Europides and Aeschylus in their books *The Persians* and *The Bachhe* respectively demonstrated Asian's loss and Europeans' victory. This tradition of representation is still continuous in various forms. The great writer Dante also used the same stereotypic images and representation in his work *Inferno*. Dante presented the prophet Mohammed being eternally chained from brain to anus in his book. In this way, the white authors of different centuries have been representing the Easterners, in the history, according to their taste. The modern American orientalists create the images of the Easterners as terrorists and give them a new identity. They represent them in many Television programmes. Said seems to be

saying so when he writes, "My analysis of the orientalist texts therefore places emphasis on the evidence, which is by no means invisible for such representation as representations not as 'natural' depictions of the orient" (*Orientalism* 19). Since Greco-Roman period, the westerners have been attempting to marginalize the non-westerners by creating the fictitious reality about the orient according to their own taste. They have been endeavoring to represent the Easterners through their imagination. In some context, they show some loving or sympathetic attitude towards the orient and they exploit even their sentiments. Edward Said explains that cultural discourse and exchange within a culture is commonly circulated is not truth but representations. Said adds further, "The relation between occident and orient is a relationship of power, of domination, of varying degree of a complex hegemony" (*Orientalism* 5).

As we know there is (and was) always an unequal distribution of power among cultures, and that ultimately affects representation of one culture by the other. There we can find the mingling of loving and hating attitude between the Eastern and Western in term of representation. We can find inequalities in various modes and process of representation Said unmasks the ideological disguises of imperialism reciprocal relationship between colonial power and knowledge. In this regard, discussing Said, Padmini Mongia writes, "that cultural lands play a part in the great games of colony an empire, of race and its development, so that the last two hundred years of European imperialism had to be understood vis a vis the cultural texts that laid the ground work for the buttressed the structure of imperialism" (4) The main mission of imperialism is to govern the countries geographically, politically, and culturally. For these reasons, they represent the colonized as they like.

In other words, the representation means misrepresentation. The Easterners are

always misrepresented by the westerners to clarify that they have been always superior. Some colonial writers try to express their loving or sympathetic attitude towards the subservient colonized people along with their sense of superiority which always resides in the core of their minds. For example, E.M. Forster, Rudyard Kipling, Joseph Conrad etc represented the East as the land of 'other' in various manners. Forster in his novel *Passage to India* did mixed representation of the Indian people. Indian people are represented as friendly, loving, and helpful in one land and they are misrepresented as barbaric, uncivilized, other, and mysterious on the other hand. Such writers have made the romantic representation of the orient as exotic locale. These numerous representation of the East/orient by the west is also the outcome of the colonizer's will to govern the Colonized. The representation is just a created medium for the colonization. They misrepresent the East in order to prove that they are not, in fact, willing to govern the orient but it is mandatory for them. So, they exhibit colonial experiences and perception, and are written from the imperial perspective. It is, as Boehmer writes, "Informed by theories concerning the superiority of European Culture and the rightness of empire" (69). So, colonial literatures have created channels for the exchange of Colonial images and ideals.

During the time of the peak of imperialism, writers felt it necessary to write about new places and the people. They began writing about the people who inhabited the lands they (colonizers) claimed the natives, the colonized. But the problem was that of truly understanding the native people, alien people, native culture, geography and the landscape. They were surprised to see the situations or the life styles of the native people. They found the behaviors and attitudes of people completely unreadable. Then after they commenced to represent these people and culture according to their own taste and with the use of their own familiar vocabularies, their



own metaphors and tropes as Boehmer argues that "strangeness was made comprehensible by using everyday names, dependable textual conventions, both rhetorical and Syntactic" (Boehmer 14). This process was continued by classifying them as barbaric and degenerate, either dangerous or alluring.

The most important function of the colonial writings is to reveal the ways in which the world is dichotomized in various manners. They could represent the degradation of other human beings as natural, an innate part of their degenerate or barbarian state. The non-European people were represented as less human, less civilized, as child or Savage or headless mass or, they were depicted as inferior only because they were different from the whites. The writers and their works were centered only in the issue of justifying the mission of Colonization. Their endeavors were only to cherish the idea of white superiority. As Said argues that " It is Europe that articulates the orient; this articulation is the prerogative ,not of a puppet master, but of a genuine creator, whose life giving power represents, animates, constitutes the otherwise silent and dangerous space beyond familiar boundaries" (*Orientalism* 56).

Any process of colonial writing exposed the love-hate relationship between the Colonizers and the Colonized. Colonial writings were centered on the power relation between the occident and the orient. Boehmer reminds us this idea when she writes, "Stereotypes of the other as indolent malingers, shirkers, lay bouts, degenerate versions of the pastoral idler, were the stock-in- trade of colonialist writings. The white men represented themselves as the archetypal workers and provident profit-maker" (39). Thus, colonialist writings always have represented the whites as intellectual, Superior, Civilizer, Masters of the world and apostle of light and the non whites as degenerate, barbaric and in need of European masters to civilize and to uplift them out of their filth. They also created a hierarchy of race, which represent

'we' for the race belonged to the superior position and the 'they' for the race belonged to the inferior position. In this regard the reputed critic Edward Said clarifies about Conrad and his representation as:

Conrad seems to be saying 'we' westerners will decide who is a good native or bad, because all natives has sufficient existence by Virtue of our recognition. We created them, we taught them to speak and think, and when they revel they revel they simply confirm our views of them as silly children duped by some of their western masters. (*Culture and Imperialism XX*)

This above quotation shows that Conrad is an imperialist and thinks that imperialism is a system since he is the product of his own time and brought up and educated from the western Colonial heritage. Thus, his representation of Africa is filtered through the stereotypes of Africanize discourse. In those above extract Conrad means to say that African needs guidance and light from European rational Civilization. He cannot see and believe that Africa has its own intact history and culture distinct from European one. Thus the orient must pass through the learned grids and codes provided by the orientalist.

The colonial writers always create binaries regarding the orient as inferior, 'other, indigenous, uncivilized, female, patient; and which place westerners as 'Superior', universal, male, doctor, civilized and so on. These epithets promote an awareness in the part of the non-westerners to create their own existence. These kinds of binary oppositions constitute a gap between what they do or write. Texts sometimes represent the unconscious bias of the writers as clarified by Said in *Orientalism*:

In any instance of at least written language, there is no such thing as a

delivered presence, but a represent or a representation. The value efficacy, strength, apparent variety of a written statement about the orient therefore relies very little, and cannot instruct mentally depend, on orient as such on the contrary, the written statement is a presence to the reader by virtue of the having excluded, displaced mode supererogatory any such real thing as "the orient". Thus all of orientalism stands forth and away from the orient that orientalism makes sense at all depends more on the west than on orient. (21-22)

Said, in the above extract, demonstrates the gulf between the orient it actually is and the orient that is represented in various genres of literature. He further clarifies about misrepresentation of the orient by the westerners or the travelers who have never seen the orient that they find gap between what they read in books and what they actually find about it. This means that westerners represent the orient what they want it to be, but not the orient as it is. It also further adds an inevitable fact that the representations that are made by the westerners are partially real and mostly these objects have only a fictional reality. In this connection, Said argues that " this universal practice of designating in one's mind a familiar space which is "ours" and an unfamiliar space which is " theirs" is a way of making geographical distinction that can be entirely arbitrary" (*Orientalism* 53). These lines explain the hostile relationship between the Colonizers and the Colonized.

