

## The Modern in Huxley's *Brave New World* and Tanpınar's *The Time Regulation Institute*

Hilal Kaya\*

**Abstract:** In this study Aldous Leonard Huxley's 1932 *Brave New World* and Ahmet Hamdi Tanpınar's 1962 *The Time Regulation Institute* (*Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü*) are brought together and analyzed in a comparative manner because they indicate a similar conceptualization of the modern that challenges the limits of conventional time and deconstructs the binary oppositions like the past and the present, the progressive and the primitive, and the private and public time. And therefore this study argues that their conceptualization of the modern, which is defined in terms of time, implies that a plural experience of modernity is possible.

**Keywords:** Turkish modernization, Multiple Modernities, A. L. Huxley, A. H. Tanpınar, modern satirical novel

Huxley's 1932 *Brave New World* and Tanpınar's 1962 *The Time Regulation Institute* (*Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü*) can be regarded as two examples of the modern satirical novel. By means of the satirical mode in their novels, both Huxley and Tanpınar foreground their critiques of the idea of the modern that is constructed on the binary oppositions like the West/the East, the modern/the traditional, and the present/the past. To both Huxley and Tanpınar, the space-based explanations of the modern reality bring forth a rupture in the flow of time and dichotomies like the West and the East. To abandon this way of understating the modern reality in their novels however provides Huxley and Tanpınar with an opportunity to find a way to reconnect the rupture in time and attain harmony. Similar to Bergsonian "pure time" (1934, 2) and Eliot's "all time eternally present" (1943, 4), their conceptualization of the 'modern' challenges the limits of conventional time.

---

\* Hilal Kaya (✉)

Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt University, Turkey; The University of Edinburgh (visiting scholar), UK

e-mail: hkaya07@yahoo.com; e-mail: hilal.kaya@ed.ac.uk

Both Huxley and Tanpınar are profoundly concerned with finding ways to heal the breach between the past/the old and the present/the modern. However, there is a significant difference between the reasons they identify for this breach: for Huxley, the breach was caused by the catastrophe of the WWI, capitalism, industrialism and Americanization, and Tanpınar viewed it as a phenomenon mainly brought about by modernization. So, despite their differences in approaching the factors of the rupture, this study will display how, and, if so, to what extent, Tanpınar's understanding of the modern in *The Time Regulation Institute* resembles that of Huxley's in *Brave New World*. It will be argued that in these novels neither the concept of the past nor the present is elevated or idealized. Nor are they treated as mutually exclusive categories. As mentioned, both writers attempt to create ways in which the past may be reconnected with the present so that a sense of harmony can be retrieved, an intuitive, heterogeneous, personal and indivisible conceptualization of time—"pure time"—can be attained, and a third alternative which embraces and reconciles the oppositions between the past/the present, body/spirit, society/culture and the east/the west etc. can be imagined.

In *Brave New World*, the breach in the flow of time, that is, the rupture between the past and the present is emphasized through the use of the counterpoint technique. John the Savage is relocated among the "civilized" people of the World State. Before exploring the climactic discussion scene between the World Controller, Mustapha Mond, and John the Savage, it is necessary to clarify the world views these characters represent. Inspired by the capitalist Henry Ford, Mond represents the dark side of modernity. His World State is founded on the idea that history is nonsense and useless. He despises the entire world history and everything that is associated with the past. Mond views history as the register of the crimes, follies, violence and tragedies of humankind; it is seen as a record of the pre-utopian world as Mond claims that "old men in the bad old days used to renounce, retire, take to religion, spend their time reading, thinking—*thinking*" (Huxley 1932, 49). Getting rid of the past or rendering things as objects and activities belonging to the past makes the World Controller more powerful over the masses that are rendered ignorant and submissive due to the eradication of cultural and historical memory. Without history, it is easier for Mond to change the state into a totalitarian one and control society "for their own good" because Mond, once a prominent free-minded scientist, believes that the

purpose of humankind is happiness and stability, not freedom and thinking. Accordingly, the World State's motto is "Community, Identity and Stability" (Huxley 1932, 1).

