

THE OUTSIDERS AS REFLECTED IN THE NOVELS OF ALBERT
CAMUS, JOHN WAIN AND YUSUF ATILGAN

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

BY

HATİCE BAY

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LITERATURE

DECEMBER 2008

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Sencer Ayata
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

Prof. Dr. Wolf König
Head of Department

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

Prof. Dr. Ayten Coskunoglu Bear
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Assist. Prof. Dr. Nil Korkut (BAŞKENT, AKE) _____

Prof. Dr. Ayten Coskunoglu Bear (METU, ELIT) _____

Dr. Deniz Arslan (METU, ELIT) _____

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

Name, Last name : Hatice Bay
Signature :

ABSTRACT

THE OUTSIDERS AS REFLECTED IN THE NOVELS OF ALBERT CAMUS, JOHN WAIN AND YUSUF ATILGAN

Bay, Hatice

M. A., Department of English Literature

Supervisor, Prof. Dr. Ayten Coşkunoğlu Bear

December 2008, 75 pages

This thesis studies the alienated characters of Albert Camus's *The Outsider*, John Wain's *Hurry On Down* and Yusuf Atılgan's *Aylak Adam*, respectively. It argues that each of the protagonists of these novels experiences alienation. That is, Camus's character is an alienated man because he has the characteristics of an absurd man; Wain's character is an estranged man due to his social discontentment and Atılgan's C. is an outsider owing to his psychological problems. The works are analyzed with philosophical, social and psychological foundations consisting of Camus's absurd worldview for Meursault; the social and cultural aspects of Britain in the 1950s for Charles Lumley and Sigmund Freud's psychological theories for C. Although the reasons that make these protagonists alienated differ, they mainly share similar attitudes towards their fellowmen, social conventions and metaphysical issues in some cases. Thus, through the analyses of the protagonists, the study discloses how these outsiders occupied a major place in the existential, social and psychological spheres of life in the twentieth century and became a universal source for the writers who came from different cultural, intellectual and historical backgrounds. This thesis has been written in order to contribute to the problem of outsidership, which has been of great significance in the twentieth century European Literature.

Keywords: Alienation, the Absurd, outsider, individual

ÖZ

ALBERT CAMUS, JOHN WAIN VE YUSUF ATILGAN'IN ROMANLARINDAKİ “YABANCILAŞMIŞ” KARAKTERLER

Bay, Hatice

Master, İngiliz Edebiyatı Bölümü

Danışman: Prof. Dr. Ayten Coskunoglu Bear

Aralık 2008, 75 sayfa

Bu tez, Albert Camus'nün *The Outsider*, John Wain'in *Hurry On Down* ve Yusuf Atılgan'ın *Aylak Adam* romanlarındaki başkahramanları incelemektedir ve her bir roman kahramanının “yabancılaşmış” bir karakter olduğunu ileri sürmektedir. Yani, Camus'nün Meursault'su “yabancı”dır çünkü onda Camus'nün *Sisifos Söyleni*'ndeki “saçma” adamın özellikleri vardır. Wain'in karakteri ise içinde bulunduğu İkinci Dünya savaşı sonrası İngiltere'sinin sosyal ve kültürel durumundan hoşnut olmadığı için topluma başkaldırmıştır. Atılgan'ın romanındaki C. de bir “yabancı”dır çünkü çocukluğunda psikolojik sarsıntılar geçirmiş ve yaşadığı toplum ona istediği ilgiyi göstermemiş, onun problemlerine kayıtsız kalmıştır. Çalışma, bu karakterleri felsefi, sosyolojik ve psikanalitik temellere dayandırarak ele almaktadır; yani, Meursault için Camus'nün “saçma” (absurd) dünya görüşünü, Lumley için 1950'lerdeki İngiltere'nin sosyal ve kültürel durumunu ve C. için Sigmund Freud'un psikanalitik teorilerini kullanarak kişileri inceler. İncelenen karakterler değişik nedenlerden dolayı topluma başkaldırmalarına rağmen genel olarak ilişkiye girdikleri insanlara, toplumsal geleneklere ve dünyaya karşı aynı tavırları sergilerler. Bu başkahramanların incelenmesiyle “yabancılaşmış” kişi tipinin yirminci yüzyılda değişik kültürel ve tarihi geçmişi olan yazarlar için nasıl evrensel bir kaynak olduğu ve hayatın varoluşsal, toplumsal ve psikolojik alanlarında nasıl geniş bir yer ettiği ortaya konulmuştur. Bu tez, yirminci yüzyıl Avrupa edebiyatında önemli bir yeri

olan “yabancılaşma sorunsalı”na bir katkıda bulunmak amacıyla yazılmıştır.