The central subject matter of any colonial writing is the encounter between the Western colonizers the Eastern colonized. The presentation of the characters is influenced by the colonial mentality. It means the colonialists always fractionalize the social, economical, individuals, political and geographical situations of the orient. Such writings are always characterized by the mixed relationship between the

colonizers and the Colonized. As Ashcroft, Bill, Biffiths and Giffithsh had defined ambivalence along with Bhaba's lines," It describes the complex mix of attraction and reputation that characterizes the relationship between Colonizers and Colonized. The relationship is ambivalent because the Colonized subject is never simple and completely opposed to the colonizer"(12). The process of acculturation is not simple, so both of these groups always have conflicting relation with each other. They represent the problems and prospects of establishing intimate and meaningful relationships between two social and cultural groups.

The Colonial writers rarely present the non-European or non-whites as the leading characters of their works. The indigenous characters are rejected to give any significant role. If any role is given, that is always a negative one. Boehmer writes was assumed to be metropolis" (24). One of the Colonial writers Joseph Conrad is branded as 'thorough racist' by Chinua Achebe and he has made a sever critique of Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness* in his paper entitled "An image of Africa: Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*" as:

*Heart of Darkness* projects the image of Africa as "the other world" the antithesis of Europe and therefore of civilization, a place where man's vaunted intelligence and refinement are finally mocked by opens on the River Thames but the actual story will take place on the River Congo, the very antithesis of Thames. The River Congo quite decidedly no service and enjoys no old-age pension. We are told that going up river was like traveling back to the earliest beginning of the world. (1373)

In this above extract Conrad, as Achebe mentions, not only dichotomizes Thames and Congo; good and bad, but implicated that Thames has overcome its darkness and

bestiality, whereas Congo is still in darkness and bestiality and it needs guidance, help and light from European rational civilization to rescue its people from the barbaric situations.

Thus, it is surprising to the readers like us that the world represented in colonialist fiction shows strangely empty of indigenous characters. The European or white characters are demonstrated as adventurous and courageous. The European characters play important role. Boehmer also thinks similarly and she argues that "The drama that there is in their drama. Almost without exception there is no narrative interest without European involvement and intervention" (69). Even though the natives are represented in the novel they are shown in headless mass lacking individual identity as human beings. So, the colonial discourses, in fact, focused on the love-hate relationship between the colonizer and the colonized. The colonized were always shown as inferior, barbaric, uncivilized and in need of leadership, incapable of self-governance and in managing their resources. The whites were always at the apex of everything, and source of every significant activities. Said presents 'Canonical' view of orientalism that is supposed to have been existed even in the time of Chaucer, Shakespeare, Dryden, Pope and Byron. Orientalists have certain stereotypes to represent land, people, culture and politics of East. Said's work on orientalism shows how the western image produces myths about the laziness, decent and irrationality of the orientals. Colonial discourses presented the orient as the liar, suspicious and lethargic. In contrary the white race is presented as clear, direct, noble mature, rational and Virtuous. West always represents oriental people as unruly inscrutable or malign. Orient is not what it is but how it is orientalized by the westerners. Said in "Crisis in Orientalism" argues that, "the political and cultural circumstances has flourished, draw attention to the debased position of the East or

oriental as an object of study "(298).

So it carries out a fact that the Westerners do not represent the reality but they always represent the Easterners by used of various unusual images. Though some of the writers pretend to show their sympathy to the Eastern people and their situations, they are in fact motivated by their will to dominate the orient. They express love and sympathy to the Eastern peoples as a new mode of power to govern them. So the multiple representations which are made in colonial discourses are only to justify their mission of colonization in various forms.

### **'Other' in Postcolonial Discourse**

'Other' is an important theoretical terms in relation to the postcolonial theory and specially to the Orientalism. 'Other' is a colonial term coined by West to represent East. It directly represents the third world which were once colonized by the West and those which have been still colonized. Since the beginning of the human civilization, the Europe has put itself in the centre and the rest in the periphery. The term 'other' is created in relation to the term 'self' or 'we'. It is directly connected with the theory of exclusiveness. It elucidated the power relation between the occident and the orient. It is created just to dichotomize between the 'west' and the rest'. A main theoretical source for the term lies in the philosophy of G.W.F. Hegel and his commentary on the mutually defining relations of Master and Slave and then in Psychoanalytical theory of Jacques Lacan, the 'Other' is the image of a unified and co-ordinate self the child sees also other children with whom it is in a relation of recognition, rivalry and competition The other is not a direct interlocutor but the symbolic place, the site upon which the subject is constituted; the something it lacks but must seek. It therefore directs the subject's desire and destiny. So far as the term is concerned with the postcolonial theory it is the western creation to govern or dominate over the 'orient'.

The orient is always 'other' of the occident. It is to subjugate or subordinate the orient. The term is also relevant to the culture. The western culture always tries justifying itself as the superior or the centre and the non-western culture as inferior or the other. The Westerners always create binary opposition by representing the orient as always away from mainstream in every aspect. So, the term is relevant with the cultural identity and power relation. We live our lives in the context of social relationships with others. The concept of other is related with political ideology. The colonial discourses helped to form the images and stereotypes of the orient. In this connection, Bhaba writes.

An important features of colonial discourse is its dependence on the concept of 'fixity' in the ideological construction of 'otherness'. Fixing as the sign of cultural/historical/racial difference in the discourse of colonialism in a paradoxical mode of representation. It connotes rigidity and an unchanging order as well as disorder, degeneracy and daemonic repletion. (218)

This above extract clarifies that the colonial writers always follow the fixed and stereotyped construction while representing the countries and people they had once colonized.