In his satirical novels and critical essays Huxley severely criticizes the mass culture and the forms of popular entertainment, vulgarity of the Hollywood movies and commercial music, and hedonistic society since he sees them as responsible for the "existential experience of alienation and despair associated with living in a disenchanting world of deadening and meaningless routine, [...] in a Sisyphean world of repetition devoid of a subjectively meaningful *telos* [purpose]" (Gaonkar 1999, 9). The main question in the novel is whether/how a human being can survive when s/he is provided with only chemical, mechanical and sexual comforts of modernity. To complicate this question more, Huxley depicts the anti-thesis of this question which is embodied by John the Savage. His is a mode of living which is inspired by the works of Shakespeare (and Huxley was inspired by D. H. Lawrence when he created John). John the Savage represents the pre-modern state of being, "primitivism," as his name suggests, and "savagery" as opposed to "civilization" and "progressivism." Brought to the World State by Bernard and Lenina, John the Savage, who is raised in a Reservation by his own mother, witnesses the "modern/civilized" people's mores and deeds, and, out of disillusionment, he regards the World State as bizarre. While Mustapha Mond sees the individual as a non-spiritual entity, an embodiment of neurological and biochemical machinery, John sees him/her as a composite of feelings. What the novel suggests is that neither of the explanations—that of Mond's or John's—is sufficient to define the complicated nature of the human being. Both worlds of the novel are depicted as madhouses. Huxley's novel deconstructs the binary oppositions between progressivism/civilization and primitivism/savagery. The idea that the modern is equal to the civilized or the contemporary is dismantled because *Brave New World* indicates that brave new worlders are the future's savages. The novel condemns the World State and the Savage Reservation as two examples of failed societies. There is stalemate between John the Savage and Mustapha Mond. The stalemate illustrates the fact that humankind cannot "go forward" with Mond's World State which supports material comforts and precludes inspiration, intuition, liberty and creativity, or the fact that humankind cannot go "backward" with John's world, which offers a less artificial life but puts restraints on its people by limiting them

through religious and social rituals and prejudices. That is, Huxley aims to dismantle the meanings imposed on the terms of “going forward and backward,” and for this reason, the boundary between these terms is blurred and he presents a stalemate between them. Huxley ends their debate in a draw. It is a choice between “insanity on the one hand and lunacy on the other,” as Huxley himself put in the “Foreword” of the novel written in 1946. Here, Huxley emphasizes the fact that there is no difference between the insanity of the World State and the lunacy of the Reservation.

Seeing the dark side of the Western experiences of modernity in the early thirties, Huxley seems to begin deviating from his temporal and spatial formulations of modernity which previously, in *Point Counter Point* (1928) for instance, made him formulate time as a linear, progressive movement from the past to the future, and modernity as moving from the West to the East. He criticizes the spatialization of time by stating that “time is unbearable. To make it bearable, men transform it into something that is not time, something that has qualities of space [...] Time has been spatialized to its extreme limit” (Huxley 1934, 214; 221). With this critical attitude towards his own earlier conceptualizations of modernity in terms of time and space, it can be claimed that Huxley developed a new perception of both time and space, which consequently defines his new approach to the modern: in *Brave New World* Huxley places the World Controller Mustapha Mond, the representative of the dark side of the Western societal modernization, opposed to John the Savage, the symbol of the pre-modern and tradition in order to challenge and criticize the liberal tradition of modernity’s tendency of defining the modern in terms of the west and the pre-modern in terms of the east. So, it can be argued that Huxley whose earlier writing, such as *Jesting Pilate* (1926), illustrates his critique of Eastern religiosity comes to emphasize in *Brave New World* that unrestricted materialism in the West, which he likens to the unrestricted power of religious leaders in the East, eventually leads to the loss of freedom and creativity. Therefore, it seems that *Brave New World* advocates a new kind of direction, a third alternative, which is embodied by Helmholtz Watson, who unites intellectual motives of both Mustapha Mond and John the Savage.

Helmholtz Watson is a figure combining the philosophies represented by the Procrustean philosopher Mustapha Mond and the primitivism-admirer John the Savage. “Helmholtz Watson discovers a path between the utopian and primitive horns” (Meckier 1979, 150); it

is a path which contains both going “forward” and “backward” and “inward” simultaneously. As a person who is interested in both beauty and harsh reality, manifested through his artistic drives and instincts, Helmholtz is exiled. He readily chooses an island with a bad climate, the Falkland Islands, because he believes that “one would write better if the climate were bad. If there were a lot of wind and storms, for example ...” (Huxley 1932, 209) His decision to live on an island and to have a life full of contemplation and artistic creation imply his further maturation. Huxley pinpoints an idea, which he deals with more in the following works like *Time Must Have a Stop* (1944) and *The Perennial Philosophy* (1945) that the ideal life is not defined in terms of space, but it resides inside people. “Helmholtz Watson emerges from his conditioning, as he liberates and reconditions himself” (Meckier 1979, 151).