Anahtar kelimeler: Yabancılaşma, “saçma”, uyumsuzluk, birey

To my grandparents Erna Bloch and Otto Breßlein

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor Prof. Dr. Ayten Coşkunoglu Bear for her helpful suggestions. It has been a pleasure to write this thesis under her guidance.

I would also like to thank Assist. Prof. Dr. Nil Korkut and Dr. Deniz Arslan for their encouragement, guidance and comments.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
ÖZ.....	v
DEDICATION.....	vii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	viii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	ix
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. MAN’S PREDICAMENT IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY.....	3
ii.i. A Socio-historical Background.....	3
ii.ii. Philosophical, Social and Psychological Issues Concerning the Novels in Question.....	8
ii.ii.i. Albert Camus and His Philosophical Treatise.....	8
ii.ii.ii. Socio-cultural Atmosphere of Britain in the 1950s.....	10
ii.ii.iii. Sigmund Freud and Some of His Theories on Human Psychology	14
III. MEURSAULT AS AN ALIENATED ABSURD MAN.....	18
IV. CHARLES LUMLEY AS A SOCIALLY ALIENATED MAN.....	31
V. C. AS A PSYCHOLOGICALLY ALIENATED MAN.....	48

VI.	CONCLUSION: A COMPARATIVE STUDY THAT REVEALS THE DIFFERENCES AND SIMILARITIES OF THESE OUTSIDERS IN QUESTION.....	64
	vi.i.Uprootedness.....	64
	vi.ii.Uncommittedness.....	67
	vi.iii.Rebellion.....	68
	REFERENCES.....	71

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This is a study of the alienated characters in Albert Camus's *The Outsider*, John Wain's *Hurry On Down* and Yusuf Atılgan's *Aylak Adam*, respectively. It contends that each of the protagonists of these novels experiences alienation. That is, Camus's character is an alienated man because he is an "absurd" man; Wain's character is estranged from society due to social issues, such as class distinctions, education and institutions, and Atılgan's C. is an outsider because of his psychological problems and unconventional worldview. The study analyzes these novels with their respective intellectual, socio-cultural and theoretical backgrounds, which consist of Camus's absurd philosophy, the social and cultural aspects of Britain in the 1950s and Sigmund Freud's psychoanalysis. Although the reasons that make these protagonists outsiders differ, Meursault, Charles Lumley and C. share similar attitudes towards their fellowmen, social conventions and metaphysical issues in some cases. Thus, through the analyses of the protagonists of the above mentioned novels, the study aims to disclose how outsiders, in general, occupied a major place in the existential, social and psychological spheres of life in the twentieth century and became an inspiring universal source for the writers, who came from different cultural, intellectual and historical backgrounds. To substantiate this argument the study has the following pattern:

In the first chapter, the factors that forced man to have an isolated existence in the twentieth century are explained. It is revealed that industrialization, urbanization, the devastating effects of the First World War and The Second World War created philosophical, social and psychological gaps between the individual and society that resulted in his alienation. Additionally, philosophical, cultural and theoretical foundations are established in this part. Namely, Camus's absurd philosophy, Wain's reactions to the social climate of post-war Britain and finally,

Freud's main psychological theories on the fragmented psyche of the individual are explicated.

In the second chapter, the thesis proceeds to analyze the novels of the above mentioned authors in their chronological order. Firstly, Camus's *The Outsider* (1942) is studied and the outsidership of Meursault is explored in the light of Camus's absurd worldview. It is brought into light how the characteristics of the absurd man, namely, living a life of indifference, living in the present moment and rebelling against the conventions of society, make Meursault a stranger.

In the third chapter, the protagonist of John Wain's novel *Hurry On Down* (1953) is discussed. In this part, Charles Lumley, whose alienation stems from his social discontentment such as unjust class distinctions, mannerisms of the middle-class people and unpractical educational system, is analyzed within the socio-cultural climate of post-war Britain.

The fourth chapter focuses on C., the protagonist of *Aylak Adam* (1959). The study, with the guidance of Freud's theories about the unconscious, repression, the Oedipus complex, obsessions and the importance of infantile experiences, delves into the roots of C.'s childhood experiences and analyzes how C. exists as an alienated man.