The discourse of west, representing everything non-western as inferior, manifests west's desire to govern, to dominate and to control 'the other' and that, this attitude is colonial heart. In this regard Boehmer in her studies of colonial literature and their process of othering remarks:

In orient, Africa or Latin America is consistently described as mysterious grotesque, or margin and in general hostile to European understanding. It is an "awful lifelessness", or vast and stupefying,

reminding the British observer as O. Douglas noted, of the uncertainty of all things .... It is a condition which appears to have emerged in the past out of the radical incongruity between the individual and the alien world in which he finds himself. (90)

On this basis, non-west is compared to a woman country. Orientals are characterized as passive, seductive and generally effeminate. Said opines that the colonial discourse serves this colonial purpose in an effective manner. The colonialists attempt to design the fixed geographical, cultural and political concept about the orient in the mind of the readers. It produces a kind of stereotype of the orient describing as an object of study stamped with an "otherness" so as to make it easier to have power and authority over the orient. Said seems to be right in saying that "an unbroken arc of knowledge connects the European or the western statesman and the western orientalist; it forms the rim of stage containing the orient" and that "the scope of orientation exactly matched the scope of Empire" (204). The Westerners believed that the Easterners were not able to govern themselves. They also meant that every scientific and technological discoveries were made in the west and the Eastern people were primitive barbaric, lethargic, ignorant, childlike and effeminate. The colonizers, with these fake evidences about the orient, tried to justify their mission of colonization. They thought that it was white man's burden to civilize them, to educate them and to make them human.



### **Chapter III: Oriental View in Pamuk's *The White Castle***

#### **East-West Dichotomy: A Man-Made Myth**

This chapter is divided into three subchapters so as to elaborate the interrelated but different aspects of the novel. Here, in what follows below, the thesis deploys the tools discussed and elaborated earlier to interpret and analyze the text in question, and proves that the hypothesis set at the beginning was a tenable one. For this purpose, the insight gained by the theoretical study made in the previous chapter is used to interpret and elaborate how the novel, though a small one in terms of volume, actually touches upon probably the most burning issue in the world today: the question of west-east divide, ethnic and communal purity, versus one world one race theory of the postmodern and the progressive parties. To tell the truth, Pamuk is uncompromisingly critical and skeptical of the human folly of taking culturally determined views of the world as the right way of finding truth, holding on to one's culture though that might mean to go on embracing the rotten and stinking parochial values of differing religions and often irreconcilably opposing religions.

The solution lies not either in approving and disapproving any particular culture or religion, but in accepting all as they come along. That latitudinarian attitude at least spares the world of the trouble of communal violence. And may be people in the long run will develop the capacity to live together in peace, if not in love with each other. The reconciliatory tone of the novel cannot be missed as Hoja, the Turkish teacher and the narrator, a Venetian scholar, unwittingly to themselves find each other to be their most wanted self. This is the spirit of the novel: celebration of a multicultural and hybrid world, even if the possibility of such a world may appear too bleak at first sight.

### **Eastern Longing for Western Science: An Orientalist Theme**

The east, as it has been portrayed in literature, Orientalist literature as they have been produced by westerners on the easterners, is somehow or other subordinate to the west in all of its aspects, whether civilizational and cultural, or technological. Therefore, it comes as no surprise that a writer from a country that divides itself into the East Asia and West – turkey lies in some part in Asia as well – must have thought about the coverage of his readership. He must have aimed at the western as well as the native and the easterners as his readers after decades of writing and gaining feedback. This sure enough has affected the very production of the novel, as Edward W. Said so succinctly spells it out in the critical essay "The World, the Text and the Critic" any work of art as an artifact occupies certain space in the world, therefore it is there with some consequence. It generates impression and n results in the world, as it had been the result of some or other worldly affairs.

This observation now enables us to look closely at the textual or novelistic detail which bear proof to the hypothesis of this thesis that the novel concerns the east west dichotomy and in the end tries to ameliorate the relation between the two. That is the only way for a co-existent and peaceful world for humanity that is the message of the novel, if one dares to propose it at the very beginning here.

The stories of how ruthlessly the social unfits and rebels were executed in the barbaric societies of the east, especially in the Muslim countries, is touched upon here. Whether it is the Persian and Arabian region or the supposedly more advanced and familiar to the west Ottoman or Turkish region, the Muslim are basically the same in their die-hard approach to discontents and foreigners, or even to those who do not match with their fundamental religious beliefs. As the tool for the thesis is postcolonial perspective, particularly that branch of postcolonialism which seeks to

expose the hidden messages in the literary texts which are symptomatic of Orientalist views, it is relevant to expose how this concept of Orientalism has been referred to in the citation below.

The historian Naima described in similar fashion the Imperial Astrologer Huseyn Efendi's execution and Mehamet iv's rabbit hunt at Mirahor Palace. It occurred to me that the author, who clearly enjoyed reading and fantasizing, may have been familiar with such sources and a great many other books-such as the memoirs of European travelers or emancipated slaves-and gleaned material for his story from them. (2)

A historian has recorded the execution of the scientist who happened to displease the Sultan of turkey in the seventeenth century. This knowledge, as the writer playfully makes the narrator, a Venetian scientist and scholar, guess, might have come to the historian via the memoirs of the European traveler. Other possible sources are the tales as told by the emancipated slaves. The irony operating lies in the fact that even to know about the about Turkish history, one could easily turn to the sketches, books and memoirs as they were left by the Europeans. That would be a reliable source. It is like saying the musk runs hither and thither in search of the musk that is continuously giving off fragrance from its own navel. The Turkish writer writes a novel in which a western narrator and character surmises about the source of history and story. One of the possible and reliable sources might have been the memoir of some westerners.

This observation takes us back to what as Foucault says about power, knowledge and truth. It is in and by discourse that any knowledge is generated and conveyed, ultimately catapulting it to the status of a truth. Only by writing – since that is the permanent mode of discourse creation and circulation, speech being not so permanent – meaning, by creating discourses, can we create histories and stories that

would be recorded in the annals of history proper.

One should not forget the fact that the novel is a frame novel, meaning it is supposed to have been written by a seventeenth century Venetian scientist while he was captive in Turkey, and manuscript was found by one named Faruk who did nothing more than ad up the sequel-like few pages at the end of the novel. But despite all this frame narrative technique, the real writer is the learned, postmodern scholar Ferit Orhan Pamuk who even risked his life by openly berating the Turkish government for inflicting torture, causing death to millions of non-Turks such as the Serbs, what Pamuk is doing here is to reveal the hypocrisy that the westerners show towards the easterners:

My fascination with the story increased even more perhaps for this reason. I even thought of resigning in protest, but I loved my work and my friends. For a time I told my story to everyone I met, as passionately as though I had written it myself rather than discovered it. To make it seem more interesting I talked about its symbolic value, etc. When I made these claims, young people usually more absorbed in issues like politics, activism, East-West relations, or democracy were at first intrigued, but like my drinking friends, they too soon forgot my story. A professor friend, returning the manuscript he'd thumbed through at my insistence. (3)

Erasure of the separating and bounding lines between or among people from different, even opposing geographic and cultural domain is the fundamental trait of the postmodern, postcolonial mind if we cite the phrase the post modern mind from an essay by Richard Tarnas. The master/slave, freeman/bondman, eastern/westerners, white/black, tall/short, Christain/non-Christain themes have to be abandoned if we

want to live friendly and peaceful life in a world already overmuch threatened by development in the weapon of mass massacre but lacking inn true spiritual or intellectual development. His is the attitude as it is adopted by the narrator of the novel. As he says, he notices a shocking similarity between his master and himself:

With the ravaged eyes of a man who'd spent a day standing side by side with death, I could not help but notice the unnerving likeness between us again as Hoja gradually ceased to use the word 'teach':  
we were going to search together, discover together, progress together.