With such an argument, Huxley’s novel opens itself for a reading of a reconfiguration of the modern defined in terms of time rather than space. The society of the brave new world seems to live in a frozen future time, while the people in the Reservation are seen as backward in time by the World State. In this binary opposition, Helmholtz stands for the hope to set both groups of people free from their loop because he has the potential to be an individual who can lead a mode of existence which contains both the past and present, and transcends these categorizations of time and creates a third alternative. In other words, *Brave New World* suggests that the problem of breach/rupture/dichotomy is solved by opening and widening the concept of time so large that it is able to accommodate both the traditionally-defined concepts of the past and those of the future. Huxley’s reconfiguration of the modern indicates the denial of binary oppositions and the prioritization of the concept of time, and in this respect it implies that Huxley after *Brave New World* abandoned his tendency to formulate the modern in Eurocentric terms and it paved the way for a new understanding of the modern that embraces plural experiences of modernity.

From the perspective explored above, we can now move on to Tanpinar’s understanding of time, which is instrumental for him to formulate his idea of the modern both in *A Mind at Peace* and in his satirical novel *The Time Regulation Institute*. Tanpinar’s interest in the concept of time is more evident than Huxley’s in that Tanpinar explicitly experiments with the notion of time in terms of an attempt of saving life from being the fool of mathematical time; that is, a dull life

regulated according to an understanding of modernity which is constructed upon a specific time perception, mathematical or clock-time which brings about the experiences of fragmentation, transitoriness, and loss of stable ground. Thus, Tanpınar investigates the impact of the experience of modernity on temporality. Tanpınar's interest in time, as mentioned before, can be traced both in his novels and poetry, particularly his poems, "Neither am I inside Time" ("Ne İçindeyim Zamanın" 1961) and "Time in Bursa" ("Bursa'da Zaman" 1961) and his novels, *Song in Mahur* (*Mahur Beste* [1944] posthumously 1975) and *A Mind at Peace* (*Huzur* 1949) and *The Time Regulation Institute* (*Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü* 1962). This part of the study aims to explore the traces of Tanpınar's conceptualization of the modern in *The Time Regulation Institute* in terms of time.

Tanpınar's discontent with the Turkish experience of modernity and modernization stems from what he sees as cultural cancellation or a cultural non-specificity as a consequence of a rupture in temporality. In other words, he reads modernity as experienced in Turkey in terms of time. In spite of the similarities between Huxley and Tanpınar regarding their approach to the concept of time, as it will be elaborated more, Tanpınar's *The Time Regulation Institute* foregrounds the significance of cultural specificities in his formulation of the modern.

According to some scholars, prior to Tanpınar several literary people failed in producing assessments which were substantial enough to shed light on the complexities of the Turkish experience of modernization. Their works are often regarded as simplistic analyses of modernity as they either heartily supported Westernization or completely rejected it. Hikmet Kocamaner argues that "while, like his predecessors and contemporaries, Tanpınar also reflected upon the incongruities between Western institutions and values and the Ottoman/Turkish ones, his critique was not limited to this specific analysis restricted by a geo-cultural distinction between the East and the West" (2009, 2). For Tanpınar, trying to make a preference between Western and Ottoman/Turkish values and institutions is simply a deficiency in thinking. He does not explore the modern in terms of binaries set between the West and the East; the present and the past; or the forward and the backward. Tanpınar's critique of the modern in *The Time Regulation Institute* contributes to the critical studies on modernity in that it aims to show that modernity is global and multiple lacking a governing center. Tanpınar's critique of modernity, at the same time, provincializes the Western discourse on