Chapter five deals with the comparisons and contrasts among the outsiders portrayed in the novels discussed. It concludes that, the protagonists, despite their differences, experience a feeling of uneasiness, have problematic relationships with their fellowmen and the world, and are estranged from the world. These outstanding similarities observed in the novels by the authors of different nations denote that the outsidership of man in the modern world shaped by the traumatic effects of industrialization and the two world wars was a universal phenomenon.

CHAPTER II

MAN'S PREDICAMENT IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

ii.i. A Socio-historical Background

The twentieth century was an age of despair, uncertainty and fragmentation, which caused man to feel estranged from the world around himself and to lead a lonely existence. He became an outsider, who lived an uncommitted life, rejected his anterior connections, renounced all cultural norms and had an indifferent attitude towards other people. Man's outsidership was the result of his alienation, which is related to "an extraordinary variety of psycho-social disorders, including loss of self, anxiety states, anomie, despair, depersonalization, rootlessness, apathy, social disorganization, loneliness, atomization, powerlessness, meaninglessness, isolation, pessimism, and the loss of beliefs or values" (Josephson 12-13). It is therefore essential to explain the factors that were responsible for man's outsidership and alienation. There were mainly three historical and social determinants that urged man to live a detached life.

The first factor that brought about the individual's alienation was industrialization. It was a process which altered the social structure of society. The increasing industrialization resulted in the creation of the factory system and the jobs that were offered attracted many people from rural areas. Therefore, large numbers of men migrated into cities, which paved the way for urbanization and a life in underdeveloped and unpleasant industrial slums. The transition from rural to urban life separated man from nature, where he once found relief and consolation. As Brian Tierney puts forth:

...the new town was not a home where man could find beauty, happiness, leisure, learning, religion- the influences that civilize outlook and habit: but a bare and desolate place, without colour, air and laughter, where man,

woman and child worked, ate and slept (58-59).

Moreover, the industrial revolution separated man from his relatives and community. Before industrialization, the individual had a large family and close relationships with his relatives. Besides, he was the conveyor of the customs, traditions and skills of the community; but ever since he became the inhabitant of the city, he altered the structure of the family. Namely, the extended family was destroyed; instead, nuclear families with the small core units of two parents and children emerged (Josephson 30). Step by step, industrialization split the community and forced man to live an atomistic and individualistic life.

Furthermore, the industrial epoch imposed rigid controls over human life and forced him to lead a robot-like existence. Before industrialization, the tools he used, the pace of work and the distribution of the work-load were within his capacities and needs (Josephson 18). Nevertheless, ever since he began to work in the factories, he had to adapt himself to the system and the pace of the machines. He lost his authority over the machine and became its servant. Hannah Arendt writes about man's machine-like existence:

Unlike the tools of workmanship, which at every given moment in the work process remains the servants of the hand, the machines demand that the labourer serve them, that he adjust the natural rhythm of his body to their mechanical movement (quot. in Josephson 20).

In other words, man was denied to have voice and choice in his work as the machines made the decisions and ordered him "when to start working, when to stop, what to do and how to do it" (Josephson 21). Gradually, man felt degraded and became alienated from his work. Charles Taylor emphasizes that

In a mechanical and a depersonalized world man has an indefinable sense of loss; a sense that life...has become impoverished, that men are somehow "deracinate and disinherited," that society and human nature alike have been atomized, and hence mutilated, above all that men have been separated from whatever

might give meaning to their work and their lives (quot. in Josepson 11).

Loss of self-importance and the sense of powerlessness destroyed man's belief in his own humanity and arouse feelings of resentment and anger.

Yet, man's anger was not only restricted to the pointless and mechanical nature of the work he did. His hostility towards the machine engendered bitter feelings for his employer as well. The industrial epoch eliminated the notion of solidarity and made relationships rotate around material interests. This increased inequality in society. As Karl Marx states, industrialization polarized society into the "property owners" (those who own the means of production, the factories and the land) and the "propertyless workers" (the workers, who actually perform the labour necessary to extract something valuable from the means of production) (96). The sensitive employee realized that his employer got large amount of profit and had economic, educational and social privileges. He, on the other hand, was exploited and was denied the claims of the middle classes. The unbridgeable gap between the bourgeois and the employee aroused the feeling of indignation and ripped him off the wish of achieving something valuable in life. He began to view himself as a useless and powerless entity and lost his belief in his creative and productive potential; consequently, he was estranged from society and from his fellowmen as well. Erich Fromm explains the reason why the modern man became alienated from his fellowmen. He observes that in the twentieth century man constructed associations on the basis of exploitation; therefore, his relationship to his fellow men can be regarded as

one between two abstractions, two living machines, who use each other. The employer uses the ones whom he employs; the salesman uses his customers. Everybody is to everybody else a commodity, always to be treated with certain friendliness, because even if he is not of use now, he may be later. There is not much love or hate to be found in human relations of our day. There is, rather, a superficial fairness, but behind that surface is distance and indifference. There is also a good deal of subtle distrust (126).