(23)

It was in the seventeenth century that the two science –addicted, searching spirits felt like becoming co-mingled together as the right way to discovery and progress. It back in the seventeenth century, one should again remember. Then what is the modern even postmodern human race doing drawing lines of orientalist and Occidentalism of ethnic purity and fundamentalism? This is a serious question as the novel poses for every commonsensical reader and individual. We cannot be free of the qualm of conscience if we do not come to terms with this and similar questions today. The purpose of literature is as assented by the majority of critics and writes themselves to teach and to please. The didactic aspect of a work of art lies in the fact that it sensitiveness us in our never-ending passion for truth, beauty and compassion. Then, where are we today in terms of maintaining racial harmony and developing the sense of tolerance. Even God himself wants human beings to multiply and be variegated as well, he wants the animal world to cover the face of the earth.

As it has already been noted, the write is an easterner, but one who is in close contact with the westerner. Turkey, the country he lives in, is presently an imminent member of the European Community. Only the fact that it is a predominantly Muslim

inhabited country has checked its entrance into the organization. Then, it is interesting to how Pamuk makes the western narrator comment upon the care taken by Hoja in calculating the prayer time for those Muslims living in the northern hemisphere.

In those first months, while we sat facing one another at the table, Hoja tried to work out how to calculate the times of prayer and fasting in northern countries where there was a great variation in the duration of day and night and a man went for years without seeing the face of the sun. Another problem was whether or not there was a place on earth where people could face Mecca whichever way they turned. The more he realized that I was indifferent to these problems, the more contemptuous he became, but I thought at the time that he discerned my 'superiority and difference,' and perhaps he was irritated. (25)

Representing the Muslims as always fanatic – guided by the religious motive whatever their standing, position, or profession – is an orientalist characteristic. Maybe Hoja is not so much worried about how to ease up the problem of locating the direction of Mecca and Medina, the most sacred Islamic pilgrimage sites. But it seems so, at least in the eyes of the westerner. Now, such an observation creates a possible pitfall: that one of oversimplification. Do all such references mean that the novelist, Ferit Orhan Pamuk, the critic of the intolerant Turkish establishment, was satirizing religious fervor of Hoja a representative of average, intelligent but hardcore Islamic people? Or was he simply trying to refer to the fact that what the western readership wants to read is the representation of the oriental characters as always religiously-minded and parochial? Any absolute attempt to come at an inference are suddenly disrupted by the fact that we are reading lines written in the late twentieth century,

when issues and phrases such as multiculturalism, hybridity and postmodernism are not only too familiar but are outmoded in a sense that they are in currency for more than a decade or two.

### **Exchanging Identities: Crossing the Cultural Barrier**

Hoja and the Venetian scientist are so much in concord with each other that soon after their being together they start feeling the presence of the other as a requisite for their smooth existence. They start exchanging their real as well as imaginary identities. Physically so alike, once the Venetian so has a dream that his counterpart had visited his home in his guise, and the family was well received. He tells the dream story, and then realizes the folly he has committed in letting the Turkish teacher have the idea: if ever he should be there in Venice, he could easily disguise himself as the Venetian and commingle with the family of the Venetian young man. Nobody would in the least have any suspicion, since they had exchanged, especially the Venetian had already revealed almost everything there is worth mentioning to be revealed to his master and disciple.

Apart from serving as a movement creator in the plot of the novel as well as an element of the exciting future possibility, this dream scene is important in the sense that actually there is no rigid identity divide between the east and the west. The westerner could be an easterner, staying and working in Turk, while as Hoja's dream proposes, the easterner could easily slip off into Venice, the west to settle there. And this happens by the end of the novel too. The Venetian assumes the identity of Hoja and remains at Istanbul. And Hoja stays at Rome as a lecturer on the history of the Byzantine Empire. This role and life situation exchange is a powerful symbolic act: crossing the cultural and geographical barrier has first to take place in their mentality. Then the physical outward activities will take care of themselves. Mental widening

and intellectual freedom is the important thing. But despite that, the Venetian has a fear that the Muslim fellow might try to take advantage of him in his guise.

Apparently my folly was of another kind. In my indiscretion those days I had told him of a dream I'd had: he had gone to my country in my place, was marrying my fiancée, at the wedding no one realized that he was not me, and during the festivities which I watched from a corner dressed as a Turk, I met up with my mother and fiancée who both turned their backs on me without recognizing who I was, despite the tears which finally wakened me from the dream. (35)

Later, by the help of this knowledge divulged by the Venetian regarding his upbringing, acquaintances and every conceivable thing of importance, the Turkish scholar escapes into Venice and takes important posts there as a professor on Turkey's literature. On the other hand, the narrator assumes the identity of Hoja and stays back in Turkey lecturing on Italian history. This exchange saves the life of both, and also successfully confers honor and recognition, though their true identity is not recognized by the people they live among. This is largely made possible by their intimate knowledge of each other plus their look-alikeness.

The resemblance between the eastern and western scholars is striking. This fact can justifiably be used to maintain the logic that there is some deeper significance in it than mere physical similarity and possible sodomy or homosexuality between Hoja and the narrator. They actually cross the geographical and cultural, more importantly communal barrier: one is a committed Muslim and another Christian who, though he does not brandish his believer's identity, stubbornly denies proselytizing himself into Islam.