modernity by “thinking through and against its self-understanding” (Gaonkar 1999, 15). In this respect, it is a dialectic thinking focusing on both similarities and differences, and particularly, thinking in terms of differences destabilizes the universalist claims of modernity and pluralizes the experience of it. Therefore, Tanpınar formulates a way to examine modernity with a culture-specific reading. Dilip Parameshwar Gaonkar stresses the importance of a culture-specific reading of the modern as follows: “A cultural theory [...] holds that modernity always unfolds within a specific cultural or civilizational context and that different starting points for the transition to modernity lead to different outcomes. [...] Different starting points ensure that new differences will emerge in response to relatively similar changes [material changes and institutional arrangements]. [...] In short, modernity is not one, but many” (1999, 17). What many Turkish writers and politicians, until Tanpınar, could not see is this trait of modernity, that is, its multifaceted-ness according to the different starting points in the world. In *The Time Regulation Institute*, Tanpınar reveals his discontent with the process of modernization in Turkey through his depiction of an imaginary institution, the Time Regulation Institute, which imposes its own concept of time, mathematical time, and intrudes into and regulates individuals’ lives. The concept of time represented by the time regulation institute can be defined as mathematical time upon which the project of modernization in Turkey was constructed. This conceptualization of time works according to a rationale—instrumental rationality—that regards people as means to gain economic profits. Seeing from this perspective, Halit the Regulator claims that their mission is very important in that it is a social duty because they “teach people that establishing a relation with time and hours is the very consciousness of time. [This is why] our institute had been established. We are involved with a social issue. We are here to perform a service” (Tanpınar 1962, 221). Halit the Regulator assumes that their institution is beneficial and meets a social need: “laborers, unqualified workers, clerical employees are more fastidious with regard to punctuality. So are the teachers. [...] Time for them is valuable, but it is not for others who lack the concept of time” (Tanpınar 1962, 220). That is, as Halit the Regulator sees it, time regulation, this concept of time, helps both people and the nation develop economically. As a utilitarian and capitalistic man, he maintains that “if Newton had examined the apple which fell on his head in its properties as a fruit, he might well have thrown it away,

seeing that it was spoiled. But he acted differently. He asked himself how he could *benefit* from this apple. ‘What highest benefit can I derive?’ he said to himself. Do as he did” (Tanpınar 1962, 203). Such an understanding of time is a trait of the progressivist narrative of modernity in Turkey. To him, the institute is a public good which saves each and every useful millisecond from slipping through citizens’ fingers. As in *Brave New World*, Hayri thus states that “modern life encourages us to keep away from the idea of dying” (Tanpınar 1962, 204) and, one can add here, solitude, because solitude is a state in which one can think, work and feel without the intrusion of the instruments of modern life. Likewise, in *Brave New World* citizens of the World State are not allowed to have solitude because according to the World Controller it is dangerous due to two reasons: solitude both prevents people from contributing to the consumption of the standardized goods and leads people to think/feel and distort “the stability” of society. Therefore, modern life deems solitude a threat to itself since solitude is related to “pure time,” “intuition” and, in Tanpınar’s words, “inner man” (1970, 24). So, Hayri declares the institute one of the greatest, most innovative, important and beneficial organizations of the era. The tendency of regarding mathematical time as a necessity of the modern age through which modern societies regulate their practices and people’s inclination to neglect or even ignore pure time are the main issues the novel is harshly critical of.

Manifesting itself in both behavioral and psychological spheres of the individual, the sense of absurd (*abes*) is embroidered in every moment of *The Time Regulation Institute* to pinpoint the inconsistencies of Turkish people who experience the project of modernization. The absurd is the emotion that dominates the whole novel. At the beginning of the novel, when Hayri’s daughter was born, Abdüsselam Bey mis-names her Zehra (Abdüsselam’s own mother’s name), while meaning to name her Zahide (Hayri’s mother’s name). Hayri observes that “the chain of disasters that followed one another began with this absurd error” (Tanpınar 1962, 93). Thus, satire in the novel is created through a series of absurdities, which develop in an unexpected and comic direction and become more complicated. As another absurd moment in the novel, the story of the Sherbet Maker’s Diamond can be given as an example: after Hayri is married off to Emine, they start to live in Abdüsselam Bey’s mansion, and after Abdüsselam’s death, people start rumors that Hayri owns the Sherbet Maker’s Diamond, which in reality does not exist. Yet, things get more

complicated and Hayri is called to court because he is accused of stealing the Diamond. After that, he is sent to the Forensic Medicine Institute because of losing his temper in the court and people think that he has mental problems. Hayri hence meets Dr. Ramiz, who later introduces Hayri to Halit the Regulator. As a result of an innocent joke Hayri told to people about the existence of a diamond (Tanpınar 1962, 98), the unexpected series of events develop, become more complicated and reach an absurdity in the novel. This absurd moment in Hayri's life story represents the absurdity of the modernization project carried out in Turkey because the novel suggests that the major underlying reason of all absurdities is related to the logic of the modernization project carried out in Turkey. The absurdities in Hayri's life both parallel and become the ramifications of the absurdities emerging due to the modernization project.

