Chapter 1

Cultural Clash between Secularism and Islamism in Pamuk's *Snow* and *My Name is Red*

This dissertation critically explores the contemporary Turkish writer and Nobel Prize winning writer Orhan Pamuk's engagement with secularism and Islamism in his writing. Literary theory in recent years has sought to explain the degree to which the text is more the product of a culture than an individual author and in turn how those texts help to create the culture and it has indicated a shift towards conceptualization of literature as something inextricably entangled in the historical, cultural and socio-political contexts of its production. This thesis will draw on this to read Pamuk's engagement with certain central clash of his time and society through his writings. Pamuk's novels *Snow* and *My Name is Red w*ork as a bridge between the traditional Islam and the modern turkey by using transnational hybridity.

This study explores the multifaceted discourse on Islam in present-day Turkish society, as reflected upon in Orhan Pamuk's novel *Snow* (2004). The revival of Islam in Turkish politics and its manifestation as a lifestyle that increasingly permeates urban environments, thus challenging the secular establishment, has occasioned a crisis of 'Turkish identity'. At the core of this vehemently contested issue stands women's veiling, represented by its more moderate version of the headscarf. The headscarf has not only become a cultural marker of the new Islamist trend, it has also altered the meanings previously attached to socio-cultural signifiers. Thus, the old binaries of 'tradition' and 'modernity,' 'backwardness' and 'progress,' applied to Islamic versus Western modes of living and employed primarily by the secularist elites and by theorists of modernization, prove insufficient to explain the novel phenomenon of Islamist identity politics. New directions in social and cultural theory on Turkey have launched a critique of modernization theory and its vocabulary based on binary oppositions. I argue that Pamuk participates, though the angle of poetic imagination, in such a

critique in *Snow* the author explores the complexities pertaining to the cultural symbolism circulating in Turkey. The ambiguity surrounding the headscarf as a new cultural marker constitutes a major theme in the novel. I demonstrate that *Snow* employs multiple perspectives pertaining to the meaning of cultural symbols, thus complicating any easy assessment of the rise of Islam in Turkey. By withholding from the reader a clear guide to unequivocal judgment of right and wrong, the author transcends the parameters of Turkish modernist ideology.

Pamuk situates his story in Kars, a border city in North-Eastern Turkey. This location at the geographical and cultural margins of Turkey emerges in the novel as a complex site of contested in ideological, political, and metaphysical positions pertaining to the question of Turkish identity. It represents a space where Islamic faith in its esoteric and exoteric forms is carried out over against state-imposed laicism. I argue that it is the other-worldliness of the locale that instigates such a reflection. The protagonist Ka, a Turkish poet who has briefly returned to his hometown, Istanbul, after twelve years of exile in Germany, embarks on a journey to Kars. A member of the secular Istanbul bourgeoisie, Ka seems to be afflicted by an ailment common to his social stratum, a vacuum of spiritual values. Even though Ka travels to Kars with a journalistic mission, he soon becomes entrapped in this alien world of Sheiks, heads carved girls, and former communists turned political Islamists. The novel oscillates between the Ka's perspective as a detached observer and his personal quest to find transcendence. By employing multiple perspectives, Pamuk complicates any easy assessment of the rise of Islam in today's Turkish society. I complement this reading of *Snow* with a brief excursus to Pamuk's another novel *My Name is Red* permeated by the author's critique of the modernist ideology of the Republican era. This critique sheds light on Pamuk's opaque discourse on faith in *Snow*. These two books have been his most disputed ones among the Turkish secular intelligentsia.

It cannot be denied that there are differences and conflicts between the so called West and the Islamic world. Pamuk's novels explore the tensions in a variety of historical contexts, However, as the Swedish Academy noted, equally important to the clash of cultures in Pamuk's novels is his examination of their interlacing and intermingling phenomena that lead not to conflict but to transnational hybridity. Bayrakceken and Randall emphasize that Pamuk's novels and his portrayal of Istanbul are characterized not by a clash or even encounter between East and West but rather by long-standing contact between the two. In fact, they argue, "Istanbul should be read in Pamuk as a site of exceptionally intense and long-standing cross-cultural interactions" (197). This cross-cultural contact and interaction has only intensified in the age of globalization as the movement of people and ideas that has helped to shape discourses in modern Turkey. In the West, Pamuk has—at least until recently—been seen as a secular voice within Islamic Turkey who championed Western style cosmopolitanism, the face of the rise of political Islam.

This project focuses on Orhan Pamuk's *Snow* (2004), a story of a writer who has been living in exile in Frankfurt, travels to Kars to discover himself and his country, Turkey. Pamuk's *Snow* examines the issue of identity on the contestation between modernity and tradition. It explores the role of modernity and imagination in the construction of Islamic political identity. This study also aims to discuss Pamuk's another novel *My Name is Red* (1998/ 2001), in the light of the dialectics between the East and the West, and re-read the text as a portrayal of Ottoman history and Turkish culture with reference to postcolonial concepts as hybridity, in-betweenness, or double-consciousness, with regard to Bhabha's views about nation and narration, and Said's arguments on the Orient and the Occident.

My Name Is Red is a story about visual imagery. The setting is Istanbul in 1590—a city of great complexity and sophistication. Under the reign of Ottoman Sultan Murat III (1574–95) there was a thriving commercial environment, a flourishing social scene, and a healthy

atmosphere of informed discussion. A culture of drawing studios, employing talented artists, had grown up in order to feed the demand for illustrated books that was encouraged by the sultan. But in 16th century Turkey, not unlike some areas of the world today, there were those who took a very conservative religious stance, which held that the work of the illustrators was blasphemous: by creating realistic images, especially those in the modern "Frankish style," using the rules of linear perspective developed in Renaissance Italy, the artists were usurping the role of God. Since many of the main characters in this novel are miniaturists, much of the discourse revolves around this conflict. The novel explores themes central to his fiction: the intricacies of identity in a country that includes East and West, sibling rivalry, the existence of doubles, the value of beauty and originality, and the anxiety of cultural influence.

Hybridity is one of the important figures of contemporary post colonial studies. Hybridity is a term which describes how the colonized people resist the power of the colonizers. The concept of hybridity is the most widely employed and most disputed term in postcolonial theory. So, hybridity signifies to the creation of new trans-cultural forms within the contact place produced by colonization. With respect to cultural forms, hybridity refers to the ways in which, forms become separated from existing practices and recombine with new forms in new practices. With this concept, the newly composed, mixed or contradictory identities are formed resulting from immigration, exile, and migrancy. Though it has been much debated literary theory, criticism and cultural and postcolonial studies, it has contributed in transition of both trans-cultural and interdisciplinary studies, which give rise to new vocabulary and political recognition.

Bhabha contends that all cultural statements and systems are constructed in a space that he calls the "Third Space of enunciation" (37). Cultural identity always emerges in this contradictory and ambivalent space, for which Bhabha claims to be a hierarchical purity of

cultures untenable. For him, the recognition of this ambivalent space of cultural identity may help to overcome the exoticism of cultural diversity in favour of the recognition of an empowering hybridity in which cultural difference may operate:

> It is difficult that the productive capacities of this Third Space have a colonial or postcolonial provenance. For a willingness to descend into that alien territory . . . may open the way to conceptualizing an international culture, based not on the exoticism of multiculturalism or the diversity of cultures, but on the inscription and articulation of culture's hybridity (38).

The hybridity can be understood by referring to Bhabha's notion of mimicry and ambivalence. Ashcroft, Griffiths, and Tiffin define ambivalence along Bhabha's line as "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). Hybrid culture exists in colonial society where people occupy an in-between space by mimicry of the colonizers. The colonized adopts the colonizer's culture, language, and values thinking it as superior. The mimic men never become pure white man; and mimicking the colonizers, the colonized become almost the same. They want to acquire the superior position of the colonizer and to be able to represent the colonizer partially as defined by Bhabha, "The menace of mimicry in its double vision disclosing the ambivalence of colonial discourses also disrupts its authority" (88). Bhabha uses mimicry to define the colonized as a mimic man is not a same person as the colonizer by wearing mask to imitate the colonizer. Thus, mimicry of the colonizer places the colonizer as an ambivalent, hybrid space or in-betweenness.

Hybridity, as it is understood in postcolonial theory, is perceived as having the potential to go beyond the sort of modern binaries from which, as Beck suggests,

contemporary social imaginaries have to find a way out. For Bhabha, hybridity takes place in conditions of inequality, during the attempted imposition of culturally hegemonic practices. Moreover, hybridity happens at the point at which colonial authority fails to fix the colonial subject in its gaze. It denotes the equivocal space that the colonial subject occupies; a space neither of assimilation nor of collaboration. Furthermore, Bhabha argued "hybridity unsettles the mimetic or narcissistic demands of colonial power but re-implicates its identifications in strategies of subversion that turn the gaze of the discriminated back upon the eye of power" (112).

> [t]he concept of hybridity occupies a central place in postcolonial discourse. It is "celebrated and privileged as a kind of superior cultural intelligence owing to the advantage of in-betweeness, the straddling of two cultures and the consequent ability to negotiate the difference" (A Hoogvelt 158).

This is particularly so in Bhabha's discussion of cultural hybridity. Bhabha has developed his concept of hybridity from literary and cultural theory to describe the construction of culture and identity within conditions of colonial antagonism and inequity. For Bhabha, hybridity is the process by which the colonial governing authority undertakes to translate the identity of the colonized (the other) within a singular universal framework, but then fails producing something familiar but new. Bhabha contends that a new hybrid identity or subject-position emerges from the interweaving of elements of the colonizer and colonized challenging the validity and authenticity of any essentialist cultural identity. In postcolonial discourse, the notion that any culture or identity is pure or essential is disputable. Bhabha himself is aware of the dangers of fixity and fetishism of identities within binary colonial thinking arguing that "all forms of culture are continually in a process of hybridity" (Rutherford, 211).

This new mutation replaces the established pattern with a mutual and mutable representation of cultural difference that is positioned in-between the colonizer and

colonized. For Bhabha it is the indeterminate spaces in-between subject-positions that are lauded as the locale of the disruption and displacement of hegemonic colonial narratives of cultural structures and practices. Bhabha posits hybridity as such a form of luminal or in-between space, where the cutting edge of translation and negotiation occurs and which he terms the third space. This is a space intrinsically critical of essentialist positions of identity and a conceptualization of ‘original or originary culture’: "For me the importance of hybridity is not to be able to trace two original Moments, from which the third emerges, rather hybridity to me is the 'Third Space' which enables other positions to emerge." (Rutherford 211) Thus, the third space is a mode of articulation, a way of describing a productive, and not merely reflective, space that engenders new possibility. It is an ‘interruptive, interrogative, and enunciative’ space of new forms of cultural meaning and production blurring the limitations of existing boundaries and calling into question established categorizations of culture and identity. According to Bhabha, this hybrid third space is an ambivalent site where cultural meaning and representation have no ‘primordial unity or fixity’. The concept of the third space is submitted as useful for analyzing the enunciation, transgression and subversion of dualistic categories going beyond the realm of colonial binary thinking and oppositional positioning. Despite the exposure of the third space to contradictions and ambiguities, it provides a spatial politics of inclusion rather than exclusion that "initiates new signs of identity and innovative sites of collaboration and contestation" (Bhabha 1).

As a strategy for survival, both transnational and translational culture is marked by specific histories of cultures of displacement, exile, migration, slavery, colonial expeditions, exploitative trades, third world migration, and the movement of political and economic refugees. The identification of Bhabha with a minority or marginalized position doesn't connect in any straightforward way with a celebration of such a position.

> The marginalized or minority is not the place of celebratory, or utopian, self marginalization. It is a much more substantial intervention into those justifications of modernity—progress, homogeneity, cultural organism, the deep nation, the long past—that rationalize the authoritarian normalizing tendencies within cultures in the name of national interest. (23)

Homi K. Bhabha believes that the way to find understanding is to find an in-between space which would be the meeting point of different cultures and where it is possible to find the common ground for the post-colonial reality. For him, the recognition of this ambivalent space of cultural identity may help us to overcome the exoticism of cultural diversity in favour of the recognition of an empowering hybridity within which cultural difference may operate. ... It is the in-between space that carries the burden and meaning of cultures, and this is what makes the notion of hybridity so important." (Ashcroft 119) In order to describe the hybridity, Bhabha uses the term ambivalence into the post-colonial discourse theory. Bill Ashcroft defines ambivalence along Bhabha's line as "It describes the complex mix of attraction and repulsion that characterizes the relationship would be ambivalent that is why the colonized's subject is never simple and completely opposed to colonizer" (12). Hybrid culture exists in colonial society where people occupy an in-between space by the mimicry of the colonizers. Hybridization is understood as the process by which colonized people mimic the colonizer's language, borrow the western ideas and practices and reject their own socio-cultural structure. On the issue of hybridity, Ashcroft writes:

> Hybridity in the postcolonial societies both as a result of conscious moment of cultural suppression, as when the colonial power invades to consolidate political and economic control, or when settler-invaders dispossess indigenous culture when they are compelled to assimilate to a new social pattern. (137)

Therefore, hybridity concerns various problems in which people are dislocated and displaced from their familiar social environment and indigenous culture when they are compelled to assimilate to a new social pattern. Bhabha wants to produce the equality between cultures through the hybridization. It is hybridization where cultures get balance and breaks the cultural hierarchy. There is no discrimination, no prejudice and no bias between cultures. Bhabha further describes:

> If the effect of colonial power is seen to be the production of hybridization rather the noisy command of colonialist authority or the silent repression of native traditions, than an important change of perspective occurs. It reveals the ambivalence at the source of the traditional discourses on authority and enables a form of subversion, founded on the uncertainty that turns the discursive conditions of domination into the grounds of intervention. (43)

Thus, hybridity is the legacy of colonialism, presupposes the power relation between the subjugated culture and dominant one. Hybridity has occurred producing new kind of sharing the ideas and belief of both cultures, but more under the pressure or the influential cultures. Hybridization is making one of two distinct things so that it becomes impossible for the eyes to detect the hybridity. Robert Young presents the hybridization as the following ways:

> Hybridization can also consist of the forcing of a single entity in two or more parts, a serving of a single object in two, turning sameness into difference, (…) hybridity thus makes difference into sameness, and sameness into difference, but in a way that makes the same no longer the same, the difference no longer difference. (158)

Hybridity simply means the cross cultural exchange. It stresses on the mutilation of cultures in the colonial and postcolonial process in the expression of trans-culture. Therefore,

postcolonial situation is not monolithic one way follows from the west to east. Thus, the mutual culture follows between the west and the east develop the situation of cultural hybridity. Cultures are always retrospective construction, which are the consequences of historical process. In the study of hybridity, one need appropriate critical forms.