To prepare the ground I spoke of certain experiences I'd had in



childhood: I told him about the terrors of an endless, sleepless night following the death of my closest-friend with whom I'd got into the habit of thinking the same thing at the same time, how I feared that I might be presumed dead and be buried alive with him. I didn't expect he would be so taken by this! Soon after I dared to tell him a dream I'd had my body separated itself from me, joined with a look-alike of mine whose face was veiled by shadows, and the two of them conspired together against me. At the time Hoja had been saying he was hearing that ridiculous refrain again and more intensely. (53)

The importance of creating history by writing stories, by creating discourses, is underlined by the joint venture of the two scientists. The narrator is the first person to suggest that they write in order to leave something substantial behind them even if their project of making an artillery or inventing some explosive machinery of destructive capacity may remain incomplete. For this, they sit together, facing each other. One goes through the manuscript of the other and the vice versa. Through it is a traumatizing experience to have oneself read by and exposed to the other, they undergo the trial. At first eagerness, then frustration, and finally they produce books which later on draw interest from the baby king. Their writing on animals and such imagined stories, mixed with a touch of science and whatnot, greatly impresses the Sultans and consequently this leads to Hoja's appointment as the royal astrologer. The narrator gets no less recognition by this. In fact it is he in whom the Sultan is more interested than in Hoja, the official scientist. The Sultan comes to guess that the knowledge Hoja has acquired comes from the European scholar.

Again this attitude expressed and espoused by the Sultan is a typical mindset of the orientals or easterners: they cannot rely upon their own knowledge and

capacity. Until a westerner come to endorse as true what they have done, they are in a flagging stage as to the veracity of their findings. Of course, here the knowledge is chiefly imparted by the Venetian scholar, and Hoja has just learned from him. But as a general indicator, the Sultan's belief that everything Hoja did must have come from the European speaks volume about the deep-rooted Westphalia or Euromaniac psyche every oriental is portrayed to have possessed. This may be the writer's strategy to please the western reader: of course they would be pleased to read that the easterners are dependent upon the westerners for scientific knowledge and development.

But what interests the narrator, not our novelist, the frame narrator, but the real, narrator-in-action since he is a character too in the novel, is the fact that the two scholars are verging upon each other, experimenting exchange of identities and as hinted often making sodomy as a way of realizing each other more intimately. They thus cross the debarring line of nature: both male but behave with each other at times as if they were of opposite sex, and of culture: they forget their relationship is that of a master and a prisoner, of Muslim versus Christian. In this context it is suggestive to note the observation made by the narrator.

The indication is to the experiment of writing with each other in the front so as to come up with a sort of confessional to rinse away their past. But Hoja is disturbed profoundly, and tears up all that he has written and becomes depressed. The narrator tries to persuade Hoja that it was no crime to confide their innermost secrets to each other. "Wasn't the prospect of really knowing one another fascinating enough? A man would be as spellbound by someone knowing the smallest details of his soul as he would by a nightmare" (58). Only through such an intimate dialogue and revealing of oneself can a true understanding and friendship between the east and the west be achieved.

As the preface to the novel makes it clear by a certain Faruk Darvinoglu that "to see everything as connected to everything else is the addiction of our time" (4). This leads one to interpret those writers and novelists, as intellectuals, cannot remain aloof from the affairs of the world. They exist in and fight in the world, fight for the freedom of expression, freedom of faith or distrust. So, they are often in conflict with the power or state mechanisms. In this respect it is relevant to cite from another post-modern writer who also comes from the east and has settled in the west. In his essay "Outside the Whale", collected in *Imaginary Homelands*, which parodies George Orwell's "Inside the Whale", Rushdie maintains that writers have always been at a continual conflict with the politicians who are given to misleading the general public with a misleading and falsified version of history. Orwell had concluded that the writers are inside the whale, meaning they are and should be free from world affairs. True art, he argued, has nothing to do with politics and that "a writer does well to keep out of politics" (94). Contrarily, Rushdie advocates an engaged plight of the writers. As he makes a humorous and perceptive observation, there are no safe corners in the modern world:

We live in a world without hiding places; the missiles have made sure of that. However much we may wish to return to the womb, we cannot be unborn. So we are left with a fairly straightforward choice. Either we agree to delude ourselves, to lose ourselves in the fantasy of the great fish, from which a second metaphor is that of Pangloss's garden; or we can do what all human beings do instinctively when they realize that the womb has been lost forever—that is, we can make the very devil of a racket. Where Orwell wished quietism, let there be rowdyism (90).

This ideal place would incorporate, not merely in phrasing but in reality, the concept of diversity in unity. People free of shackles of nationalism and manacle of patriotism, people with tolerant and educated world view irrespective of their culture and religion, are the deserving and perspiring denizens of such a land. For this the experience and act of migration, literal and metaphorical, of the crossing the frontier of one's religious and national domain so that one can see the world takes difference and varieties, a mosaic of people and cultures, to make itself, can be realized by the desirable inhabitants of this free world. Speaking of his vision of such a world, Rushdie has written celebrating the salutary educative effects of migration and harmonizing and creative impacts of hybridization at present. "We are Hindus who have crossed the black water; we are Muslims who eat pork" (15).

Underlining the priority people started to give to their religion and culture in a postmodern/ post-Cold War world, Professor Samuel P. Huntington published *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order* (1996). In this work of sociology that studies and interprets antagonistic/friendly relationship between and among people, societies, and nations along civilizational lines, Huntington has tried to prove that 'cultural identity' has always been the central concern of people striving to preserve their existence and uniqueness. In his own words, "In the post-Cold War world flags count and so do other symbols of cultural identity, including crosses, crescents, and even head coverings, because culture counts, and cultural identity is what is most meaningful to most people" (20). Throughout the text, Huntington keeps on pointing out how ideological and economic considerations are secondary to cultural ones, the reason being that culture provides answers to people seeking meaning and stability. And this culture is closely linked with the soil and society where one is born. To preserve their belief in themselves, people turn back to their

cultural uniqueness that can be found in its originality and purity only in the land of its origin—the land inhabited by the majority people from their own tribe or group. Huntington's observation appears too religion-centered at the cost of other motives such as economy, education and, not least, the freedom seeking and all-inclusive type of internationalism:

In the post-Cold War world, the most important distinctions among people are not ideological, political, or economic. They are cultural. Peoples and nations are attempting to answer the most basic question humans can face: Who are we? And they are answering that question in the traditional way human beings have answered it, by reference to things that mean most to them. People define themselves in terms of ancestry, religion, language, history, values, customs, and institutions. They identify with cultural groups: tribes, ethnic groups, religious communities, nations and at the broadest level, civilizations. (21)

Despite the relevance of what he has said, as the contemporary violent acts done merely for religious motives such as the bombing of the Twin Towers of the World Trade Center by Islamic members, and the dispute between Pakistan and India, and the killing between the Israelites and the Palestinians, we see that this kind of notion is not going to help establish peace in the world. Instead of producing enlightened humanity from the new times, we would be entering into another obscurantist era if we let superstitions and religious beliefs guide our very life among people of different cultural and religious background. Professor Huntington has also made the flawed and potentially enmity-arousing observation that "for people seeking identity and reinventing ethnicity, enemies are essential" (21). It is the beauty of plurality, of the existence of multiple culture and customs which confer hue of life to the creation of

God or of nature, as we might be inclined to believe as per our capacity and proclivity. Rushdie is among those who cannot accept Huntington's thesis that the world is being realigned along cultural and civilizational lines. For, that to happen would mean humanity is receding into barbarism and darkness rather than following, rugged though it has been, a trajectory of enlightenment.