The novel reflects two different attitudes to modernity in Turkey through two characters whose understandings of time differ radically: Nuri Efendi and Halit the Regulator. Hayri himself emphasizes their remarkable roles in his life as follows: "Nuri Efendi and Halit the Regulator were the two poles around whom my life revolved" (Tanpınar 1962, 50). To begin with, Nuri Efendi represents the spiritual and philosophical interpretation of time in Turkey before westernization begins. Nuri Efendi is a time setter (*muvakkit*) whose duty is to determine the time of prayer. Hayri emphasizes the importance of time in the life of Muslims in Turkey: "prayers five times a day, breaking fasts during Ramadan, meals taken before dawn, and other prayers depended on the time indicated by watches and clocks" (Tanpınar 1962, 42). The relationship between Muslim Turkish people and time is defined in terms of a close harmony between their daily routines and spiritual life: "The ticktock they heard had nearly the same evocative power as the water running at the fountain for ablutions in the courtyard of a mosque, and echoed the voice of sublime and eternal beliefs. The ticktocks' properties were *sui generis*, and expanded in both dimensions of life. While on the one hand it arranged your daily affairs and duties, on the other hand it opened the immaculate and smooth paths that led to the eternal bliss of which one was in pursuit" (Tanpınar 1962, 42). This passage can be analyzed in the light of both the Sufi understanding of time and Bergson's conceptualization of time as a transcendental way of experience that cannot be constrained by the mathematical and homogenous time. As mentioned before, Bergsonian and Sufi

formulations of time, described in terms of *durée* and intuition, have influenced Tanpınar's conceptualization of personal and intuitive time. Particularly, the words in the quotation above such as, "evocative," "echo," "sublime," "eternal," "immaculate," and "bliss," all uncover his understanding of time as duration. All these terms are attached with intuitive pure time because they, like pure time, challenge the liberal tradition of modernity's conventional understanding of time and its universalist claims by providing a transcendental way of experience. Therefore, pure time makes a culture-specific understanding of the modern possible as it prioritizes plurality and heterogeneity over uniformity and standardization. Tanpınar's description of ticktocks in the intuitive concept of time, or "pure time" in Bergson's term (1934, 2) is situated against the mathematical, homogenous and spatial conceptualizations of clock-time which divides and regiments time in the forms of quantifiable symbols, like calendars or clocks, or numbers. Likewise, the Sufi understanding of time, which essentializes the intuitive experience, enables one to comprehend the relative nature of reality. Also, as mentioned in Tanpınar's *Five Cities* ([*Beş Şehir*] 1946), the personal, intuitive and heterogeneous conceptualization of time is taken as "another time right next to the one in which we live, laugh, enjoy ourselves, work, and make love—a time much different, a lot deeper, one that has no relation to the calendar and the clock" (1987, 80). Having awareness not only of mathematical time but of intuitive conceptualization of time, Tanpınar prefers the experience of the latter because, to him, the intuitive time exists in another dimension or in "the extra-spatial realm" (Birlik 2007, 176). In this respect, one can argue that the ticktocks of the intuitive time do not make the individual feel chased by the hour and second hands or entrapped within the modern life.

Nuri Efendi deems time-adjusting important for two reasons in that it first regulates one's sense of spiritual life and then gives him/her a schedule for work and productivity. This second function of time-setting attracts Halit the Regulator's attention because he is described as a materialistic man who knows how to manipulate people with words. He is bothered by the clocks and watches in İstanbul which are either unadjusted or out of order. Halit the Regulator represents a utilitarian and capitalistic mentality in that time is defined in terms of money. And with this motivation, he decides to found the Institution to regulate all the clocks and watches in İstanbul and then in the entire country in order to ensure that all citizens have a persistent sense of

time. The same idea is also emphasized by Kocamaner when he states that “the motive for Halit the Regulator to establish the Time Regulation Institute is the reorganization and synchronization of labor to remedy this self-destructive tendency in Turkish economic life caused by the ill-set clocks of the citizens of the newly founded Republic” (2009, 12). His materialistic attitude to time and the modern is also evident in his use of slogans for the Institute, such as “common time is joint work” and “the way to well-being runs through a sound understanding of time” (Tanpınar 1962, 207). At this point, one can point out the similar messages of the slogans produced in Tanpınar’s novel and that of Huxley’s. Both novels use similar slogans, which mainly prioritize the idea of instrumental reason, progress and civilization, community and stability over the individual.