Edward Said in his book *Orientalism* (1978) has shown that the West has followed a tradition of perceiving, representing and interpreting the Arab world, Islam and the colonized world in general that distorts each of them according to a set of preconception, projections and desires. Bhabha in his influencial work *The Location of Cultures* emphasizes the mutual power relationship between the colonizer and the colonized. He deconstructs the binary oppositions, the rigid distinctions between the colonizer and the colonized, the black and white or superior and inferior. In other words, he deconstructs the Edward Said's traditional notion towards the colonizers' straightforward treatment of the colonized as the other or inferior.

Bhabha highlights the anxiety of the colonizer and the agency of the colonized. The colonizer wants the colonized almost the same but not quite. Bhabha believes that "mimicry is at once resemblance and menace" (123), since becoming quite the same means that the colonizer's authentic identity is paradoxically imitable. Thus, the colonizer is troubled by the other, the colonized or colonizer's double. Bhabha insists on double narrative movement as crucial in attempts to narrate the nation, the nation's people must be thought in double time (297). Stating the ambivalence of nation as narrative, he offers a model of a split narrative that attempts to narrate its people both as historical objects of nationalist pedagogy and as subject of signification in the present. The split narrative means that the people must be thought of in double time: former pedagogical and latter performative. However, these double cannot be fully harmonized; they contradict or disturb one another. The concept of people is crucial to this model of double narrative movement where they are both objects of discourse

and historical sedimentation and subject of identification in the present. According to Bhabha, the narration of the nation can be characterized as always contradictory, always ambivalent; the difficulty of migrants' writing of the nation would seem to be marked. The attention to doubleness and double vision created through experience of more than one culture needs to be theorized while interrogating any straightforward opposition between two supposedly holistic and complete cultures. In this sense, the nation is no longer the sign of modernity under which the cultural differences are homogenized that offers the emergence of new construction of identity and culture in the writing of the nation. The battle between what previously existed and what is newly being written is not simply a conflict between the truth of the origin and the imposition of stories. Bhabha's point the nation through narratives does not merely address to draw attention to its language and rhetoric; it also attempts to alter the conceptual object itself. The writing a new nation reveals that the nation always was and is narration.

Although the translation changes the original to characterize it only as loss, it is a privileging of authentic meaning endowed through authorial intent. The possibilities for narratives of translation might be to question the privileging of the desire for authenticity, for access to the original meaning in narrative. Translatability becomes vital as a critical concept, no longer associated only with conversion of one language into another but used for translation between cultures. Bhabha suggests that the difference between culture and language can be translated only by living on the borderline of history and language on the limit of race and gender. In model of translation, different kinds of cultural exchanges are to be considered from diversity of subject position aligned to, but never simply representative of race, gender, sexuality and culture. Bhabha's model of cultural difference is similar to Jacques Derrida and his understanding of translation to Derrida's apprehension of iterability of the sign. From the notion of cultural difference and cultural translation comes Bhabha's most

renowned but equally misunderstood proposition of hybridity. In Bhabha's model, hybridity is understood as cultural, not biological or racial. Cultural hybridity is theorized as the result of the continual process of translation which is internal to any culture in turns stem from a comprehension of cultural difference. Although hybridity is said to be common in all cultural practice for Bhabha, giving post-structuralism a peculiar postcolonial attribution involves a theorization of emergent cultural practices and identifications by migrant and minority communities in the West.

The heresy of being a translator for the writer is writing against, disrupting, dislocating and sacred narratives of belonging, tradition, and cultural identity; exploring the spaces where purity and easy access to origins are lost, remade and transformed. Through the reading of hybridity as heresy, it becomes possible to approach these ambivalent statements as an ironic performance of what could be emerging as new narratives of cultural translation that interrupt existing discourse. Bhabha proposes that blasphemy is 'a transgressive act of cultural translation' and that hybridity is heresy. Blasphemy is not a merely a misrepresentation of the sacred by secular; it is a moment when the subject matter or the content of a cultural tradition is being overwhelmed, or alienated, in the act of cultural translation (Bhabha, 225). It is marked by anxiety and written by missing people so it is as an ambivalent hybrid cultural practice. Locating Bhabha itself demonstrates the irreverent borrowing and adaptations that have become part of Bhabha's rhetoric.

Robert Young thinks that there is no clear cut idea about hybridity. He writes up; there is no single or correct concept of hybridity, it changes as it repeats but it also repeats as it changes. It shows that we are still locked into parts of the ideological network of culture that we think surpassed (159). So the culture has no fixity. While talking about Fanon's vision of revolutionary culture and political changes, Bhabha in his essay; "Cultural Diversity and Cultural Difference" says that the meaning and symbol of culture have no primordial unity

and fixity; that even the same sign can be appropriated, translated, re-historicized and read new (157). Thus, the culture is always changeable and it has been fluctuating where no fixity is. It is dynamic and creates a third space that is the place of intermingled subjects.

> Hybridity is the inner cutting edge of translation and negotiation, the in-between, the space of the entry that Derrida has opened up in writing itself that carries the burden of the nationalist, histories of the people. It is in the space that we find those words with which we can speak ourselves and others. And by exploring this hybridity, this third space, we may elude the other of ourselves. (Bhabha, 127)

Pamuk's novel *Snow* has received numerous critical attentions from various perspectives: feminist, cultural encounter, cross-cultural encounter and so on. Reviewing the novel, Stendhal the Charterhouse of Parma, comments that the novel is political and it depicts the political scenario of Turkey. In this regard, he argues, "*Snow* is a complicated novel, full of politics, politics in a literary work is about to speak of very ugly matters" (epigraph of the novel). The above lines highlight the political issues of the novel, which are not relevant to discuss in the literary work. It carries out the political theme and highlights the contemporary cultural conflict of the Middle East, particularly Turkey. In the same manner, Jörg Lau focuses on the revolutionary nature of the novel and argues:

> Your novel *Snow* is a political novel. It is populated with revolutionary Islamists, Turkish and Kurd nationalists, disillusioned left-wingers looking for God, and girls who are committing suicide because they are prevented from wearing headscarves. Although you show no bias to any one position, you have come under considerable political pressure. Life seems to be imitating your writing in a strange way. (Interview, 2005)

Jörg Lau praises the writing style of Pamuk. In his view, Pamuk's power of writing and skill of the selection of subject matter is unique and different from the other contemporary writers. More than that, there is a balance of the subject matter and creative art of presentation. After winning the Nobel Prize on the novel *Snow* Pamuk comments on the book and says:

> I'm not writing a political novel to make propaganda for some cause. I want to describe the condition of people's souls in a city. The city is called Kars and it is situated in the outermost northeasterly edge of Turkey, but it is a microcosm, which to some extent stands for Turkey as a whole. (1)

In the above short comments, he claims that the novel is based on the contemporary problems of the people that are created by the cause of political turmoil of the nation. Snow is a metaphor that suggests the coldness of the relation of the major cultural group of Modern Turkey. Some critics comment the novel as hegemonic writing, which evokes the East--West relations on the perspective of west. An article by Margerate Atwood in *New York Times* further expresses that:

> A ripping political thriller […] Pamuk keeps so many balls in the air that you cannot separate the inquiry into the nature of religious belief from the examination of modern Turkey, the investigation of east-west relations and nature of art itself, and art and life mimic one another with hideous, occasionally hilarious, persistence. All this rolled into a gripping political thriller. (169)

The above lines highlight the secularist's and Islamist's religious tussle of modern Turkey. Modern Turkey is badly affected by the issues of religion. Mysterious moving scenes of Turkey are captured in the novel by using the object snow which has a capacity to be melted as well as it sometime creates problem to cross the boundary. The cultural boundary of Turkey is similar with the snow. By using various meta-narratives, writer includes all the

political events in the novel and it makes a fine literary work as well as political document, which daily occurs in the nation. Pamuk has taken as his great subject the tensions between West and East, religious and secular, in his native Turkey.

In another different ways, *Snow* is evaluated as a document of cultural globalization. The West especially European Union forcefully made Turkey a member of their union but most of the Muslims in Turkey denied to join them, then the tensions grew up, and developed as clashes. Thus, the novel is seen in the perspectives of non-west by David N. Coury in his critical essay "Torn Country: Turkey and the West" in Orhan Pamuk's *Snow:*

> This is not to deny that there are differences and conflicts between the so-called west and Arab world (which may in the west falsely associated with the Islamic). Turkish political scientists Eurgum Ozbudun and E. Fatt Keyman make a similar point in the study of cultural globalization in Turkey. By giving the rapid changes, that Turkey has undergone in the several significant facts of contemporary Turkish culture. First, the resurgence of Islam has maintained, taken various: discourses, clashes, and attitude. Second, globalization has framed the manner in which Islam has begun to play an important role in Turkey's political, economic and cultural affairs. (396)

The above lines highlight the discourses which are going on in modern Turkey in the name of culture, religion and ethnicity. The overall analysis of the novel shows that *Snow* is a novel written on the subject of violence that creates trauma among common people including women and children. The ongoing conflict is based on culture, although criticism of the novel on the perspective of cultural trauma is hardly found.

Pamuk's *Snow* depicts conflict between East and West. It has to do with the mentality of the people of the East and the West. Gerald Hawting, lecturer at the University of London, is of the opinion that the religion of Islam is quite similar to that of the Abraham, Jesus and

Moses, which were the contemporary of Muhammad. Despite being religion of such great importance, it has its own ups and downs and drawbacks, as well. However, these drawbacks are, largely due to the misconception in regards to the interpretation of their sacred religion. Islam religion, as witnessed in *Snow*, is tough in females. Hawting argues:

> It is beyond doubt Islam is one of the sacred and ancient religions of the world. However, as every society has its ups and downs, and merits and demerits, Turkish is no exception to it. In Turkey, the state religion is Islam, and often being guided by misconception, the females become victim to severe kinds of mental and physical torture. (64)

Thus, the novel is an attempt to re-justify the presence of Islam and Turkey in the Western world. Thereby, the importance of Islam, also has been searched; however, from a different view point. Similarly, E. B Taylor takes the text as a problem between the Islam and effect of globalization. He opines:

> It is characterized by confusion or loss of identity brought on its part by the conflict between European and Islam, or more generally – Western and Eastern values. These factors often disturbing or unsettling include complex, intriguing plots and characters of Turkish society in great depth, all thanks to the global impact. This work is also redolent with discussion of and fascination with the creative arts, such as literature and painting. Pamuk's work often touches on the deep rooted tension between East and West and traditional and Modernism/ Secularism. (32)

In the modern day, Turkey is not free from external touch and influence. So, there is confusion on what their real identity is, and what they should do, either, to follow some dogmatic forms of Islam religion or come up with certain changes. Another Non-Western

critic Sibel Irzik interprets this novel from the point of view of political perspective. He argues, “The successive instance of political allegory provides a peculiarly modernist fantastic narrative making the distinction between fact and fiction, politics and text ever more difficult to discern” (480). Likewise he gives power perspectives and states that both secularists and fundamentalists are trying to employ their own ideology.

> Neither secularists have sympathy towards the sufferings nor fundamentalist have their consistency to save their Muslim culture. Rather these both groups have focused for upcoming Municipal election. They both are obsessed with the power. But Pamuk’s stand is fixed and he reinforces to save national culture without violating individual liberty and freedom. For him the fight between brotherhoods is unnecessary by the obsession of power. (551-52)

Thus, Irzik expresses that power is not outside politics. In politics, power is essential to imply one’s ideology upon the other. As such, the concept of fact becomes fiction to the ‘one’ who is outside the power frame. Thus, fact and fiction are always in a flux, they are in continuum. It depends on interpretation. One thing is certain that by using power if one is hampering other’s freedom. It is nasty that heralds social conflict and contradiction. Another interesting feature of the novel is that it advocates the concept of individual freedom. In words of M Ruthven, “Ka is an existential fighter,” (69) very similar to Pamuk’s own choice of living and life. Elaborating his idea on this aspect, Ruthven comments:

> Pamuk’s character Ka, favors Individualism; whether right or wrong. Pamuk seems to have learnt the lesson of existentialism from his own intuition towards Western Enlightenment. He realizes that search for individual existence must reconcile with local culture, if not, it is certain to be harmful to self and the society. (69)

Meltem Ahıska in her analysis of the definitions of modernity in non Western contexts notes this binary foundation, which is given a temporal and spatial dimension through distinct metaphors:

> Turkey, which has been labeled by both outsiders and insiders as a bridge between the East and the West, has an ambivalent relation not only to the geographical sites of the East and the West but also to their temporal signification: namely, backwardness and progress. Turkey has been trying to cross the bridge between the East and the West for more than a hundred years now with a self-conscious anxiety that it is arrested in time and space by the bridge itself. In other words, the meaning of the present has a mythical core that has persisted over years and which remains a source of frustration and threat, and as a symptom of internalized inferiority. (Ahıska, 353)

Similarly, Pamuk's *My Name is Red* is acclaimed as a successful attempt at penetrating into the heart of the cultural crossings between the Islamic East and the West. Critics pointed out Pamuk's skillful interpretation of cultural and artistic tradition. Gordon S. Grice reviewed this novel as "The Medieval world in *My Name Is Red* is a sensual world—highly textural, subtly colored, pungent and romantic. But it also represents a sense of loss — a loss of tradition, a way of life, an everyday engagement with art." Pamuk himself opined that *My Name Is Red* at its deepest level is about the fear of being forgotten, the fear of art being lost. Readers get lost in the world that the words of novelist have created, they become lost in a world that is also regrettably, now lost. Another critic Hywel Williams acclaims Pamuk's *My Name is Red* as a sublime and timely parable of East and West. He further writes:

> Pamuk's *My Name is Red* is a philosophical thriller constructed around the clash between these two views of artistic meaning, which is also a chasm between two world civilizations. Great fiction speaks to its time; in the week of the American suicide bombings, this outstanding novel clamors to be heard. (2001, retrieved)

Another critic Richard Eder in *The New York Times* says, "*My Name Is Red* is not just a novel of ideas. Eastern or Western, good or bad, ideas precipitate once they sink to human level, unleashing passions and violence. *Red* is chockfull of sublimity and sin. (...) To sum up, and each time the sums come out different: the ideas in *Red* give fascination and energy, and work to hold together its turbulent narrative. They work and they fail; and in a way, though not entirely, the failure is Pamuk's success." According to critic Esra Almas,

> *My Name is Red* tells a story of love and murder around a secret book of miniature paintings. The novel is a treatise on Islamic art, a historical novel that reflects the sixteenth century Istanbul, and a romance that reflects the forgotten art of miniature painting. Using masterpiece as a concept to frame the novel, this study sheds light on the new perspectives the novel offers on both the concept, but also on the East-West encounters that Pamuk's work is associated with (1)

Erdag Goknar approaches his work from a political perspective, arguing that Pamuk's embrace of literary modernity is itself a form of political engagement. The central pillar of this study of Pamuk's novels then becomes the underlying tension between religion and state or between Islam and secularism. He further argues that "by implicating each other in the historical framework of Turkish secular modernization, religion and state constitute major discursive forces not just of a politics but of cultures" (31).