In the novel under this study too there are moments of mutual mistrust and antagonism, of attempts at forced conversion as once Hoja tries to do with his counterpart. Such references speak volume as how much tenuous such cross-cultural relations can at times be. The incident takes place after their joint venture at writing about their childhood memories. Hoja is accusative of the narrator and the later is vindictive too. He seems to emphasize the fact that Hoja went out immediately after realizing that it was an hour of prayer, not of trying to save an infidel soul by bringing him to accepting the faith of Islam.

He said I was scared, he could see it in my face, I was scared because I remained faithful to Christianity! He scolded me; a man must be a Muslim to be happy here, but he neglected to press my hand before he retreated into the dank darkness of his own house, didn't touch me at all. It was the hour of prayer, and when I saw the crowds in the courtyards of the mosques, I was seized with fear and started for home.

(61)

It is dogmatic on the part of the Turkish scholar to insist that the narrator must convert into Islam to be happy there in Turkey. It is an intolerant perspective that cannot be appreciated and acceptable to any one liberal minded whether to believe in some creed or not.

Hoja is a scientist but also an obscurantist: he accepts Muhammad marrying a

widow but when a well-meaning neighbor comes with the offer of his cousin on his uncle side. Hoja declared he would not marry a widow. The novel reports his reaction thus:

Hoja reacted more brutally than I'd expected: he said he did not want to marry, but even if he had he wouldn't take a widow. Upon this our visitor reminded us that the Prophet Muhammad had not minded Hadije's widowhood and even taken her as his first wife. (65)

After this harangue, the visitor does not spare the opportunity of slandering the stargazer either. He is termed as an infidel, worse than a crazy guy always gazing at stars at night and at the dirty ceiling during day time. Such accusation aptly portray the plight of a scientist in the seventeenth century Islamic country: they were supposed to be infidel and queer bad people because they thought more over invention and gave more time on star gazing than on prayer and paying homage to Prophet Muhammad:

With the spleen of a merchant criticizing the goods he intends to buy, our visitor added that the neighbours were saying that Hoja ate his food at a table like an infidel instead of sitting down cross-legged; that after paying purse upon purse of money for books, he threw them on the floor and trod on the pages in which the Prophet's name was written; that, unable to placate the devil within him by gazing at the sky for hours, he lay on his bed in broad daylight gazing at his dirty ceiling, took pleasure not in women but only young boys, I was his twin brother, he didn't fast during Ramadan and the plague had been sent on his account. (65-66)

This is an acrid criticism posed by any Islamic society on open-minded experimental

people who give time for exploration and research. Such portrayal sure enough satisfies the longing of the western readership to read about the essentially different other, the backward oriental people in an exotic light.

Sharing each other's experiences and stories is one of the best ways to grow an intimacy worth its name. It is only after we have emptied our innermost guilt, thoughts and secrets that we can be sure of our friendship. The same goes between Hoja and the narrator. They tell secrets to each other and come to familiar terms with each other. So much so are they infatuated with each other that they need each other's presence to be in a calm and serene bent of minds. The report of their intimacy goes like this:

Like two bachelors telling each other's fortunes to pass the time on endless winter nights, we sat at the table face to face, scratching out something or other on the empty pages before us. The absurdity of it! In the morning when I read what Hoja had written as his dream I found him even more ridiculous than I did myself. He had written down a dream in imitation of mine, but as everything about it made clear, this was a fantasy which had never been dreamt at all: he had us as brothers! He'd found it appropriate to play the role of elder to me while I listened obediently to his scientific lectures. (66)

The narrator may not have been much pleased to listen to the scientific lectures of Hoja: it is an anomaly commonly, as per the orientalist discourse, for an easterner to lecture on science to a westerner. But the credit of creating such an episode in which Hoja is in a position to exhort his Venetian friend on science goes to Pamuk the novelist who, as it has already been noted in the foregoing chapter, made it clear that the west is in no better position to boast of being enlightened and civilized. It is as



barbaric as the east is, if they can be called barbaric at all. The Nobel Lectures become once relevant to cite here:

We have often witnessed people, societies and nations outside the Western world – and identify with them easily – succumbing to fears that sometimes lead them to commit stupidities, all because of their fears of humiliation and their sensitivities. I also know that in the west – a world with which I can identify with same ease – nations and peoples taking an excessive pride in their wealth, and in their having brought us the Renaissance, Enlightenment, and Modernism, have, from time to time, succumbed to a self-satisfaction that is almost as stupid. (Pamuk, "The Nobel Lectures")

Therefore, it should come as no surprise that Pamuk makes his eastern Muslim scholar lecture his western Christian scholar on science. The other way of looking at the same issue is to blame the novelist of ingratiating the cynical streak in the western readership by making them read an episode in which the disciple takes up the role of the master, forgetting the fact that he had gained the knowledge from the very person he is now lecturing to. As Pamuk makes it clear in his Nobel Lectures, it is not only the easterners who are prone to folly, weakness and superstitions and the vice of pride. The westerner, despite their claims of having originated and then passed the intellectual awakenings such as the Renaissance, the Enlightenments etc, are yet essentially the same fragile human beings subject to all the human follies and foibles.

The narrator and his mentor or rather master share so much with each other, biologically, that it is easy for them to exchange their identities and take up the roles of each other. This prospect is not without significance in either way; in the political and worldly perspective of the novel, it takes us to look at the possibility of east-west

reconciliation; at the personal level of the characters in the novel, it can be a possible way of defending themselves with false, disguised identities if need be.

He spoke for a while about how he wanted to pick up from where I had left off. We were still standing half-naked in front of the mirror. He was going to take my place, I his, and to accomplish this it would be enough for us to exchange clothes and for him to cut his beard while I left mine to grow. (72-73)

And rightly so, when the courtiers become inimical to the Venetian he assumes the identity of Hoja whereas Hoja himself flees to Italy to take up a safe and respected job of a historian on turkey. Thus both of them survive successfully, though some went so far as to suggest that it was Hoja and not the Venetian who had disappeared and that the infidel was still there in Istanbul enjoying his time as the favored astrologer of the Sultan .