One slogan in Huxley’s novel, “ending is better than mending” (1932, 43), with its emphasis on the activity of “ending,” makes one remember the idea of creating rupture in the conceptualization of time, which is an issue both Huxley’s and Tanpınar’s novels explore. In *Brave New World*, one can argue that Mustapha Mond, who sees history and the past as obsolete, in fact fears the disruptive nature of time: he sees time as a phenomenon flowing in a linear and sequential movement, so for him time needs to be carefully regulated and controlled. Therefore, the activity of “ending” in *Brave New World* refers to Mond’s desire of ending history and freezing temporality. To Mond, ending history indicates rendering the progress irrelevant in the World State. In this sense, Mond’s principal aim of controlling time in a new era reminds one of the subjects of time regulation in Tanpınar’s novel. Both novels hence attract attention to the time regulation as a tool in the hands of totalitarian states to accomplish their endeavors of controlling their citizens. By creating a rupture in the conceptualization of time and regulating time, technocrats, such as Mond and Halit the Regulator, would like to force humanity to alter its conceptualization and experience of time. The technological dominance of time provides technocrats with the power of manipulating temporal experience and ending the historical process.

Modern life, in the late periods of the Ottoman Empire and the early periods of Turkey, was founded on a new concept of time which aimed to regulate the individual according to the needs of modern life by orchestrating life by means of standardization and uniformity. The modern time, or the sense of a homogenous temporality, helped the state-building elites of the Republic create the modern Turkish subject

belonging to a national community and sharing a common sense of temporality. Thus, the nation building can be seen as a modern compulsion related to political, economic and social causes as theorized by Benedict Anderson in *Imagined Communities* (1983). He defines the nation as an “imagined political community—and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign” (1983, 6). To explain his definition, Anderson first asserts that “the nation is *imaginary* because members [...] will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion” (1983, 6). Later he states that “the nation is *limited* because even the largest [...] has finite, if elastic, boundaries, beyond which lie other nations” (1983, 7). The members of a national community imagine the existence of boundaries and this suggests that they recognize the existence of separation by culture, ethnicity, and social structure among humankind. As another point, he argues that “the nation is imagined as *sovereign* because the concept was born in an age in which Enlightenment and Revolution were destroying the legitimacy of the divinely-ordained, hierarchical dynastic realm [...] nations dream of being free, and, if under God, directly so” (1983, 7). The sovereign state, therefore, can be the symbol of freedom from traditional religious structures and it provides the sense of organization that does not rely on the weakening religious hierarchies. Anderson also contends that “the nation is imagined as a *community* because it is always conceived as a deep, horizontal comradeship” (1983, 7). So, this imagined alliance among people of the same imagined nation makes people willingly die to sacrifice themselves for the nation. Also, Anderson establishes a connection between the emergence of the notion of homogenous empty time and the nation, that is, he argues that it became possible to imagine the nation via the notion of “homogenous empty time” (1983, 24). Anderson’s definition of the nation does not fail to explain the nation-building process Turkey has gone through: after the loss of the Empire and with the emergence of homogeneous empty time and print-languages, the nationalist consciousness emerged and the nation came to be used as a discourse in Turkey. Anderson states about Turkey’s nationalism that “to heighten Turkish—Turkey’s national consciousness at the expense of any wider Islamic identification, Atatürk imposed compulsory Romanization [...] thereby hoped to align Turkish nationalism with the modern, romanized civilization of Western Europe” (1983, 45-6). Within the discourse of nation in Turkey, the ruling classes, along with

“compulsory romanization,” adopted a new comprehension of time which is homogeneous empty time, and so claimed that Turkish nation can move calendrically through this new time. The modern time hence became a political, economic and social tool within the modernization project carried out in Turkey to build both the discourse of nation and the national consciousness.