In order to sustain life at present in the world of tensions caused by cultural differences, various languages, ethnic groups, racialism, immigration, nationalism, borders, etc, one must learn to adjust in hybrid situation. Living in pure form of traditionalism and the modernism may not be so much approving since both of these aspects cannot remain flawless nor they can exist together. This is the reason why hybrid identity survives in this fast changing world through the freedom of making choice among languages, cultures and religions. By leaving certain drawbacks of the eastern perspectives or traditional worldviews and following particular qualities of the western or modern worldviews, man can live equitable and revered life which may lead the world towards deeper level of humanity with profound love and care. In this way, there will be a reasonable practice for making avant-garde identity in the global culture today which derives not from a few centers, but from all over the world.

This research work has been divided into four different chapters, including Introduction, Textual Analysis and Conclusion. The first chapter introduces the issue raised. Textual evidences have been searched to route the novel along the way of cultural identity in the second and third chapter. And the fourth chapter is the Conclusion. This chapter summarizes the whole research.

Chapter II

Plea for Coalescing the West with the East in Pamuk's *Snow*

Pamuk's *Snow* is an explicitly a political novel. It has been a widely popular national allegory that imagines up in contemporary cultural clashes among various religious communities in Turkey. The novel focuses on the tensions between the centre and periphery. The text emphasizes the intrinsic sorrow in Turkish consciousness on the cultural level which has been confused by the impact of European political and social institutions. Raising the questions about the struggles between the religious and secular intelligentsias, *Snow* reconsiders the rise of political Islam in Turkey since early 1990s and making allegory of political history of a country that is struggling between the western laicism-secularism and the contemporary practices of political Islam. With combination of these issues within a modernist narrative framework, Pamuk examines the encounter of the modern Muslim with the culture and political legacy of the western world. Published during the time when Turkey has begun its access to negotiation with the European Union, the text is a great example of national representation in the sense that it demonstrates the inherent political and social conflicts of modern Turkey, which has been coping with the idea of "westernization" since nineteenth-century. The text highlights the theme of cultural clash between the secular elite, a group that has benefited highly from the modern urban institutions of Turkey, and their ritual counterparts who are driven more by traditional rules of faith.

Pamuk uses many types of formal techniques derived from Western fiction to portray themes and settings from the Ottoman past and the Turkish present in his works. In fact, Turkey is described as a bridge between the East and the West so far as individual rights, free will of the people to express themselves, violence and political affairs are concerned. However, there exists the clash between the ideologies of the Western culture and religious fundamentalism.

Pamuk's *Snow* provokes mixed responses through various characters so far as their choices are concerned. And it leads to the clash between the Islamic ideology followed by one set of characters and the secular law of the country followed by another in the novel. *Snow* also reflects the view of Akbar S. Ahmed about the clash between 'two opposed philosophies' where one is based in secular materialism, the other in faith. However, while attempting to understand the reasons behind the conflict between Islamism and secularism in Turkey, the readers must not identify Muslim and Islamist as identical because, actually it is not so:

> Muslim is not synonymous with Islamist in the sense that the first expresses a religious identity and the latter implies a political consciousness and social action. Accordingly, Islamist counter-elites can be both actors in the Islamist movements and professionals and intellectuals aspiring for political power. Islamism, however, does not only denote membership in an Islamist political organization, but also suggests a sense of belonging and a group identity. (Göle 47)

This tussle between Islamism and secularism occurs due to the polarity of views between the two cultures that is the culture of the West and the culture of the 'other' already mentioned above. In the novel, it is clearly evident through the death of the "suicide girls" after the imposition of ban on veil by the secular government of Turkey. Subsequently, the Muslim men and women came forward in protest of the ban as it hurts the religious sentiments of their community. Pamuk has captured this impetus of the conflict between Islamism and secularism realistically in the novel. Ka plays "the intrepid reporter" (9). It's true that the military becomes successful in their attempts to have control over the Islamists in Turkey but only for a short while. The Islamists raise their heads whenever they get suitable opportunity and try to revolt against the secular government and vent their anger. In this way, there

continues the tussle between them. But then, it is from the external support that the Islamists of Turkey are encouraged to move forward in their mission. It is through the local news paper, the *Border City Gazette* that the readers get the real picture of Kars at present:

> Although the people of Kars once lived side by side in happy harmony, in recent years outside forces have turned brother against brother, with disputes between the Islamists and the secularists, the Kurds, the Turks and the Azeris driving us asunder for specious reasons and reawakening old accusations about the Armenian massacre that should have been buried long ago. (301)

In order to come out from such political crisis and fulfill his dream, Ka, who plays the role of intermediary between the Islamist, Blue and the government, does not hesitate to deceive Blue and Kadife. He does not reveal the real motive of Sunay behind the role offered to Kadife in the play to be staged at the National Theatre. Ka exaggerates the whole thing in favour of the two so that they might not reject the proposal given by Sunay. Ka admits it in front of Sunay: "First I had to flatter Kadife, then I had to flatter Blue" (340). However, İpek doubts Ka and blames him for the death of Blue and Hande. She shares it with her sister Kadife at the National Theatre: "Ka knew where Blue was hiding, and after his last visit to see you here, he never returned to the hotel" (407-8). Blue the representative of political Islam in *Snow* stands against the secular law of Turkey. He is known as the "Master" among his followers for "his being a political Islamist of some notoriety" (71). Orhan Pamuk introduces him as the 'brown-haired' clean-shaved little man who has an 'aquilinenose' and 'breathtakingly pale skin' with deep blue eyes. In his youth he was "a godless leftist" who "tagged along with the other young militants and stoned the sailors coming off the American aircraft carriers" (328). But with the passage of time there comes a radical change in him. He is no more sticking to the leftist ideology as before. The speech of Ayatollah Khomeini has influenced him greatly and brings him back to Islam: "The most important thing today is not

to pray or fast but to protect the Islamic faith" (328). It has created such an impression in Blue's mind that he joined Muslim organization with an aim to put the words of Khomeini into practice. Since then he never looks back. Nor does he lose his confidence. Such a high level of self confidence enables Blue to become the leader of the Islamists. There is no doubt that Blue is an active member of political Islam. Even during his days in Germany, he has left no stone unturned to attend "at whatever Muslim association I happened to be visiting" (75). The sole purpose was to promote the ideology of political Islam. Unlike many other Islamists who become eminent for their involvements in murders "Blue's fame derived from the fact that he was held responsible for the murder of an effeminate, exhibitionist TV personality named Güner Bener" because the latter "uttered an inappropriate remark about the Prophet Mohammed" (71). The incident took place while Güner Bener was presenting a quiz show broadcasted on a minor channel. The young Islamists of Kars are in the clasp of Blue. That's why the police does not arrest Blue despite their knowledge about the latter's arrival in Kars: "because they wanted to know which young Islamists were his associates. Now they're sorry, because last night, just before the raid on the religious high-school dormitory, he vanished like smoke" (210). However, one of the reasons behind Blue's staying in 'hiding' place is to keep himself away from the press which 'had made sure' his 'part' in the execution of Güner Bener. This incident is known throughout the country and is widely criticized. Even, "Some of the Islamist presses were as critical as the secularists. They accused Blue of 'bloodying the hands' of political Islam, of allowing himself to become the plaything of the secularist press, of enjoying his media fame in a manner unbefitting a Muslim, of being in the pay of the CIA" (72). While most of the characters in *Snow* are attracted to the West, Blue disapproves it. According to him, the humiliation of the Muslim world lies in the fact that it has "fallen under the spell of the West" (81). But he remains strict in his ideology. He doesn't want to imitate the European culture because that would mean that "you'll always be groveling"

(357). His disapproval of the slavery of the Turkish press to the Western press and subsequently his hatred for the West is further revealed during the time of his conversation with Ka: The Turkish press is interested in this country's troubles only if the Western press takes an interest first ... Otherwise its offensive to discuss poverty and suicide. They talk about these things as if they happen in a land beyond the civilized world. (77)

Blue's fanatical obsession with radicalism has its root in this belief. Indicating towards the press of Turkey and its servile attitude towards the Western press, Blue holds the view that a press which is not self-dependent and influenced by other press while functioning has no right to continue to exist. That's the reason why Blue does not want Ka "to write about the suicide girls for a Turkish paper or for a European paper!" (77) He further confesses that "because of the hatred I felt for the West, I admired the revolution in Iran" (328). His grievances for the West reach its peak when he says: "I refuse to be a European, and I won't ape their ways. I'm going to live out my own history and be no one but myself. I, for one, believe it's possible to be happy without becoming a mock-European, without becoming their slave" (331).

It is clear from the above speech that Blue is against "imitating the West" (331). By doing so he does not want to lose his cultural identity which is a sign of pride for him. To save this pride he prefers to maintain his distance from the European culture. Blue, the "militant Islamist who'd spent half his life railing against the merciless Turkish state," is "now sitting in a prison cell because he was implicated in two separate murder inquiries ..." (326). But he is adamant in his decision. He refuses the proposal of Sunay 'relayed' by Ka for his release. Blue does not want to bow down in front of secular laws of the country by surrendering himself. That's why during this conversation in the jail cell Blue said to Ka:

> So tell him [Sunay] this: I reject his proposal. I thank, you for taking the trouble to come all this way" (327). Blue boldly replies Ka's question "Aren't

> you afraid of dying?" He says: "If that's a threat, then the answer is no, I'm not afraid of dying. If you're asking me as a concerned friend, the answer is yes, I'm very afraid. But whatever I do now, these tyrants will still want to hang me. There's nothing I can do to change that. (327)

It hardly matters for Blue to suffer the death sentence but his concern for the political Islam counts a lot for him. He wants to strengthen the spirits of the followers of political Islam: "On the subject of my execution, I would like to make clear that I have no regrets about anything I have done for political reasons at any time in the past, including today, 20 February" (328). Seeing the lethargic attitude of the people around him, Blue develops an outlook that would enable him to lead a sincere life. When Ka denies as an 'agent' of anyone, Blue reveals his own identity with strength of mind, "After all, I see myself as an agent of Islam" (330). He is completely conscious of the goal of political Islam while according to him others are not. It is reflected in the following words:

> These meek lambs here – they might have strong religious beliefs, but at the end of the day they obey the state's decrees. And all those rebel sheikhs, all those who rise up because they fear our religion is slipping away, all those militants trained in Iran, even those like Saidi Nursi who enjoyed long-lasting fame – they can't even count on having graves in the first place, let alone resting in peace in them. As for all those religious leaders in this country who dream of the day their names turn to emblems of faith – the soldiers load their bodies on to military planes and dump them in the sea. (330)

Blue is so active in his mission of strengthening the organization of political Islam that his name is widely known in his native land and abroad. While interrogating Ka in order to know the assassin of the director of the Education Institute and the whereabouts of Blue "the round-faced agent explained" that:

> ... Blue was a dangerous terrorist and a formidable conspirator. He was a certified enemy of the republic and in the pay of Iran. It was certain that he had murdered a television presenter, so a warrant had been issued for his arrest. He had been sighted all over Turkey. He was organizing the fundamentalists. (182-83)

That's the reason why this enemy of the country is under the observance of the military force of Turkey now and then. But Blue knows how to handle such pressure without losing his guts. Ka further observes "a mixture of pride and extraordinary tenderness" (239) in the appearance of Blue during the time of the interview. However, it changes into 'resolve' later on. He leaves no stone unturned to defend him and tries to justify the actions of the Islamists so far. Rather Blue guards the Islamists saying that they are not involved in the assassination of the mayor and the director of the Education Institute in any way:

> He said that the state had arranged for the mayor and the director of the Education Institute to be assassinated to provide a pretext for the coup. And the coup itself was designed to prevent the Islamists winning the election. The banning of all political parties and associations proved his point, he said. (232)

He continues to justify the deeds of the Islamists with a cool and calm composure. He then adds to his previous statement in favour of the Islamists by saying that: It is deplorable when Islamists go on television to boast about killing just one poor atheist, but it is just as appalling when secularists—orientalists seek to vilify the Islamists by running news reports that augment the death toll to ten or fifteen. (235)

Blue does not fail to understand the motive behind Ka's arrangement of such interview with him for the 'Western newspaper'. He, thus, without any hesitation points his finger towards the Western press and says "all they need to say is that I'm one of the most prominent Islamists in Turkey, and perhaps the entire Middle East" (233). His abhorrence

against the West continues which is reflected once again when the title for one of the columns meant to be published in one of the German newspapers is selected as “An Announcement to the People of Europe about the Events in Kars” in its first draft by a ‘leftist-militant informer’. Blue reacts: "We’re not speaking to Europe; ...We’re speaking to all humanity ... The people of Europe are not our friends but our enemies. And it’s not because we are their enemies – it’s because they instinctively despise us" (277).