But before he could be sure how much he needs Hoja no Hoja him, the narrator flees into an island to hide there so as to evade the epidemic which has already recorded a high death toll. But the Muslims do not appreciate a person who tries to flee from, the epidemic faced by them. The person is held at ridicule and despise. There, he hides in concealment fearing Hoja would send his men to arrest and harm him. But Hoja does nothing of the sort to harm his escaped convict and fellow scientist and overall else, a close friend. He follows, finds where his friend is settled, and then comes back. After some time Hoja comes with his men to take his friend back. This gestured is a token of love and care, not of possession or master's greed to capture his slave. Such moments of fine and soft treatments make one ready to believe that the fabled enmity between the east and west is just the result of discourse formation, of making horror stories in which the both sides exercise brutality upon

each other.

I'd first heard of Heybeli island from a young monk who'd come to Istanbul from there; when we met in the European quarter of Galata he had enthusiastically described the beauty of the islands. It must have made an impression on me, for as I left our district I knew it was there I would go. The ferrymen and fishermen I spoke with wanted incredible amounts of money to take me to the island; and I became depressed thinking they knew I was a runaway- they'll betray me to the men Hoja will send after me! Later I decided this was how they intimidated the Christians they looked down on for being afraid of the plague. (75)

The narrator is not able to resist the temptation flee back to his native country. It is not surprising: a young man captivated and taken into another country always is eager to return home. But he is also equally attracted by the care and concern expressed by Hoja towards him. He cannot easily forget and spurn how much Hoja depends upon him for writing, expressing himself, as well as for carrying out the experimentations both scientific and sadomasochistic. To cite a rather long excerpt would clarify the nature and intensity of relationship between the two scientists:

I tried to convince myself that sooner or later I would be able to escape to my own country. I only had to steal from the open doors on the island, but before that it was essential that I forget Hoja. For I had fallen unawares under the spell of what had happened to me, of the temptation of memory; I could almost blame myself for abandoning a man who looked so much like me. Just as I do now, I longed for him passionately; did he actually resemble me as much as he did in

memory or was I fooling myself? It was as though I'd not once really looked into his face in these eleven years; in fact I'd often done so. I even felt the urge to go to Istanbul. (76-77)

The urgency of the narrator to return to Hoja is not spurious or short-lived, as emotional attachments generally tend to be. It was not for some material profit from the inventions or the royal recognition from the Sultan either. He feels a genuine need to be one, together with Hoja whose very self, as he admits, he was. And the Sultan enjoys their company. Like an attentive father who separates two brothers arguing over their marbles, he disentangled them with his observation about their speech and behavior. Those observations, the narrator tells us, he found sometimes childish and sometimes clever, and that started to worry him. He began to believe that his personality had split itself off from him and united with that of Hoja's, and vice versa, without their perceiving it, and that the Sultan, by evaluating this imaginary creature, had come to know them better than they knew themselves. The candid statement follows here below about the narrator's desire to be one with his master and colleague:

It wasn't that I wished to seize a share in the triumph or to receive a reward for what I had done; the feeling I had was quite different: I should be by his side, I was Hoja's very self! I had become separated from the outside, just as in the nightmares I often had. I didn't even want to learn the identity of this other person I was inside of; I only wanted, while I fearfully watched myself pass by without recognizing me, to rejoin him as soon as I could. (86)

Later with failure of their war machine in completing its job of demolishing the White Castle at a [place called Doppio, Hoja has the premonition that he would suffer the

same fate that his preceding astrologer had suffered; death by the decree of the Sultan. So he is meditating upon flee to Italy since he knows every detail of his friend's life there. He would assume a false identity and nobody would recognize him there. On the other hand the Venetian scholar could stay back, assuming the identity of Hoja. But they are not able to deceive the Sultan whose uncanny eyes pierce the secret of the disguise they are planning. Perhaps to ease up their qualm of conscience, the Sultan deliberately speaks such things and asks such questions which could be answered only by the Italian. Once the Sultan has shown interest in the scientist from Italy who could read minds of people. The irony here is that he is already able to read the mind of the identity changing scientists:

He let slip only once or twice that he wanted to establish relations with their' men of science; perhaps they would understand the truths he'd discovered about the insides of our heads; he wanted to correspond with men of science in Venice, Flanders, whatever faraway land occurred to him at the moment. Who were the very best among them, where did they live, how could one corresponds with them. (108)

The Sultan seems to toy and play with the idea of exchanging identities as he declares that basically all are the same. He speaks these words in the company of the narrator only, so as to ease up his thought of staying back if Hoja escapes to Venice. This is an entirely unexpected and daring statement made by such an official persona as the Sultan in the direction of allowing outsiders stay back in his empire with dignity and comfort of a royalty-favored personage:

He had said to me once that basically every life was like another. This frightened me for some reason: there was a devilish expression on the sultan's face I'd never seen before, and I wanted to ask what he meant

by this. While I looked apprehensively into his face, I felt an impulse say 'I am I', it was as if, had I been able to find the courage to speak this nonsensical phrase, I would obliterate all those games played by those gossips scheming to turn me into someone else, played by Hoja and the Sultan, and live at peace again within my own being. But like those who shy away from even the mention of any uncertainty that might jeopardize their security, I kept silent in fear. (109)

The premonition of Hoja's escape into Italy and his joining the family of the narrator is foreseen by the narrator himself, in their talks and in dreams even one particular dream gives the detail how Hoja would adjust himself in the Italian milieu by assuming a perfect figure of his friend back in Istanbul:

Latter, up until the time we learned the Sultan had summoned us and our weapon to Edmire for the campaign, I had a recurring dream: we were at a masked ball in Venice reminiscent in its confusion of the feasts of Istanbul: when the 'courtesans' took off their masks I recognized my mother and fiancée in the crowd, and I took off my own mask full of hope that they would recognize me too, but somehow they didn't know it was me, they were pointing with their masks to someone behind me; when I turned to look, I saw that this person who would know that I was me was Hoja. (111)

Thus everything seems to point to the direction that they exchange their places and relations and start a new life. The final scene towards preparing themselves, especially by Hoja's side occurs after the failure of the artillery in bringing down the White Castle at Doppio.

It was the day he had me tell of the bridges of Venice, of the lacework

on the tablecloth on which He had eaten breakfast as a child, of the view through the window overlooking the garden at the back of His house that He recalled when he was about to be beheaded for his refusal to convert to Islam- it was when the sultan ordered me to write down all of these stories in a book, as if they were my own record of what had happened to me, that I decided to escape from Istanbul as soon as possible. (136)

It is not the narrator meditating upon an escape who acts; it is the Muslim astrologer who escapes into Christian Italy. But the rumor is spread that the infidel astrologer has escaped and there is news of him writing books based on his experience in Istanbul.