Tanpınar conceives modernization in Turkey as a project based on a temporal rupture and/or created by the spatialization of time—that is, identifying “the modern” and “the pre/non-modern” with specific geographical places—in order to found a new nation on the ashes of the Ottoman Empire. The novel suggests that the modernization project of Turkey brought about a temporal rupture and two perceptions of time: private and public. While the private time is identified with the “traditional,” “old” and “Eastern” which is represented by Nuri Efendi, the public time is associated with the modern time and its representative is Halit the Regulator. Tanpınar, who conceptualizes time as a monolithic entity and never aims to favor one dimension of time over the other, aims to remind the reader in *The Time Regulation Institute* of the fact that there is this private dimension of time, the intuitive and pure time, which is flowing next to the mathematical time. And he engages with this dimension of time, pure time, by means of two symbols in the novel: a clock, namely, the Blessed One and the world of the coffeehouse at Şehzadebaşı. Firstly, the clock at Hayri’s childhood house, the Blessed One, is attributed some supernatural features, yet what makes it unique is something else, which is described by Hayri as follows: this clock admitted no regulation, no setting, and no repair. It was the impersonation of a special time out of the sphere of man. Sometimes it would abruptly start to strike, and a long time would elapse before it stopped” (Tanpınar 1962, 44-5). Hayri establishes a relation between the Blessed One and pure time/the intuitive private time because, as implied in the quotation, this clock resists conforming to the rules enforced by mathematical time/the public time. Similarly, Kocamaner too argues that “this clock represents a spiritual or an intuitive perception of time akin to Bergsonian *la durée* (duration), which refers to the ‘uninterrupted transition, multiplicity without divisibility and succession without separation’ [*Duration and Simultaneity* 30]” (2009, 19).

The coffeehouse at Şehzadebaşı, is another symbol through which Tanpınar presents how Turkish people are engaged with the pure

time/private time. Although visitors of this coffeehouse are presented as they are constantly fooling around with some strange activities, for instance, trying to summon spirits, they stand for the Turkish society which is metaphorically stuck between before and after the *Tanzimat*. Bombarded by both past and present realities, the coffeehouse goers try to cope with the modernization crisis by socializing there. For many critics of the novel, like Moran, Kutlu and Ayvazoğlu, the frequenters of the coffeehouse are the “embodiments of the absurd; they are “idlers” who immerse in “collective dreams” (Tanpınar 1962, 131) Agreeing with the main arguments of these critics about the state of the coffeehouse goers, I also argue that Tanpınar’s depiction of the world of the coffeehouse complicates the issue of idleness. Here I would like to emphasize that Tanpınar depicts a world of coffeehouse in his novel to emphasize its function as a way of escape or a shelter where one can take a break from the reality shaped by the modernization project carried out in Turkey. It is like a world of magic, a playground for “idle” dreamers. Idleness attributed to these people at the coffeehouse is a feature which belongs to a reasoning that qualifies people according to their productivity and usefulness. Bertrand Russell argues that “I want to say, in all seriousness, that a great deal of harm is being done in the modern world by belief in the virtuousness of work, and that the road to happiness and prosperity lies in an organized diminution of work” (1935, 3). This idea which uses public propaganda required to inaugurate the work discipline preaches working and condemns idleness. Here, by idleness Russell does not refer to the comfortable laziness, as in the case of the land owners in the feudal Europe. Tanpınar thinks like Russell and has a positive attitude to the idea of leisure which helps individuals improve emotionally, spiritually and intellectually. In this regard, it can be asserted that the coffeehouse frequenters, despite their various motivations, go to the coffeehouse and socialize and by means of these conversations and activities at the coffeehouse they feel they are getting in touch with the collective consciousness and their “authentic selves” in Martin Heidegger’s term (1927, 276). Hayri’s observations of the life at the coffeehouse foreground the points related to the idleness, the transformation into a magical world and having collective dreams. In the imaginative world of the coffeehouse its visitors are dreaming collectively about experiencing the pure time, which, they believe, will liberate them from the bondage of the modern mundane.