He further reveals his inner voice saying that he would never try to be like the people of the West for gaining any kind of benefits. He does not want the West to be the master of all and poke their nose in the affairs of others. He, thus, strongly rejects Turgut Bey’s views about Europe as “Europe is our future and the future of our humanity” (277). Blue says with brimming confidence that “as long as I live I shall not imitate them or hate myself for being different to them” (278). His hatred for the West is an aspect of rivalry between the two different cultures in *Snow* that has been described as a “clash of civilizations” (Huntington, 28). Despite his anger against the West Blue accepts the bitter reality about the mastery of the West. His awareness of the fact compels him to say to Turgut Bey that: “I couldn’t care less about your European masters. Where they’re concerned, all I want to do is step out of their shadow. But the truth is, we all live under a shadow” (280).

Finding no other options for his release from the jail, Blue agrees to the proposal of Sunay. According to the proposal, Blue would allow his beloved Kadife to bare her head on stage at the National Theatre during the performance of the play "A Tragedy in Kars". But as soon as Blue reaches the hiding place after his release from the jail, he alters his decision. It shows his real nature of a ‘villain’. According to the agreement it is at the cost of Kadife’s assurance of uncovering her head on ‘live television’ that lets him go but now he is least interested in that. Blue says to Ka that “I want you to tell Kadife not to have anything to do with that disaster they plan to stage this evening” (356). He tries every alternative for his

safety but at last he has to face the cold hand of death “on the night of the revolution” (400), during a raid in his ‘hiding-place’ when he was watching TV along with Hande:

> According to the official report, Blue took one look at the soldiers and the police officers assembled outside and rushed to get his weapon; he then opened fire without warning. Several neighbours and the young Islamists who would turn him into a legend almost overnight remember that, after getting off a few rounds, he cried, ‘Don’t shoot!’ Perhaps he was hoping to save Hande. However, Z Demirkol’s special operations team had already taken up positions around the perimeter, and in less than a minute not just Blue and Hande but every wall of their safe-house was riddled with bullets. (402)

Blue dies a bitter death and everything comes to an end. However, the common people will remember him as a radical Islamist for his criminal records. Still, Blue earns some compliments from İpek before his death:

> Blue is very compassionate, very thoughtful and generous ... He doesn’t want anyone to suffer. He cried all night once, just because two little puppies had lost their mother. Believe me, he’s not like anyone else ... He’s very strong-willed, he’s decisive, he’s so powerful, but also so much fun.... (371)

While scrutinizing the death of Blue İpek blames Ka as the possible spy and responsible for the death of Blue and Hande, she says to Kadife: “I think it was Ka who betrayed them to the special operations team. That’s why I didn’t go back to Germany with him” (408). Whether her suspicion has any valid ground or not is not clear. But the report of the inspecting colonel “implicated Ka in the coup” as a result of which “the military court summoned him as a witness” (418). It is due to Ka’s “failure to appear at two hearings” that he has been “charged with obstruction and issued a warrant for his arrest” (418). Fazıl too believes that it is Ka who deceives Blue which leads him but to the grave. He says to Orhan Bey that “after Ka had

failed to persuade Kadife to give up the play ... he'd visited Z Demirkol in his new headquarters, where the latter was waiting for Ka to tell him Blue's whereabouts" (428). Despite his fanatical obsession with political Islam, Blue offers authentic insights into some facets of society and makes genuinely shocking criticism of it. He points out that: "Most of the time it's not the Europeans who belittle us. What happens when we look at them is that we belittle ourselves" (75). Blue's claim justifies Said's view regarding the inferiority complex of the 'other' as stated in *Orientalism*. According to Blue it is merely the distortion of the fact because some "girls who commit suicide are not even Muslims" (77). His keen insight into this matter compels him to ask Ka not to write any articles about the girls who committed suicide in any paper inside or outside of Turkey because "suicide is a terrible sin! It's an illness that grows the more you focus on it!" He goes on saying:

> And it's wrong to say they're taking stand over headscarves. If you publish lies like this, you'll only spread more rumours – about quarrels among the headscarf girls, about the poor souls who have resorted to wearing wigs, about how they've been destroyed by the pressure put on them by the police and their parents. (77)

Muhtar also has inclination towards political Islam though he is not as radical as Blue. His attraction towards the Islamic philosophy and its impact on society is noteworthy. "Muhtar was not from one of those wishy-washy centre-right parties; he was a proponent of radical Islam" (67). To be more precise, it is through the character of Muhtar that the readers are supplied with an apt opinion by the novelist to evaluate the system of beliefs of political Islam. He doesn't want merely to sit idly and support political Islam. He joins "Prosperity Party, the party of God" (26) as an electoral candidate to contest in the forthcoming election with a purpose to promote political Islam. According to Serdar Bey, the owner of the Border City Gazette, the local newspaper, Muhtar has a fair chance of winning. He says to Ka: "The

only candidate the people trust is the one who is running for God's party ... And that candidate is Muhtar Bey, the ex-husband of İpek Hanım ... Muhtar's not very bright, but he is a Kurd, and the Kurds make up forty per cent of our population. The new mayor will belong to God's party" (27).

Muhtar got married with his classmate İpek and tried to settle down at their native town that is Kars, but it was in vain. Muhtar was a poet friend of Ka during the time of their university education. They were in the same 'political group' that is "left-wing" (37). However, Muhtar diverts his attention towards religion only after his divorce. It is revealed by İpek. She says to Ka that: Muhtar took over his father's Arçelic and Aygaz white-goods distributorship ... And once we were settled here, I tried to get pregnant. When nothing happened, he started taking me to doctors in Erzurum and Istanbul, and when I still couldn't conceive we separated. But, instead of remarrying, Muhtar gave himself to religion. (35) Muhtar returns to Islam from his "atheist years" (56) under the influence of Saadettin Efendi, the Kurdish Sheikh. The Sheikh used to treat Muhtar like a friend and shows him "the road to God Almighty" (57). Presently, he is "running on the Islamic fundamentalist ticket" (53). Muhtar says to Ka:

> It was at this point that some devil within – half utilitarian, half rationalist – a remnant of my atheist days, began to goad me. People like me find peace only when fighting for a cause in a political party with like-minded people. Which is why I joined this party – I knew it would give me a deeper and more meaningful spiritual life than I had found with the men in the lodge. This is, after all, a religious party, a party that values the spiritual side. My experience as a party member during my Marxist years prepared me well. (58-59)

It is Muhtar, who, for the first time takes the pain to send for Blue to Kars and used to pass most of their time together for quite some time at the initial stage. "But after the Istanbul

press branded Blue a terrorist, he didn't want to put the party in a difficult position, so now when he comes here, he never gets in touch" (300). After all, Muhtar has undergone a crisis at one point of life. He has to withdraw his nomination file to cease contesting election for the Prosperity Party. Still he does not have any complaint about his life: "He was happy with the way his life was going: although the Prosperity Party had been shut down, he was sure to be the candidate of the new Islamist party the next time there was an election, and was confident of a time to come when he would be mayor" (421).

Political Islam also is brought into focus through Kadife in the society of Turkey. She represents political Islam as the leader of the "covered" movement. Pamuk, however, attends to the harmful outcomes of this movement which is against secular way of life. It sounds interesting to see the transformation of Kadife from an infidel to a religious one. Previously, "she'd go on television and bare her bottom, and flaunt her legs" (110). Now, she wears "one of those non-descript headscarves" (112) regularly worn by thousands of Muslim women. It is "the symbol of political Islam" (112) at present. Kadife, the daughter of an atheist father felt ashamed to say Islam as "our religion" (110) when she was a model. Even she used to encourage girls from the religious high school to remove the scarves from their heads to become modern. But now she is leading the "headscarf" movement very actively. She is involved in this movement so deeply that she does not like to talk about her faith with a secularist or an atheist. She clearly states: "And I'm not one of those Islamist toadies who go around trying to convince secularists that Islam can be a secular religion" (114).

Kadife condemns Teslime for the latter's extreme step of committing suicide in front of Ka because "Human beings are God's masterpieces and suicide is blasphemy" (113-14). She further adds that: "If you turn to the twenty-ninth line of the Nisa verse of the Glorious Koran, you'll see that suicide is clearly prohibited" (114). In fact, Kadife's reference from the *Holy Quran* is apt. The above mentioned verse of the *Holy Qurān* states that: O ye who

believe! eat not up your property among yourselves in vanities: but let there be amongst you traffic and trade by mutual goodwill: nor kill (or destroy) yourselves: for verily Allah hath been to you Most Merciful! (429). Kadife further elaborates upon it and says to Ka that:

> The *Holy Quran* is the word of God, and when God makes a clear and definite command; it's not a matter for ordinary mortals to question" (114). It shows that Kadife has gained sufficient knowledge of the Shari'ah of Islam. Her conscience pricks her so much that she repents for her past deeds. She shares her feelings with Ka: "Now I've come to see that God put me through all this suffering to help me find the true path. Once I was an atheist, like you" (116). It is due to this awareness that Kadife has become a popular figure in the religious high school where some of the admirers "worshiped her by the name of Hicran (115).

In fact, Kadife works as an agent of Blue. She meets with Ka secretly in Room 217 of a hotel where the latter is staying to convey Blue's 'message'. At the same time she warns Ka that the latter must not "go to Blue looking for quotes" or "try anything funny" (228) and rebukes Ka thus: Make sure you show Blue respect. Whatever you do, don't try to belittle him by playing the conceited, foreign-educated, European sophisticate. If you let this sort of foolishness slip out by accident, don't even think of smiling ... And don't forget, the Europeans you admire and imitate so slavishly couldn't care less about you ... and they're scared to death of people like Blue. (229) But the irony lies in the fact that Kadife "smiled" (379) while reading the secret letter 'openly' at the National Theatre given by Blue through Ka. It reveals Blue's intention of resisting her to bare her head in front of the audience. And she sticks to her promise as she says, "I don't need an excuse. Sunay's already told me I'm free to go home if I wish" (379). Kadife has taken such decision to uncover her head in exchange of Blue's release from the jail. But at the same time she violates her promise as the

leader of the headscarf girls as well as the Shariah of Islam by bowing herself in front of secularism. Contrarily, she propagates the secular character of the country through her performance of baring her head at the National Theatre. Expectedly, it enrages the believers of Islam in general and the followers of political Islam in particular.

Sunay Zaim, unlike Blue, sees European culture as a culture of civility. He tells the people of Turkey that they have "embarked on the road to enlightenment and no one can turn you from this great and noble journey" (158). Sunay's fascination for the Enlightenment and high regard for Mustafa Kemal Atatürk (1881-1938), the head of the secular government of Turkey are the factors behind his strong faith in secularism. He imagines himself to be like Atatürk, the first president of Turkey and tries to give an authentic shape to secularism in Turkey. Then, Pamuk's exposition of the two staged coups in the National Theatre at Kars carried out under the leadership of Sunay Zaim bear striking resemblance with the actual event that took place during the last decade of the twentieth century:

> The last major military intervention in politics was the so called 'soft coup' of 1997, in which the military dominated National Security Council, an advisory body to the government, pushed out an Islamist prime minister the army suspected of being insufficiently committed to the secular foundation of the state. (White, 38)

Pamuk tells the readers that Sunay Zaim has been a great actor since the seventies (7). He used to work in Istanbul along with his wife, Funda Eser, but has never, astonishingly, put his theories into practice until this coup in disguise at the National Theatre. In the novel, the first staged coup episode is precipitated by a show of a Kemalist play "My Father or My Scarf" by Funda Eser. Sunay addresses the audience before the play begins. In his speech, Sunay, the owner of a theatre group in the city of Kars at that time, does not hesitate to point his finger towards the Islamists in particular and any other organizations that go against the secular

character of Turkey in general. Thus, like a hero brimming with confidence Sunay Zaim addresses the audience in favour of modernity at the National Theatre:

> Oh, honourable and beloved citizens of Turkey ... Do not fear. The reactionaries who want to turn back the time, those vile beasts with their cobwebbed minds, will never be allowed to crawl out of their hole. Those who seek to meddle with the republic, with freedom, with enlightenment will see their hands crushed. (158)

The news of the death of the director of the Education Institute perturbs Sunay Zaim so much that he cannot hold his nerves. He further addresses the audience at the National Theatre in an angry tone: “This lowly murder will be the last assault on the republic and the secular future of Turkey!” (159) it reflects Sunay as a proponent of secularism. To his surprise, Sunay hears a retaliatory shout from a supporter of political Islam. ‘The short’ and ‘fearless boy’ says: “Damn the godless secularists! Damn the fascist infidels!” (159) However, it does not affect Sunay Zaim. He applauds the soldiers who fired at the “troublemakers” (173) agitated audience at the National Theatre with the same impetus and says to the audience: This is not a play – it is the beginning of a revolution ... We are prepared to go to any lengths to protect our fatherland. Put your faith in the great and honourable Turkish army! Soldiers, bring them over. (163)… even the most Westernised secularists in the hall were frightened by the sight of their own dreams coming true (151).

The motive behind the staging of the play "My Fatherland or My Headscarf" is to unite the secularists and the Islamists but it is in vain. On the contrary “Eser’s play reveals the irreconcilable divide between the secularists and the Islamists” (Heyking 80). After the ‘ardent patriotism of the Kemalist period’ there was worry among the modern Turkish people generated by the radical Islamists. The authorities could hardly ask women not to wear veils:

> Fear of the political Islamists was so great that they had long ago accepted that the city must remain as it always had been. I say 'dreams', but not even in their sleep could they have imagined the state forcing women to remove their headscarves as it had done in the early years of the republic. They were prepared to live with the practice, as long as the Islamists don't use intimidation or force to make Westernized women wear scarves, as we've seen in Iran. (151)

Therefore, the combined effort by the state and the army is necessary to tackle the "dangerous fanatics" otherwise "we'll end up back in the Middle Ages, sliding into anarchy, travelling the doomed path already well travelled by so many tribal nations in Asia and the Middle East" (207-08). Sunay, then, shifts his attention towards Blue. He does not understand "What does this murderer have that makes everyone fall for him? Why is his name legend throughout Anatolia?" (211).