After returning to his country he had written a stack of books describing His unbelievable adventures among the Turks, about their last sovereign who so loved animals and his dreams, about the plague and the Turkish people, our customs at court and at war. With curiosity about the exotic Orient just beginning to spread among aristocrats and especially well-bred ladies, His writings were well-received, His books much read, He gave lectures in the universities, and grew rich. Moreover, His former fiancée, swept up in the romanticism of His writings, married him without giving a thought to he age or her husband's recent death. (142)

They settle permanently in each other's country and with family. Having exchanged their location and only a few people privy to their secret their life goes on unhindered. Rather it becomes a source for their writing, as they can write so astonishingly about seemingly the other people and country but actually they are their own.

Therefore, this is thematic message of the novel *The White Castle* too. Only a liberal, latitudinarian outlook of life can create free spaces for the transfer, flow and coming together of people to crest a multicultural society. And it is only in a multicultural society that differences and varieties are celebrated, respected. Therefore peace is ensured and mutual understanding is made possible.



## Chapter IV: Conclusion

### Reconciliatory Note despite Dichotomy and Difference

In the thesis, a sensitive discussion that touches on such crucial and topical issues as hybridity, western-eastern relation and the myth or implausibility of an essential cultural, identity. Orhan Pamuk's *The White Castle* is a saga of two scientists who are fortuitously brought together and experiment on armaments for years. In the meanwhile they come to like each other so much that they become each other's alter ego.

The novel studied in this thesis is worth pondering for its immediacy, relevance, and appeal, for it touches upon some of the most compelling issues such as the predicament of the people from minority culture, refugees, and nonconformists, the representation and misrepresentation of the cultural each other, as well as a broader pondering upon the political reality of countries manipulated by flawed leaders, monarchs and fawning courtiers.

*The White Castle* is a great postmodern Turkish novel that emphasizes on the arbitrary character of national and personal identity. There is nothing, the novel contends effectively, what can be called an essential or unalterable identity. As the case of changeability of the narrator and Hoja's identity indicates, such identities are in way essential and unalterable. They are, at best, contingent and socially constructed. It is common, in the post-modern milieu, to propose that meanings are contingent and context-bound; therefore no fixity in itself can be attributed to a literary text. This open ended quality is found in the present novel too, as the closure leaves it as a guess work to the reader whether the two scientist really exchange their countries or not, whether they meet each other or not, and whether their society recognizes them as false identity-assuming people or not.

It is also noteworthy for its deployment of postmodern themes of multiculturalism, fluidity and ambiguity. The central and unifying idea of the novel is that one can become Italian or Turkish or anything else, because in the innermost core of one's being one is neither an Italian or Turkish nor anything else. All identities are constructed, result of contingencies. Actually, there is no reality or fact, but fictions prevail between the two worlds: east and west.

The novel deals with the often discussed issue of the west-east divide, but with a new insight that suggests it is more important and edifying to work for amelioration than to go on perpetuating the myth of differences and enmities. If the story of the seventeenth century revolves around the reconciliation of two young men from different hemispheres and cultural spheres of the world, how much more multicultural this century should have been! Such is the spirit of the novel which suspects the rationality of ethnic and communal purity, versus one world one race theory of the postmodern and the progressive parties. To tell the truth, Pamuk is uncompromisingly critical and skeptical of the human folly of taking culturally determined views of the world as the right way of finding truth, holding on to one's culture though that might mean to go on embracing the rotten and stinking parochial values of differing religions and often irreconcilably opposing religions. The solution lies not either in approving and disapproving any particular culture or religion, but in accepting all as they come along. That latitudinarian attitude at least spares the world of the trouble of communal violence. And may be people in the long run will develop the capacity to live together in peace, if not in love with each other. The reconciliatory tone of the novel cannot be missed as Hoja, the Turkish teacher and the narrator, a Venetian scholar, unwittingly to themselves find each other to be their most wanted self. This is the spirit of the novel: celebration of a multicultural and hybrid world, even if the possibility of such a world may appear too bleak at first sight.

## Works Cited

- Achebe, Chinua. "An Image of Africa: Conrad's Heart of Darkness". *The Story and Its Writer: An Introduction to Short Fiction*. Ed. Ann Charters. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. Vol. 2. Boston: Bedford, 1995. 1373-1378. 2 Vols.
- Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G., Tiffin, H. Ed. *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*. London, Routledge, 1995.
- Altinel, Savkar. "Putting a Tangible Shape on Time." *The New Republic*. New Delhi: OUP, 1991. 45-60.
- Bhaba, Homi K., "Post Colonial Criticism." *Redrawing the Boundaries: The Transformation of English and American Literary Studies*. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt and Giles Gunn. New York: MLA 1992. 215-16.
- Boehmer, Elleke. *Colonial and Postcolonial Literature*. New York: Oxford UP, 1995
- GurrÃ- aQuintana, Ãngel. "Interviews with Orhan Pamuk." Web. *The Paris Review*. Feb. 2012. 7 Jul. 2014. < <http://www.theparisreview.org/interviews/5587/the-art-of-fiction-no-187-orhan-pamuk>>
- Holbrook, Victoria. "Preface." Trans. *The White Castle*. Manchester: Carcanet Press Limited, 1997. 1-4.
- Huntington, Samuel P. *Clashes of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. New York: Viking, 1996.
- Mongia, Padmini. Ed. *Contemporary Postcolonial Theory: A Reader*. Delhi: Oxford UP, 1997.
- Orwell, George. *Burmese Days*. Harmonds Worth: Penguin, 1934.
- Pamuk, Orhan. *The White Castle*. Trans. Victoria Holbrook. Manchester: Carcanet Press Limited, 1991.
- - -. "My Father's Suitcase: The Nobel Lecture". Web. *The New Yorker*. Dec. 2006.

9<sup>th</sup> Aug. 2014. <<http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2006/12/25/my-fathers-suitcase>>

Parini, Jay. "Pirates, Pashas, and the Imperial Astrologer." Web. *The New York Times*. May 1991. 30 Aug. 2014.

<<http://www.nytimes.com/books/98/06/28/nnp/pamuk-castle.html>>

Paul, Bernard. "Critiques on *The White Castle*". Web. *Goodreads*. Mar. 2008. 27 Aug. 2014. <<https://www.goodreads.com/book/show/>>

Rushdie, Salman. *Imaginary Homelands*. London: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Said, Edward. "Crisis in Orientalism". *Modern Criticism and Theory: A Reader*. Ed. David Lodge, 1991. 291-301.

---. *Culture and Imperialism*. London: Vintage, 1993.

---. *Orientalism*. London: Vintage, 1994.

---. *The World, The Text and The Critic*. Massachusetts: Harvard UP, 1983.