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

To conclude this study, it can be argued that both Huxley's *Brave New World* and Tanpınar's *The Time Regulation Institute* are examples of the modern satirical novel. Huxley's critique of the totalizing claims of reason, science and the instrumental rationality in *Brave New World* is a way in which he engaged in the question of modernity: by the time he wrote this novel, he had become increasingly critical of Western modernity as failing to justify Enlightenment reason; therefore, he criticized some of the outcomes of modernity; to put it more specifically, the misuse of science, instrumental rationality and the Enlightenment faith in universalism. In the same manner, Tanpınar's novel is critical of the institutes, organizations, agencies and the system of bureaucracy established during and as a part of the modernization project of Turkey. Turkish modernization, as suggested by *The Time Regulation Institute*, is not a process of linear progress but a more complex process including alienation of individuals and displacement of identities. From this perspective, *The Time Regulation Institute* is a novel which reminds us of the significance of the idea of Multiple Modernities and the idiosyncratic characteristics and complexities of Turkish modernization—which is by nature heterogeneous. This comparative study reveals that Huxley's and Tanpınar's discontent with modernity as exposed in *Brave New World* and *The Time Regulation Institute* show close resemblances especially in terms of both novels' critiquing the formulation of time in the liberal vision of modernity and their deeming modernity or modernization based on this vision as a rupture. The modern as experienced in "the West" is a point both novels satirize because, as the novels take it, the Western modernity is based on an instrumental view of human beings as things to be manipulated. Therefore, the study contends that in spite of all historical and cultural specificities that distinguish *Brave New World* from *The Time Regulation Institute*, Tanpınar's novel enters into a dialogue with Huxley's novel in relation to their critique of the bureaucratic, rational and technological state which posits itself as a threat to life by rendering human beings as mere tools. Their formulations of the modern that inform their novels are similar since

they challenge the limits of conventional time and deconstruct the binaries between “the West” and “the East”: the novels, in other words, propose that multiple experiences of modernity are possible.

### REFERENCES:

- Anderson, Benedict. 1983. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London and New York: Verso.
- Bergson, Henri. 1999. *Duration and Simultaneity: Bergson and the Einsteinian Universe. (Durée et simultanéité. À propos de la théorie d'Einstein [1922])*. Manchester: Clinamen Press Ltd.
- Bergson, Henri. 1946. *The Creative Mind: An Introduction to Metaphysics. (La Pensée et le Mouvant [1934])*. New York: Kensington Publishing Corp.
- Birlik, Nurten. 2007. Tanpınar’s attempts to go beyond temporal reality: ‘The Dance’, a Bergsonian analysis. *Middle Eastern Literatures*. Volume 10, Issue 2: 175-183.
- Eliot, T. S. 1943. “Burnt Norton” in *Four Quartets*. California: Harcourt.
- Gaonkar, Dilip Parameshwar. 1999. “On Alternative Modernities”. *Public Culture*. Volume 11, Number 1: Issue 27, winter.
- Heidegger, Martin. 1962. *Being and Time. (Sein und Zeit [1927])*. Translated by J. Macquarrie and E. Robinson. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Huxley, Aldous Leonard. 1926. *Jesting Pilate: The Diary of a Journey*. London: Chatto Windus.
- Huxley, Aldous Leonard. 1928. *Point Counter Point*. London: Modern Library.
- Huxley, Aldous Leonard. 1932. *Brave New World*. London: Chatto Windus.
- Huxley, Aldous Leonard. 1934. *Beyond the Mexique Bay: A Traveler’s Journey*. London: Chatto Windus.
- Kocamaner, Hikmet. 2009. Reconfiguring Modernity through Time: A. H. Tanpınar’s *The Time Regulation Institute*. [https://www.academia.edu/5645809/Reconfiguring\\_Modernity\\_Through\\_Time-\\_A.\\_H.\\_Tanpinars\\_The\\_Time\\_Regulation\\_Institute](https://www.academia.edu/5645809/Reconfiguring_Modernity_Through_Time-_A._H._Tanpinars_The_Time_Regulation_Institute)
- Meckier, Jerome. 1979. Debunking our Ford: My Life and Work and *Brave New World*. *South Atlantic Quarterly*, 78: 448-59.
- Russell, Bertrand. 1935. *In Praise of Idleness and Other Essays*. New South Wales: George Allen & Unwin.
- Tanpınar, Ahmet Hamdi. 1962 (2001). *The Time Regulation Institute. (Saatleri Ayarlama Enstitüsü)*. Trans. Ender Gürol. Madison, USA: Turco-Tatar Press.
- Tanpınar, Ahmet Hamdi. 1970. *As I Lived [Yaşadığım Gibi]*. Prep. Birol Emil. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları.
- Tanpınar, Ahmet Hamdi. 1987. *Five Cities [Beş Şehir]*. İstanbul: Dergah Yayınları.