Sunay falls in deep 'trouble' for his 'offhand remark' in an interview with an 'anti-Western' religious newspaper that: "Perhaps one day, when public deems fit, I might be able to play the Prophet Mohammed" (195).This 'careless comment' by Sunay enrages the Islamists as it is forbidden in Islam "that any mortal should presume to play the Great Prophet" (195). Sunay condemns Blue as an "evil man" who can go to any extent at any hour of the day. He wants to get rid of Blue as soon as possible. According to him, he's definitely the mastermind behind the assassination of the director of the Education Institute. He goes around telling everyone that he's against suicide while he's busy turning poor, brainless teenagers into suicide bombers. (314)

Sunay wants to handle the Islamist like Blue technically with a purpose to leave behind certain lessons for others so that they might not dare put themselves in Blue's shoes. His "... aim in life is not to punish these heinous creatures, these reactionaries and terrorists in

our midst" (314). He wants to do something in the manner it is done in Thomas Kyd's play *The Spanish Tragedy* which influenced him greatly. He waited for fifteen long years to perform in similar kinds of play "that ends in suicide" (314). In fact, he wants to give a real shape to his long awaited dream very soon through his performance at the National Theatre. It will be done "in front of a live audience, and, of course, it will go out on television at the same time so that the whole city can see it" (314). In order to make the play more convincing for the people of Turkey, Sunay has 'simplified the plot' of the play/ "amended the play" (319) *The Spanish Tragedy* just before the end of it. He also changes the title of the drama. The new title is announced by 'the television announcers' as "A tragedy in Kars" "during the last half-hour of the relentless promotional campaign" (399). Its sole purpose is to highlight secularism at the cost of religious customs. To make things in favour of secularism and to show its dominance and control over political Islam, Sunay includes Kadife, the leader of the 'headscarf girl' to play the role of an appropriate "Spanish lady"(319). According to that role Kadife has to cover her head initially on stage, and at the end being exhausted of the bloody dispute, she has to remove her veil. Moreover "Funda will play her evil-hearted rival. Kadife will appear on stage wearing a headscarf. Then, in defiance of the ludicrous customs that have given rise to the blood feud, she'll bare her head for all to see" (314). This step of Sunay certainly would provoke anger in the followers of Islam. Despite knowing the fact that the political Islamists would see this as a demoralising 'move', (360) Sunay moves ahead with his mission. However, it's not an easy task for Sunay to convince Kadife and make her agree to play such role which is against the customs of her religion. Thus, he seeks the help of Ka, who can solve the problem by acting as a mediator. Initially, Ka does not agree to Sunay's proposal in order to keep himself away from the possible 'target' of the Islamists. But Ka agrees when Sunay promises the former about his safety by providing security. Sunay further promises to Ka that: "If Kadife bares her head, I can have her Blue released at once. They can

run off together to some foreign land and live happily ever after" (315). It acts as bait not only for Kadife and Blue, but also for Ka. He is spending every minute under bad political condition. That's why Ka takes the responsibility to convince Kadife. And he does so by emphasizing it as the only option for Blue's release from the jail so that she might agree to play the role mentioned above. After a long protest Kadife shows little interest to this proposal but that too depends on Blue's approval: "Well, let's see if Blue will want me to save him by pulling off my scarf" (319). Finally, she accepts the proposal at the cost of Blue's release. She takes this decision only after getting Blue's approval through Ka who is a mediator and "a double agent" (380). The rest is well done by Funda Eser. She convinces Kadife well regarding the latter's role in the play. Funda Eser encourages Kadife time and again during the time of the rehearsal of the play to bare latter's head. She very cunningly kisses and pats Kadife frequently to arouse "the dormant evil that Kadife kept hidden" and says to Kadife to "let your hair speak for itself, and let the men go mad!" (352). The extreme height of such provocation is seen when Kadife wants to study the script of the play:

> Funda proclaimed that the only script that counted that night would be the moment when all the men of Kars gazed, dumbfounded, at her long, beautiful, radiant hair. The women in the audience would be so moved by love and jealousy that they would want to reach out and touch it. (353)

Sunay's decision to include Kadife in the play meant to be staged at the National Theatre is not merely to give her an opportunity to act as an actress but to prove the dominance of secularism over anything and everything at least in Turkey. Through Kadife's role Sunay tries to show to the students of the religious high school and the Islamists in particular and the people of Turkey in general, the surrender of religious customs to the secular identity of the country. Though, Kadife disagrees to accept this role initially but then she is not a feeble minded girl who cannot take self decision. She says to Ka that "if I decide to bare my head, I

won't go halfway. I'll be really to do it "(320). Sunay is very enthusiastic and eagerly waiting to see her bare head on stage in front of the people of Kars because it will also have profound political consequences in addition to its "artistic triumph" (341).

Subsequently, Sunay stages the second coup at the National Theatre with the show of his much waited play "A Tragedy in Kars" with the same purpose as the previous one. In his second performance, the actor Sunay Zaim plays a shocking role by undergoing a real death on stage. During the first twenty minutes of the play there occurs an exchange of dialogues between Kadife and Sunay over a blood feud in some 'backward, impoverished and benighted' town. "Sunay raged against the backwardness of blood feuds and of people who allowed themselves to be drawn into them; he debated the matter with his wife and a younger woman who seemed to understand him better (this was Kadife)" (399). In between their heated discussion, Kadife ironically says to Sunay that: "In a city where men are killing one another like animals just to make it a happier place, who has the right to stop me killing myself?" (402) Kadife has to take either of the two important decisions that are "about baring her head and about committing suicide" (403). It is the crucial aspect of the play apart from Sunay's sacrificial death on stage.

However, the second act which starts with a secular note with Funda Eser's "belly-dance parody" (404) draws much more attention of the audience at the hall of the National Theatre. It is because of "the cumulative effect of Kadife and Sunay's long scenes alone on stage" (404). During their long debate on stage about the reasons behind committing suicide, Sunay suggests 'love' and 'poverty' may be the possible reasons behind it. But Kadife does not agree with him and thinks 'pride' as the primary reason behind it. She further adds: "A woman doesn't commit suicide because she's *lost* her pride; she does it to *show* her pride" (405). At the same time she makes it clear to Sunay that she does not support suicide, which depends on every individual's 'own decisions'. Furthermore: "All they achieved by killing

themselves was an even greater loneliness. Some were disowned by their families, who in some cases refused even to arrange the funeral prayers" (405-06). To the surprise of all Sunay took his Kırıkkale gun out of his pocket and says to Kadife "when you're sure that I'm utterly defeated, will you please use this to shoot me?" (406). Special attention is paid so that the students of the religious high school must present themselves at the theatre and thus realize the significance of the play.

Most of the audience at the National Theatre remains dumbfounded and are forced to believe the reality of what they have just seen. Surprisingly, there are the other 'residents' of Kars, who have watched everything that happens on the stage and yet they fail to become sure about Sunay's death until they have gone through the local newspaper, the *Border City Gazette*, the next day. Though there occur a number of popular local theories about the surprising death of Sunay on stage, ultimately "Kadife's last words ('I guess I killed him!') had turned her into something of an urban legend" (415). But at the same time "the cause of the headscarf girls in Kars had been greatly weakened four years earlier, after Kadife had bared her head ... that the Kars movement had yet to display the dynamism of those in Istanbul" (431). At the end of the play "A Tragedy in Kars", and afterwards the people of Kars remain in dilemma about Kadife's motive behind the shooting of Sunay Zaim to death on stage and let herself be safe: "There were those among Kadife's Islamists admirers and her secular accusers who maintained that this was precisely what was so crafty about the way Kadife had killed Sunay and then refused to kill herself but the inspecting colonel held that this was to confuse art with reality." (416)

Such a performance by Sunay not only astonishes the audience at the National Theatre who see it with their own eyes but also the people of Kars. Sunay reveals his desire behind that role to Serdar Bey, the local journalist just a day before the staging of the play. In his words: "What I am trying to do is push the truths of art to their outer limits, to become

one with myth" (344). The audience at the National Theatre in particular and the people of Kars in general who have watched the play "A Tragedy in Kars" on live TV becomes more curious. They eagerly wait to see what might happen in the last scene. This concluding scene of the play surprises everyone:

> Sunay produced the Kırıkkale gun he had brandished in the last act and showed it to Kadife and the audience. 'Now you are going to bare your head. Then I shall place my gun in your hands and you will shoot me ... And, as this is the first time anything like this has happened on live television, let me take this last opportunity to explain to our audience how they are to understand. (411)

Thus, the two coups that occur at the National Theatre, once during the time of the performance of the play "My Fatherland or My Headscarf" and the other at the time of *A Tragedy in Kars* to suppress the Islamists, stirred by a political motive are considered as the heart of the novel, *Snow*. In fact, the people of Kars consider "the 'staged coup' more as a strange theatrical event than a political one" (415). In this regard, John Updike aptly says that Pamuk is attracted to the unreal reality, the false truth, of theatrical performance, and *Snow*, in its political aspect, pivots on two nights of performance at the Kars National Theatre, in which illusion and reality are confoundingly entwined.

Kasıım Bey, the assistant chief of police too has made a contribution so far as the coup at the National Theatre is concerned. He co-operates Sunay to a great extent to conduct the play. He emerges on the screen just before the play to begin and addresses the audience. "Furthermore, he admonished, 'this time' no rowdiness would be tolerated-no one would get away with shouting or hissing or making coarse comments of any sort" (373). According to Ka, this long speech signifies that Z Demirkol is a 'good cop'. He has done his duty properly. Like a responsible cop, he continues interrogating Ka about the whereabouts of Blue, a

'terrorist' and a 'murder' or "whose life you've just saved" (363). Very shrewdly Z Demirkol informs Ka about their 'new operations centre' which would be held on the top floor of the religious high school where "we'll wait for you there" (363). He adds: "You're already aware that this handsome hero with the midnight-blue eyes, wanted for the barbarous murder of a bird-brained television host who stuck out his tongue at the Prophet Mohammed, and that he was also behind the assassination of the director of the Education Institute" (363). Z Demirkol is so devoted in his duty that he along with his 'special operation team' stayed for a couple of days more even after the road being clear from snow "so that they could kill a few more Islamists and Kurdish nationalists" (427).

The 'inspecting colonel sent by Ankara', who has been given the responsibility to inspect Sunay's death on stage and to prepare a thorough report on the 'theatrical coup', does his work fairly without paying any attention to the "many theories" (415) of the people of Kars. "His analysis of the gun scene confirms it was more a case of sleight of hand than magic" (415). Furthermore, on the basis of the Colonel's report nobody is responsible for the death of Sunay as "... he [the Colonel] wound up alleging that the true mastermind – the one who had helped Kadife memorize her lines and taught her the various maneuvers she would deftly perform – was none other than the deceased himself" (416). Then the secular bend of mind of Professor Nuri Yılmaz, the director of the Education Institute is clearly reflected through his conversation with his soon to be assassin, an Islamist in the New Life Pastry Shop. It gives the readers a vivid picture of the clash between the ideology of the political Islam and that of the secular laws of the country. The "tiny man" (38) has come from Tokat covering a long distance 'in the dead of winter' only to give shape to the design of the political Islam by slaying the director of the Education Institute. But just before he "shot him [the director] in the head and the chest" (38), the Islamist has tried to defend the headscarf girls logically by giving references from the *Qurān*, the 'Holy Book' of Islam. The spread of

the news that the girls who covered their heads “as dictated by their religion and the Holy Book” (40) are disallowed in the educational institutions through “a Muslim radio station called “flag” perturbed him so much that he cannot but come at such an odd hour of the season to teach the director a lesson for denying schooling to the covered girls. Referring to the “31st verse of the chapter entitled “Heavenly Light” in the *Holy Qurān* (40), the assassin reminds the director about the compulsion of the headscarves for women in Islam. Professor Nuri agrees that “this verse states very clearly that women should cover their heads and even their faces” (40). But at the same time the director has shown his inclination towards the laws of the country which is secular in nature as he says, “We live in a secular state that has banned covered girls from schools as well as classrooms” (40). The ban of headscarf in educational institutes makes the Islamists angry and this act of reconciling “God’s command with this decision to ban covered girls from the classroom” by Professor Nuri who too “fear God” (40), makes their fury reach its peak. The Islamist seeks to create psychological pressure on the director in a very polite and gentle manner during the time of their conversation. He tries to prick the conscience of Professor Nuri by pointing out his unstable/fickle identity and religious faith. He calls the director infidel time and again and torments him mentally with such questions as: “Is your conscience bothering you? ... What good can come to this country if women uncover their heads?” (44) He further boasts of being a member of a democratic country which he misinterprets thus: “Every once in a while I’ll get really upset about something I’ve heard, about an injustice done to a believer. And because I live in a democracy, because I happen to be a free man who can do as he pleases, I sometimes end up getting on a bus and travelling to the other end of Turkey to track down the perpetrator wherever he is and have it out with him, face to face” (41). But the situation becomes ironical when the Islamist says to Professor Nuri, “I don’t belong to any religious organizations. I despise terrorism. I believe in the love of God and free exchanges of ideas”

(41). He further goes on justifying his decision to kill the director and the people like him by referring the *Qurān* "as the *Holy Quran* states, it is my duty to kill any tyrant who visits cruelty on believers" (45). On the contrary, Professor Nuri, who is unmoved by the words of the Islamist at the New Life Pastry Shop could only add salt to the injury by supporting the secular views as he says, "When a woman takes off her headscarf, she occupies a more comfortable place in society and gets more respect" (46). The conflict continues as the Islamist thinks opposite is true where headscarves protect women from harassment, rape and degradation. It's the headscarf that gives women respect and comfortable place in society (46). He starts condemning Professor Nuri as a "shameless atheist" (46) and "shameless idiot" (47). The above conversation clearly reflects Professor Nuri's ardent belief in secularism. He prefers a bitter death rather than violating the secular law of the country. The views and opinions of the other minor characters like Turgut Bey, Orhan Bey and Serdar Bey give the readers a clear insight about the ideas and ideology used in *Snow* and the Turkish society. Turgut Bey again says to Ka before attending the meeting at the Hotel Asia that: "The question is, speaking as the communist, modernizing, secular, democratic patriot I now am, what should I put first – the Enlightenment or the will of the people? ... then I have no choice but to go and sign the statement" (247).

Turgut Bey recalls his past as a young leftist when he was strong-minded and avoided "to join the Turkish bourgeoisie" (250). When a 'young man' among the Islamists present in the meeting held at the Hotel Asia asks Turgut Bey the reason behind his coming if he is 'not against the coup'. Turgut Bey instantly replies that "I have come to this meeting because I wish to prove to the Europeans that in Turkey; too, we have people who believe in common sense and democracy" (279). It clearly reflects Turgut Bey's readiness to embrace the European culture. After gaining the experience by attending the meeting at the Hotel Asia, Turgut Bey reveals his views about the justification of the military coup that has taken place

at the National Theatre in the recent past in the presence of Ka, Serdar Bey and his daughter Kadife. He says:

> I'm glad I got to see with my own eyes how low the level of political understanding has sunk – young and old alike, they're hopeless. I went to this meeting to protest against the coup, but now I think the army is right to keep them out of politics. They're the drugs of society, the most wretched, muddled, brainless people in the city. I'm glad the army couldn't stand by and let us abandon our future to these looters. (307)

Though Turgut Bey very boldly favours the military coup and condemns the activities of the Islamists, his confidence calms down and becomes practical enough to understand the consequences of allowing his daughter, Kadife to bare her head on stage. He says to Funda Eser, "If my daughter does this, the religious fanatics in this city will never forgive her" (353). His concern for his daughter creates panic in him as the scheduled time of the play to be performed at the National Theatre comes closer. He says to Ka that: "It's clear that Sunay has planned another unspeakable outrage for this evening's performance. I feel like a fool, falling for Funda's assurances and letting my girl go off with those lunatics" (374).

After a thorough study of *Snow* it can be said that the presentation of the clash between the religious customs and the secular laws of the society in Turkey where politics of religion is a motivating force, as depicted in *Snow*, is praiseworthy. The growing awareness in political Islam in Turkey led to the conflict between secular and religious beliefs and the result is a dramatic one. It transforms drastically the lives of the people in the town of Kars where tension is generated in the minds of the people.

Ka is novel's anti-hero: he returns to Frankfurt, forsaking both his homeland and Ipek, and dies some years later. He makes a case toward the end of the novel for relinquishing ideology for the sake of happiness: "Life's not about principles, it's about happiness," he tells

Kadife. "But if you don't have any principles, and if you don't have faith, you can't be happy at all." She rejoins (312). Ka's response reflects the overarching theme of the novel and, most likely, Pamuk's own stance on this issue: "that's true", Ka states. "But in a brutal country like ours where human life is cheap, it's stupid to destroy yourself for the sake of your beliefs. Believe high ideals—only people living in rich countries can enjoy such luxuries" (312). Ka's ambivalence toward ideology and extremism—'be it religious or political'—is a plea for tolerance and seems to lend hope for peaceful coexistence of people of different ethnic, religious, and political backgrounds. But Ka retreats into seclusion in Germany and dies in isolation, which suggests that avoiding global reality is not a solution either. Ozubudun and Keyman are less ambivalent about the matter, concluding that the influence of Western ideas in the form of the globalization is crucial for Turkey, because it is through the globalization of the local that a more pluralistic and multicultural life has come into existence . . . and coming to terms with this fact is of utmost importance not only for understanding the changing nature of Turkish modernity, but more importantly, for establishing democracy in Turkey. (318)

Ka's observation regarding the society of Turkey is notable. He views it from two diverse perspectives. Firstly, as a local he does not fail to understand the strength of Islam which has become an influential means for commanding political control in Turkey. Secondly, like the foreigners or more specifically the Westerners, he too cannot make head or tail of whether the religious customs should be encouraged or not in a secular country. The success of secularism over political Islam at Kars in particular and in Turkey in general, is seen to a great extent due to the several coups at several 'hiding places' of the Islamists and at the National Theatre. For instances, the coup led to the death of the 'radical' Islamist Blue at his hiding place; then the coup at the National Theatre led to the death of a large number of Islamists particularly from the religious high school; and finally it is due to the coup that "the

old dormitory is empty now. It is due to these coups after certain interval that the Islamists cannot raise their heads collectively for their rescue. Nor do they get ample time to strengthen their religious organizations smoothly. Thus, the Islamists cannot but bow down in front of secularism and this weakness is partly reflected through the emptiness of the dormitory, once a terrorist's nest, now "there's nothing in here but birds" (426), where there is nothing except darkness. Some other examples can also be cited which are relevant to justify it. Fazıl, who used to support and work for political Islam at times is now no more crazy for it but leading a happy life with his wife Kadife and 'their six-month-old, Ömercan', working as a 'receptionist' in the Snow Palace Hotel. To become self depended and to devote as much time as possible to work, he further joins two other jobs, "one was at the Palace of Light Photo Studio and the other was at Kars Border Television" (418). And Kadife, once a leader of the 'headscarf' girls, now "busied herself with hotel business" (418). Muhtar after suffering torment in jail for his alleged involvement in the activities of political Islam is leading a moderate life now. He is optimistic about his possibility of another chance to contest election for "the new Islamist party the next time there was an election" (421). And there is a fair chance to become a mayor.

Moreover, Pamuk has shown the contrast between the two --Blue, the 'radical Islamist' and Sunay Zaim, the true proponent of secularism. On the one hand, Sunay is preparing to die a real death on stage during his performance in the play "A Tragedy in Kars" for the sake of secularism: "I staged this revolution precisely so that you women could be as independent as women in Europe. That's why I'm now asking you to remove that scarf" (410). In fact, he keeps to his words in front of the audience 'on the night of the revolution'. Even the people of Kars have seen "the live broadcast from the National Theatre" (402) on TV. On the other hand, Blue remains firm in his decision to carry out the principles of political Islam and prefers death rather than surrendering himself to the secularists in Turkey.

Chapter III

Apology for Hybridity in Pamuk's *My Name is Red*

Orhan Pamuk's *My Name is Red* is a historical detective fiction that narrates the story of a search for the murderer of the miniaturists in 16th century Ottoman Istanbul when paintings were forbidden for seemingly religious reasons which opens up an argument about the cause of disappearance of the arts of the miniature painting in Istanbul and the Ottoman World. It has unforgettable narrative drive that unites past and present, as well as the high art with popular appeal that has made Pamuk into Turkey's greatest writer. *My Name is Red* is not only the story of the murder of miniaturists, but also a comment on Turkish modernity and its failures; specifically its strict identity categories, its fear of the difference as well as the apathy of the people. The identity categories in question fall short of explaining the complexity of human psychology and behavior. Overall, Pamuk's *My Name is Red* questions the place of the individual within the overarching narratives; specifically, Pamuk's novel traces individuality between tradition and the modern. The dichotomies of secular and religious, traditional and modernity are one of the central themes in the novel, however, such dichotomies are not separate and conflicting entities, nor can they be clearly and easily defined and cannot exist without the other half; as Enishte Effendi mentions, "nothing is pure" (194). *My Name is Red* does more than just state this. The novel articulates this through its form: for instance, events and many details which would otherwise not be recounted are narrated through various characters. *My name is Red* not only endorses a multiplicity of voices, but also shows the existence of a multitude of perspectives in an allegedly religious and conservative community. Thus, the hierarchy of the narratives is undermined by giving voice to various living and non-living things, including things of imaginations. For instance, the colour red cannot be described through dichotomies, traditions, worldviews, or identity categories, nor is it religious or secular. Yet as the colour itself states, red is everywhere

(228). It is this in-betweenness and impossibility of classification that gives its name to Pamuk's novel, *My Name is Red*. As the epigraph puts it, "the blind and the seeing are not equal" (*Quran*, "The Creator", 208).

The whole novel is the story of a failure that leads to the disappearance of the art of miniature; Pamuk's novel raises a basic question: why and how did this happen? In this respect, *My Name is Red* problematizes the infertility of seeing the self, art and the world through monolithic perspectives and identity categories, and shows how internalizing the imaginary in the extremes can drag individuals/artists into the grammar of mutual denunciation. In workshop of miniaturists, style and signature are not allowed, because selflessness is expected from the artist. Master Osman, the head of the miniaturist workshop says that: "it is indeed important that a painting through its beauty, summon us towards life's abundance, toward compassion, toward respect for the colours of the realm which God created, and toward reflection and faith, the identity of the miniaturist is not important" (70).

This is a view in which the miniaturists are expected to repeat the tradition before them, not developing anything new, not questioning the current methods, as well as rejecting any other rival methods including the European portraiture and the use of perspective. In doing so, the miniaturists are also required to avoid anything mundane and to depict a world "that Allah envisioned and desired" (24). In this respect, the head miniaturist seems to be following a fanatical and monist reasoning in his justification for the refusal of perspective, style and signature in art.

It is very humiliating belief and tradition for miniaturist in Pamuk's *My Name is Red* particularly considering that most miniaturists limit their art in terms of form. Most miniaturists require their artistic work to be a part of a moral story, whereas in terms of content, story is held to be essential for miniature (132). Unlike European portraiture,

miniatures of 16th century Istanbul in *My Name is Red* are expected not to be painted without a moral story, and an image without one is received as blasphemy (148). From where the conflict starts in the novel and they lead to events including the murders; and it is how the conflict between tradition and modern materializes. The novel has been generally acclaimed as a successful attempt at penetrating into the heart of the cultural crossings between the Islamic East and the West. Critics pointed out Pamuk's skilful interpretation of Islamic cultural and artistic traditions. The author himself explains the influence of the Eastern traditions in his novel as follows:

> I tried to tell my story in the manner of these Persian masters. These two distinctive ways of seeing the world and narrating stories which are of course related to our cultures, histories and what is now popularly called identities. How much are they in conflict? In my novel, they even kill each other because of this conflict between east and west. But of course, the reader, I hope, realizes that I do not believe in this conflict. All good art comes from mixing things from different roots and culture, and I hope *My Name is Red* illustrates just that. (Interview, 2005)

Pamuk's novel presents a compelling portrayal of the ways in which a shift in perspective potentially questions centuries-old artistic traditions. His engagement with Islamic art, an object of mystery and fascination in the Western perception, challenges the notions that constitute Islamic art as a limited form held back by extreme conservatism and hostility to change and innovation. The enthusiastic response of the reading to Pamuk's book proves that Islamic art is an intriguing subject for readers. What is more intriguing about *My Name is Red* is the way it presents the field of art as disrupted by the conflicts and paradoxes of desire. Art in *My Name is Red* emerges as a field haunted by the ghosts of an overpowering tradition and claimed by those who want to open it to new influences. The desire of the Ottoman artist

plays a major role in this conflict and the object of such desire is the Venetian art of portraiture. In the novel, the Ottoman artist figures as a traumatized being, torn between an overwhelming tradition and a desire for creating art in the Western fashion. Throughout *My Name is Red*, the fragile artistic scene is repeatedly disrupted by the tensions and contradictions that inherent in binaries such as subjective/objective, East/West, tradition/change, and anthrocentric and theocentric perspectives. *My Name is Red* explores tensions focusing on the conflict, contradictions, traumas, imperfections, and malfunctioning in the field of art. It reflects the suffering of the Ottoman artist during the production of his miniatures alongside his demand for deriving pleasure from art. Set in the politically-strained atmosphere of sixteenth century Istanbul, the novel portrays the antagonism between two groups of Ottoman miniaturists in the court of Sultan Murad III, who reigned between (1574—1595). The liberal group in the court supports innovating traditional arts and embraces the idea of borrowing from Western artistic traditions, while the culturally conservative group rejects Western influence, which they see as threatening and contaminating. Islamic prohibition of Western iconography is a strict one. Traditional miniaturists reject the anthrocentric perspective of the West for Allah's omniscient perspective. They maintain that painting reality from the elevated point of view of Allah helps them capture the essence of creation and represent reality more truthfully than Western artists are capable of doing. The fact that Western painters depicts the object from the level of ordinary man, not from the elevated level of Allah's perspective, therefore, arouses worry and among Islamic artists and this approach is considered profane: the science of perspective and the methods of the Venetian master is nothing but the temptation of Satan' (160). In Islam it is believed that Allah is above, his creation cannot be represented as an ordinary object from a human being's point of view. Islam further maintains that endorsing an anthropocentric perspective promotes idolatry and tempts people to worship images. In order to prevent

idolatry, it condemns Western art as the art of 'the infidels' which becomes a fantastic monster created to alleviate the Islamic artists against his fear of being faced with the lack in the symbolic network. The story suggests that before the Mongolian invasion of the Muslim lands, Islamic artists drew pictures from an anthropocentric viewpoint, just like Westerners. But after the Mongolian invasion, they abandoned this technique. Instead, depicting objects from Allah's omniscient perspective became the norm because such depiction was thought to approximate the universal truth. Islamic modesty requires that the artist must check his vanity and remove every individual trace from his work. The great master Bihzad, for example, never cares for recognition and popularity, and sees self-effacement as the basic virtue of the artist: Where there is true art and genuine virtuosity the artist can paint an incomparable masterpiece without leaving even a trace of his identity' (18) western artists challenge Allah, claiming creativity for themselves, which hubristic and should be suppressed at all cost. Islamic suppression of individual expression and style is further related to a desire for security and permanency. Pamuk's *My Name is Red* is a "chronicle of the confrontation of the two ways of seeing",（Çiçekoglu 3） a characterization which is certainly not unwanted. Unlike the murderer, liberal artists, including Enishte see the value of harmonizing different ways of seeing; this practice might synthesize different forms of artistic expressions. Enishte as a pioneer sacrifices his life to achieve his goals is aware of the fact that "illustrating in a new way signifies new way of seeing" that does not rest on artificial binaries but on the effort to experiment with different possibilities (28). His acceptance of the commission is not just an artistic endeavor; it is a political act as well that aims to advocate a more productive relationship between East and the West. Enishte's attempt to borrow from the West, in effect, reveals his desire to open ways for coexistence without the dictate of artificial hierarchies privileging either side: The Venetian Doge might say to himself, Just as the Ottoman miniaturists have come to see the world like us, so have the Ottomans themselves come In

turn to resemble us, in turn, accepting our Sultan's power and friendship. (266) Enishte's amalgamation of Eastern idealism with Western realism reveals his efforts to cross borders in order to generate a mutual dialogue between cultures. What Enishte wants is not to imitate the Venetians, but to use their techniques to bring richness to the Ottoman traditions:

> I wanted the things I depicted to represent Our Sultan's entire world, just as in the paintings of the Venetians masters. But unlike the Venetians, my work would not merely depict material objects, but naturally the inner riches, the joys and fears of the realm over which Our Sultan rules. (25)

It would be mistaken to read *My Name is Red* as just another account of the encounter between East and West, or of different ways of seeing the world. Although the lure of European representation moves the plotline forward, reflections about it are barely presented. The novel is instead filled with description of miniatures, mainly Persians, and anecdotes about miniaturists. Pamuk's formal use of the miniaturist's aesthetic is conspicuous in other ways. The repetitive utilization of identical compositions in different texts is a particularly notable feature of miniature painting. This feature is also evident in Pamuk's novel. The effect is self reflective just as it is with miniature painting, wherein a familiar cycle of stories is illustrated and re-illustrated over and over again, and often in identical fashion. By making use of aesthetic guide, Pamuk is basically engaged in a formal exercise that aims merely to mimic and even be an imitation of it. That could be one interpretation and not unreasonable. Pamuk's approach is intended to be another example of his hybrid style, the blending of eastern and western literary techniques, which the author himself has admitted. The characters do routinely address the reader in outburst of self-reflexivity typical of postmodernist fiction. Painting as an act of memory is an idea also expressed by Nizami in his description of the picture of Husrev that arouses Shirin's love for him. What Nizami stresses in the episode, as Priscilla Soucek elucidates, is that the picture is the product of the

painter's memory, of the "image preserved in his imagination" That is the picture of Husrev is not to be understood as a realistic portrait.

My Name is Red is more about Turkish modernity than it is about the Ottoman world. Enishte Effendi attempts to imitate European portraiture, similar to the Turkish experience of modernity that has attempted to copy European models of governance—such as secularism and nationalism since 1920s. Pamuk's *My Name is Red* shows dichotomies of meaning-form, miniature-portraiture, fiction-fact, East-West, religious-secular, etc and related conflicts do exists; however these categories are insufficient to account for the intricacy of human relationships. Jose Casanova, in his historical stadial consciousness writes that secularism makes a separation between modern and pre-modern, defining the secular as modern and religious as backward or primitive. Pamuk's novel does not have such a strict Eurocentric secularist perspective; and religion is not perceived merely as "an intellectual regression" (Casanova 59). In that sense, Pamuk is not biased towards religion and has a more balanced critical view of Turkish modernity, one that does not scapegoat religion. *My Name is Red* is a critique of Turkish modernity. Even though the novel is set in 16th century Istanbul, Pamuk's work is more in dialogue with 20th and 21st century modern Turkey rather than with the Ottoman world. This is because the novel at the very beginning, informs the reader that there has been a murder, but also, at the end of the novel, the disappearance of the art of the miniature is declared, tying together all the other events in the plot (501). Therefore, Pamuk's novel becomes the story of shortcomings of Turkish modern life.

Mikhail Bhaktim's theory of the novel provides an ideal critical framework to explore the artistic and social functions of the multiple voices that open *My Name is Red* as heteroglossia: the concept that every utterance involves multiple perspectives and layers resulting in a polyphonic organization of language that does not surrender to the tyranny of monologic ideologies. There is a strong evidence of such ideology in the novel that the

promise and democratic expression is broken when the storyteller's tongue gets him in trouble with the preachers' men, who cry: "Cut out his tongue so he never again slanders his Excellency the preacher" (357). Before the fatal sentence, the storyteller expresses the text's longing to experience all perspectives at once in the writing process—East and West, male and female—and in so doing unveils the novel's most dialogic movement. In the rare inclusion of lyric in the text's prose discourse, the storyteller sings this poem "inspired by the Almighty":

> My fickle heart longs for the West when I'm in the East and for the East when I'm in the West. My other parts insist I be a woman when I'm a man and a man when I'm woman. How difficult it is being a woman, even worse is living a human's life. I only want to amuse myself front side and backside, to be Eastern and Western both. (354)

Within both the Ottoman and contemporary contexts of *My Name is Red*, the heteroglossic interaction does not merely point to the global dialogic meeting of East and West, tradition and modernity, religious conservatism and secularism, but also amplifies the local diversity of voices and languages that exist within each perspective. From the perspective of literary genre, for instance, Pamuk's Ottoman historiography places traditional Turkish story telling elements within a Western tradition of novelistic writing; from an art history perspective, it meanders among both Eastern and Western visual aesthetic cultures; and as a politically allegory it shows the weakening Ottoman Empire's struggle to negotiate between competing Eastern and Western ideologies.

As a narrative that emphatically negotiates Eastern and Western ways of seeing, *My Name is Red* decentres any threat of unitary narratological shadow from either side of the meridian by spreading its multiperspective voices across many "I" s. the miniature situated

within the Sultan's book are created at the threshold of a new Western artistic paradigm that views the world "as the eye sees it" rather than from the idealistic perspective of God, as if from top of the a minaret" (70), as the Persian miniaturists avoid the depiction of multiple points of view and individual style, creating the illusion that there is only one way of seeing from Allah's infinite perspective. The cautious rules that revolved around sixteenth-century artist guild favour in Sultan's court could be seen "as a way of dealing with the iconoclastic tradition of Islam" (Çiçekoglu, Pedagogy 1). Since the Sufi ethos and its view of creativity was more concerned with a transcendent reality—a reality beyond the natural world—what resulted in their subtle artistic depictions is a much more abstract view of the world. Indeed Master Osman notes that the old masters "would suffer pangs of conscience about changing the world one day as an Eastern shah commanded, the next, as a Western ruler did—which is what the artists of our day do"(325). The anxiety concerning perspective and artistic style is inextricably linked to the tension between Eastern and Western aesthetic values. Bhaktim opines that this tension would seem to render the Eastern style of painting a monologic one. The coffeehouse becomes space, therefore, where story teller and painter speak freely to the problems facing their art and their society; the murders, appropriately introduced to ideas from the European Renaissance are starting to question principles of Islamic cultural production. Even under the threat of violent street mobs incited by the conservative preacher, the storyteller celebrates with laughter the various cultural aspects of the Ottoman Empire. This is also the most contemporary and political aspect of the novel; what Pamuk seems to be doing is highlighting the problems of literary production in modern Turkey. By drawing the characters and events of *My Name is Red* from the Ottoman Renaissance, Pamuk denies such an amnesic monolingualism, which forgets modern Turkey's multilingual and multicultural past. With typical Pamuk's touch of the fantastic, these characters echo Bhaktim's argument "a novel must represent all the social and ideological voices of its era, that is, all the era's

languages that have any claim of significance; the novel must be a microcosm of heteroglossia" (DN 411). Within both the Ottoman and contemporary contexts of *My Name is Red*, this heteroglossic interaction does not merely point to the global dialogic meeting of East and West, tradition and modernity, religious conservatism and secularism, but also amplifies the local diversity of voices and languages that exist within each perspective. These dialogical encounters unfold in several ways: from the perspective of literary genre, for instance, Pamuk's Ottoman historiography places traditional Turkish storytelling elements within a Western tradition of novelistic writing; from an art history perspective, it meanders among both Eastern and Western visual aesthetic cultures; and as a political allegory it shows the weakening Ottoman Empire's struggle to negotiate between competing Eastern and Western ideologies. Perhaps more significantly, Pamuk goes beyond the text's literary, aesthetic, and political registers by citing as an epigraph a line from the "Heifer" chapter of the Koran: "To God belongs the East and the West" (6). Yet this totalizing statement is brought down to earth by Satan (qua miniature drawing), who is accused of separating East from West (287).

The narrators in *My Name is Red* engages the reader's imagination by creating Iserian textual "blanks" that leave room for the reader's participation as detective, judge and co-conspirator. Pamuk is creating a space for a reader who is as autonomous as his own narrators. Rather than being align with narrator or author, the reader is influenced by and influences the multitude of voices in the text, sometimes connecting them together. Distant reading is a way of encompassing both Eastern and Western perspectives; it’s a progression beyond local aesthetic values and an embracing of foreign forms. Indeed, this is precisely Pamuk's accomplishment in *My Name is Red*: his writing is what Moretti would call a "compromise between foreign form and local materials" (58); it's this comparative

perspective that allows him to combine traditional aesthetics and storytelling with the techniques of Western Novelist writing.

A reference to Deleuze and Guattari could offer an appropriate conclusion: using botanical metaphors they argue that Western thinking is based on "arborescence," the notion that everything is derived from a single source or cause and therefore exists in a closed system of thought and language. They contrast this with the concept of the rhizome, which "ceaselessly establishes connections between semiotic chains, organizations of power and circumstances relative to the arts, science and social struggles. …there is no language in itself, nor are there any linguistic universals, only a throng of dialects, patois, slangs and specialized language" (A Thousand Plateaus 8). In other words even single languages are composed of multiple little or minor languages. In this sense, the basic structure of language resembles Bhaktim's notion of heteroglossia and Pamuk's idea that culture is a "mix of things from other sources." The actions presented in *My Name is Red* is therefore a continuous unfolding and bringing together of different social grammars, of these images drawn in the Sultan's secret book, as well as a continuous intermingling of Eastern idealist with Western realist methods of seeing. The promised synchronic unity of the book of miniatures, which is never completed, submits to the basically structured narrative of *My Name is Red*, which ceaselessly establishes connection between synchronic and diachronic elements, present and past, realism and idealism, art and writing.

Pamuk is not setting up a simple dichotomy between East and West, especially since Enishte's innovative book combines both. Indeed, the aesthetic framework of *My Name is Red* is not very different from Enishte's. "As heir to both Eastern and Western writing," Jale Parla writes, "Pamuk sees the potential for the emergence of a new system of representation that is the synthesis of these two traditions. As Enishte says," nothing is pure; even art is hybrid." Working against the imminent plurality of voices and ideas—which are represented

foremost by the story teller and promised by the hybrid form of painting championed by Enishte—the preacher wants to annihilate representational art, freeze the possibilities opened up by multiple discourses, and set up a monologic framework based on a parochial Islamic worldview.

A local Muslim leader, Muhammad Ali was a "champion of Islam" who wanted to distinguish the religion from the extremist group Isis. Without embracing secularism, Ali illustrated the need to redefine religion in order to create a European way of being a Muslim. Pamuk is interested in religious identity and the way it shapes human consciousness; unlike Ali, Pamuk focuses on the formation of subjectivity within a Muslim homeland. Pamuk, on the other hand, presents a strong case about the necessity of maintaining a secular view as a safeguard of individual liberty. The separation between the affairs of the state and religion is crucial for Pamuk, who believes religion is a private practice which should therefore, have no weight in political discussions. Although advocating secularism, Pamuk does not aim to alienate his Muslim audience, rather he identifies secularism as a condition of modernity. There can only be further alienation without secularism, the position created by the insider/outsider binary of religion, he observes and often threaten the fundamental principle of a multicultural society.

Pamuk is interested in the discourse of orientalism, arguing that orientalist discourse as an epistemological system can be disorienting for the Easterner who experiences a discrepancy between self representation and West's narrativization of his/her home. Said in discussing East-West binary, identifies the artificiality of the dual categories and shows how they convey a biased picture of difference… Said argued that the East has been systematically depicted as an antithesis to Europe. Many scholars feel that Said's analysis of orientalism has to be re-evaluated in the light of historical changes that have occurred in the East. Other Western orientalists, such as Francesco Gabrieli, go so far as to offer: "apology

for orientalism" arguing that "Our friends from the East should … not come to ask us to start studying their past and present in the light of modern Eastern historiography, aesthetics and economics inasmuch as these are today nonexistent" (84).

In *My Name is Red*, Pamuk is even more innovative: he utilizes orientalist discourse strategically to describe the opposition between Ottoman liberals and conservatives. Due to their stubbornness, the two groups fail to reach a consensus in their interpretations of religious and national identity. Pamuk's use of orientalism as a tool to discuss the contentious views exists within the same society can ultimately be seen as a response to the trap of artificial binaries which oversimplify the relationship between the East and West. As all aesthetic signifiers, the book is invested with fantasies and desires. It, however, constitutes the absent centre of *My Name is Red.* It has an equivocal existence: it is both there and not there. They have is a rough idea of the figures in it. For this reason, the secret book bears the unmistakable qualities of a fetish, concealing what is not there; a fantasy object temporarily filling the empty place of the lack. In *My Name is Red*, inclines and fantasies function as stakes, helping the miniaturist cope with the lack. Enishte's identification with the Western Other is problematic as it also embodies the lack. However, he persistently maintains a perfect and complete image of the Western Other and even risks his life doing so. While Enishte justifies his copying of the Western methods in his secret book to the murderer, he appeals to him by insisting that he is not persuaded by everything they do and attempting to imitate the world directly through painting seems dishonorable to him (170), yet he immediately adds that there is an undeniable allure to the paintings they create by these methods. They depict what the eye see, whereas conservative painters paint what they look at. By universalizing Western art in this manner, he implies that make-believe, the illusion of completeness, perfection, timelessness, and universality, are simply the object. He pursues the illusion through the book he designs; the book thus becomes the embodiment of the

object. It serves him as a fetish and helps him to maintain the illusion that the Western Other is perfect and complete.

Behind the mask of murder mystery, Pamuk analyses the relation between different modes of artistic expression-namely the disparity between Eastern and Western art—that dictate a particular way of seeing the world. Pamuk observes how different artistic visions can become political matters in society which views cultural exchange as a threat to identity. By having the Ottoman leaders counter Westernization with tradition, Pamuk has them unconsciously adopt an orientalist discourse. East and West in this novel lose their geographical significance, and they become political positions. Pamuk can therefore, draw parallels with Fred Halliday's contentions about the representation of Islam in the West in the twentieth century.According to Halliday,

> [t]he conflict is not as Islamists and their fellow travelers in the West would have us believe, between Islam treated as a unity and the West, but between different interpretations of Islam and the politics it can allow." Even within the same Islamic society (Hawley 8).

What Pamuk does in this novel is to depict religion as a polycentric discourse, an agenda pursued by other writers interested in Muslim identity. Pamuk is determined to complicate Islamic identity by depicting the pressures in a Muslim society to dispute the belief that every Muslim believer roots for fundamentalist. Pamuk uses religious discourse not to analyze Islamic belief, but to explore how different interpretations of Islam create inner tensions in Islamic states.

An antithesis to Eastern art, Western art requires a different way of seeing. Western painting, according to the Ottoman masters, is not concerned with capturing divine vision; it portrays reality as it appears to the human eye. By adopting perspectives not from the minaret

but from the street, it imitates the world directly. Enishte Efendi observes that the paintings of the Venetians "are more compelling because they more closely resemble life itself" (170). Their efforts to paint life-like objects using perspectival techniques indicate a shift from idealism to realism. Venetians excel not only these religious techniques but also own their creations by signing their names on the canvas. Such possessiveness is indicative of the fact that the Western painter exists not as a part of collective consciousness, but as an individual in quest of unique style. Pamuk recognizes the futility of attempts to claim cultural purity and is impatient with those who insist on cultural isolation as a means of preserving traditions. The murderer, blinded by the fear of Westernization, symbolizes those who try in vain to stabilize identity failing to recognize that cultural identity is a meeting ground for different allegiances embodying "conflicting loyalties" (Maalouf 4). For the murderer, identity is fixed, and any attempt to achieve synthesis will inevitably result in humiliation:

> Had Enishte Efendi's book been completed and sent to them, Venetians masters would have smirked, and their ridicule would have reached the Venetian Doge—that is all. They'd have quipped that the Ottomans have given up being Ottoman and would no longer fear us. (399)

Enishte and other secularists anticipate future controversies. Secularism, explains Anouar Majid, is a worldview that came to existence mainly during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century. Majid defines secularism as the product of thought enlightenment and a classical liberal philosophy whose goal was nothing less than the recalibration and redefinition of human morality to adjust it to a new social calculus that excluded traditional religious commitments (2). Pamuk doesn't condemn religion; indeed, all characters who remain open to change like Enishte, Elegant and Black consider themselves as devout Muslims. They explain their passion not in terms of their desire to become westernized, but as a way to serve to the enrichment of Eastern art. They all support the idea of adopting new

forms to enhance Eastern traditions. The opposition between liberals and conservatives is the result of a discrepancy between how liberals view themselves and how they are viewed by conservatives. In effect, both groups are disoriented. Both resemble the modern disoriented Muslim, who has "the impression of living in a foreign, hostile, indecipherable universe" (Hawley 4). Pamuk feels that a society which is governed by the strict dictates of religion in its affairs with the rest of the world will always disorient its citizens. Pamuk's secular view aims to create an understanding that emphasizes the separation of religion from politics as well as the separation of politics from art—not because art should be immune to political conviction, but because art is too precious to be politicized by various interest groups.

As long as Muslims have a disoriented view of their relationship with the rest of the world and continue to struggle against the forces of globalization, they will remain in stasis and their will only carry meaning by the degree of radicalism they display against an unnecessary enemy they construct in their mind; thus, the murderer can justify his actions by hostility to the West: "For me, having a style would be worse than being a murderer" (375). Pamuk makes a clear distinction between assimilation and secularism. For him, Western values and institutions without questioning their validity is an act of assimilation that does not benefit the cultural traditions of the Turks. The novel presents change as an inevitable condition of modernity. The miniatures artists start getting news from the bordering provinces which testifies that "in Mashhad and Aleppo, many miniaturists had abandoned working on books and begun making odd single-leaf pictures—curiosities that would please European travelers—even obscene drawings" (23). This change signals that despite the efforts of conservatives, art recognizes no cultural borders; it cannot be isolated. Art is an eclectic form of expression that cannot have a specific orientation. This novel allows Pamuk to employ a traditional East-West binary to talk about the differences between Eastern and Western art. Pamuk uses orientalism to emphasize the struggle between the possible ways of

constructing as Ottoman identity. By opposing liberals with radicals, he creates a context to discuss questions about the relationship between disoriented Muslims who fear change and their counterparts. Though the author initially utilizes an East-West binary as a strategy, his purpose is not to present this binary as an inherent opposition between cultures, but to argue that it is imperative to bring an end to the contention created by each group's misguided visions of each other in order to learn how to coexist without giving way to violence.

The discrepancy between Eastern and Western artistic representation illuminates the crisis of identity that the Ottoman suffered and bequeathed to modern Turkey. Pamuk ends his novel by saluting the fact the young "artists painted neither like Easterner nor Westerners."(411). *My Name is Red* clearly criticizes the fundamentalist position that cultural exchange cannot and should not cling to purity. It is Pamuk's contention that the diffusion of different values and perceptions should be viewed as a triumph rather than a loss.

Chapter IV

Conclusion: Resolution of Cultural Tensions

Pamuk's novels *Snow* and *My Name is Red* reflect the cultural tensions between the secularists and the Islamists in Turkey. Within the framework of this thesis and the works of Orhan Pamuk the definition of identity is not limited to an individual or national identity but connects with a variety of concepts that have conventionally figured in metaphysical contrasting pairs such as original/duplicate, same/different, word/image, facts /fiction. Pamuk does not aim to reverse these hierarchies so that dislocation gains privilege over original or multiplicity is idealized over singularity. Nor does he suggest that these categories are interchangeable so that the other can replace the self or that the image can take the place of the word. What he is doing, instead, is to entangle the definition of these categories as representations of an original and ideal meaning. For Pamuk the definition of identity, rather than aiming to reach closure, is made possible as displacement. It is characterized by confusion or loss of identity brought on its part by the conflict between European and Islam.

In each reference, Pamuk tries to create a balance between both Islamic ideology and Western view of life but he is more Westerner than the Muslim, or more generally–Western and Eastern values. It is through with discussion and fascination of creative arts, such as literature and painting and the global impact, Pamuk’s work often touches on the deep rooted tensions between East and West and traditional and Modernism/ Secularism. Pamuk not only depicted how Turkey has been badly affected by the conflict between Islamism and secularism but also appeals for amalgamation of these opposing social, cultural, and religious perspectives by developing his writing with narrative frame work of cultural hybridity. Pamuk has taken a stand that the national identity can be preserved without violating individual liberty and freedom because he argues that conflict between the brother and

brotherhood is unnecessary and unwanted. By entangling the both Islam and secularism Turkish can have new cultural identity which maintains religious harmony and brotherhood sentiments. The opposition between modernity and tradition, frantic Westernization and cultural purism, lies at the heart of the many struggles and obscure powers depicted by Pamuk in his novels. In terms of saying Islamization, the author appeals to say 'coming to terms with Islamic culture', not seeing all aspects as a negative thing, but accepting its peculiarities. Pamuk's argument is quite reasonable as secularism that has to be defended by repressing the conservatives/Islamists with the use of power, army, the military coup, the martial law, etc. reveals the narrow definition of secularism which cannot convince the Turks that they are living in democracy. Pamuk wrote *Snow* and *My Name is Red* with the projection that political Islam might one day come into power. Through these novels, Pamuk seems to be indifferent to hard-core fundamentalist like Blue, but he wants the readers to have at least a sense of a radical Islamist's point of view.

From the political perspective, secularism came to be defined with reference to power relations between the majority and the minority. When the minorities feel threatened, they protect their religious identity in political terms. Political secularism thus does not necessarily negate the religion, rather it stresses on religious freedom as a basic right. From cultural perspective secularism is perceived as diversity and pluralism. The Islamists oppose this aspect of secularism as well because for them Islamization also means cultural unification and centralization. If one is hampering other’s freedom using power, it is certainly nasty that heralds social conflict and contradiction. That's the reason the essence and emergence of cultural hybridity is stated as a reliable theoretical tool to entangle Eastern and Western worldviews, Islamism and secularism through the work of art in Pamuk's novels.

Work-cited

Ahıska, Meltem. 'Occidentalism: The Historical Fantasy of the Modern' in The South Atlantic Quarterly. Vol. 102, No. 2/3, Spring/Summer, (2003):351- 379. Print.

Ahmed, Akbar S. *Postmodernism and Islam: Predicament and Promise*. London: Routledge, 2000. Print.

Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin, Ed. *The Empire Writes Back*: *Theory and Practice in Post-colonial Studies Reader*. London: Routledge, 1989. Print.

Atwood, Margaret. "Headscarves to Die For." *New York Times*. New York. 15 August 2004. Web. 13 May 2009.

Bayrakceken, Aylin, and Don Randall. "Meetings of East and West: Orhan Pamuk's Istanbulite Perspective." *Critique* 46.3 (2005): 191–204. Print.

Bhabha, Homi K. "Interview with Homi Bhabha". *Identity. Community, Culture, Difference*. ed. Jonathan Rutherford. London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1990. 207- 221. Print.

---. *Location of Culture.* London: Routledge, 1994. Print.

---."Narrating the Nation." *Nation and Narration*. Ed. Homi Bhabha. New York: Routledge, 1990. Print.

Bhaktin, Mikhail. *The Dialogic Imagination*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981. Print.

Casanova, Jose. *Public Religions in the Modern World*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1994. Print.

Coury, David N. "Torn Country": Turkey and the West in Orhan Pamuk's Snow". Critique: Studies in Contemporary Fiction. Heldref Publication, Summer.2009: 340-349 Print.

Deleuze, Gilles and Felix Guattari. Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia. Trans. Robert Hurley, Mark Seem and Helen R. Lane. 1984. London and New York: Continuum, 2003. Print.

Eder, Richard."Heresies of the Paintbrush" *The New York Times.*2 Sept. 2001: 7007007.

Fanon, Frantz. *The Wretched of the Earth*. New York: Grove Press, 1961. Print.

Feride Cicekoglu, "Pedagogy of Two Ways of Seeing: A Confrontation of Word and Image in

My Name is Red." The Journal of Aesthetic Education 37.3 (2003): 7.

Fuss, D. Essetially Speaking: Feminism, Nature & Difference. New York, Routledge, 1991.

Gabrieli, Francesco. "Apology for Orientalism." MacFie 79-89.

Gerald, Hawting. *The First Dynasty of Islam*: The Umayyad Caliphate AD 661-750. London: New York, Routeledge, 2000. Print.

Göknar, Erdağ. “Orhan Pamuk and the ‘Ottoman’ Theme.” *World Literature Today* 80.6 (2006): 34–37. Print.

Gole, Nilufer. "A Headscarf Affair, a Women's Affair?" The Immanent Frame, blogs. ssrc. Org/tif/2008/02/21/a-headscarf-affair-a-women's-affair/.

Grice, Gorden S. *My Name is Red.* Reviews. *New York Journal of Books.* 30 Nov. 2010. https://www.nyjournalofbooks.com/book-review/my-name-red

Guneli, Gun. "Heresy in Miniature" *The World and I.* 17 Jan. 2002: 227.

Habermas, Jurgen. *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity: Twelve Lectures*. Trans. Frederick G. Lawrence, Cambridge: MIT Press, 1998.

Harraway, Donna. "The Persistence of Vision" *Writings on the Body: Female Embodiment and Feminist Theory.* ed. Katie Conboy, Nadia Medina and Sarah Stanbury. New York: Columbia UP, 1997: 283-96. Print.

Hoogvelt, A. *Globalization and the Postcolonial World*: *The New Political Economy of Development.* Baltimore, John Hopkins University Press, 1997. Print.

Huntington, Samuel P. *The Clash of Civilization and the Remaking of World Order* New York: Simon, 1996. Print.

Irzik, Sibil. "Allegorical Lives: The Public and the Private in the Modern Turkish Novel." *The South Atlantic Quarterly* 102 (Spring-Summer 2001): 551-65. Print.

Knopf, Alfred A. "A Conversation with Orhan Pamuk." The Borzai Reader Online. Random House, 2003. Accessed on 26 July 2009.

Lacan, Jacques. *The Language of the Self*. Trans. Anthony Wilden. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press. 1968. Print.

Lau, Jorg. "Achte auf die Details des Lebens." *Die Zeit*. Zeit Online, 12 Oct. 2005: 46. Web. 13 May 2009.

Levi-Strauss, Claude. *Tristese Tropicques*. Trans. John Russell. New York: Crioterion, 1961.

Maalouf, Amin. *In the Name of Identity:Violence and the Need to Belong.* Trans. Barbara Bray. New York: Arcade, 2000. Print.

Majid, Anouar. "The Muslim World's Colossal Neglect" *Call for Heresy*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007. Print.

Pamuk, Orhan. Interview with Jorg Lau."The Turkish Trauma." *Sign and Sight*, 2005. Web. 18 Mar. 2011.

--- . *My Name is Red*. Trans. Maureen Freely. New York: Knopf, 2004. Print.

---. *Istanbul: Memories and City.* Trans. Maureen Freely. New York: Knopf, 2005.

---. *Snow*. Trans. Maureen Freely. New York: Knopf, 2004.

Parla, Jale. 'The Divided Self of the Eastern Quest' in Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Dergisi. 7 (1979): 201- 214. Print.

Priscilla, Soucek. "Nizami on Painters and Painting" *Islamic Art in the Metropolitan*

Museum of Art, ed. Richard Ettinghausen. New York: 1972:18. Print.

Rutherford, J. (1990). The Third Space: Interview with Homi Bhabha. Identity, Community, Culutre, Difference. J. Rutherford. London, Lawrence and Wishart**:** 207-221. Print.

Ruthven, Malise. *A Satanic Affair*. London: Hogarth, 1991. Print.

Said, Edward. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1993. Print.

--- . Orientalism. New York: Vintage, 1979: 2. Print.

Spivak, Gayatri. *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*. Eds. C. Nelson and L. Grossberg. Basingstoke: MacMillan, 1988: 271-313. Print.

Swedish Academy. "The Nobel Prize in Literature 2006." *Nobelprize.org.* Nobel Foundation,

12 Oct. 2006. Web.13 May 2009.

Tylor, Edward B. *Anthropology: An Introduction to the Study of Man and Civilization,*

London: Macmillan and Co., 1881. Print.

Updike, John. "Anatolian Arabeques: A Modernist Novel of Contemporary Turkey." *The New Yorker*. Condé Nast, 30 Aug. 2004.Web.3 April 2012.

White, Jenny B. *Islamist Mobilization in Turkey: A Study in Vernacular Politics.* Seattle: University of Washington Press. 2002. Print.

Young, Robert. *Colonial Desire. Hybridity in Theory, Culture and Race*. London: Routledge, 1995. Print