Eventually, material interests replaced genuine human bond and the interaction among men decreased. Besides the mechanistic and exploitative nature of the interaction among men, bureaucracies, which were the direct results of industrialization and which included all organized and institutionalized work settings, such as industry and education, had an alienating effect on man. The inhuman, cold and manipulative aspects of these institutions made man feel powerless, and C. Wright Mills remarks thus:

On every hand the individual is confronted with seemingly remote organizations; he feels dwarfed and helpless before the managerial cadres and their manipulated and manipulating minions (quot. in Josephson 23).

As a result of such rigid and impersonal structures, man's feeling of being "out of place" was inevitable.

Industrialization, which accelerated technological innovations in weaponry, transportation and communication networks also changed the balance of power among countries. In other words, European nations competed with one another for land, military strength and economic power, and the competition resulted in the First World War (1914-1918), which was another catastrophe that intensified man's sense of estrangement.

The Great War, according to R. J. Overy, was "grim, dirty, and brutalizing, a moral desert for those who lived through it" (5). It was such a devastating event that after it man was in a

sense of loss- of innocence, of moral certainty, of social values, of cultural confidence. The Europe which astonished the nineteenth century with its wealth, inventiveness and power was prey to growing self-doubt and fears for the future (Overy 4).

Man was totally in a vacuum as the war caused him to question such concepts as honour, democracy and civilization, which he had previously believed in. Moreover, man suffered from a sense of displacement because after the war, he found himself in a world, which was alien, impersonal and uninhabitable. In the face of the devastating loss of lives, destruction of cities, soaring poverty and misery, he

lost his faith in God. He began to question how God, “who chose the best of all possible worlds” and who “is all powerful, good and wise” (Trundle 12), was indifferent to his plight. With all the disappearance of ultimate certainties, man experienced a tremendous sense of loss. He was so confused that in order to alleviate his existential and psychological sufferings and find a sense of purpose and meaning in his life, he put himself in the hands of political doctrines and mass movements. Especially, Fascism, which was the result of post-war disillusionment, gained momentum in Italy, Germany and Spain in the 1920s and 1930s and its rise in power resulted in the Second World War (1938-1945).

The Second World War was the final blow that sharpened man’s feelings of helplessness, disorientation and estrangement. It was far more destructive than the First World War as it caused unprecedented devastation of life and property. It deprived man of his right to live in a just, free and happy place. Moreover, it left a world, which was cold, depressing and which guaranteed nothing. Death became a certainty as it was present everywhere. Therefore, man felt himself out of this world. As Camus explains:

...in a universe suddenly divested of illusions and lights, man feels an alien, a stranger. His exile is without remedy since he is deprived of the memory of a lost home or the hope of a promised land (5).

In such a pessimistic mood, the individual came to respond to the happenings around himself with silence. Edward Engelberg writes thus:

Modern solitude goes far beyond anxiety and nightmare: it not only annihilates motion, it retards and destroys emotion. When affect is arrested, when there is no root back to Society..., when the ego is self-devouring, then we have reached a state of solitude beyond alienation- the state of silence (39).

The catastrophic social and historical events of the twentieth century and their devastating outcomes resulted in man’s silence, alienation and deracination. Ultimately, there appeared philosophers, writers, theoreticians and scientists who were not indifferent to man’s deracinated and helpless condition. They reflected his

predicament in their works and at the same time they tried to find solutions that could reduce the alienating effects of the nightmarish events on man. Among these men of thought were Albert Camus, John Wain, Sigmund Freud and Yusuf Atılgan.

ii.ii. Philosophical, Social and Psychological Issues Concerning the Novels in Question

ii.ii.i. Albert Camus and His Philosophical Treatise

Albert Camus was a French writer, under the influence of the existentialist and the absurd philosophies, wrote masterpieces such as *Caligula* (1937), *The Outsider* (1942) *The Plague* (1947) and *The Fall* (1956), in which he focused on the reactions of the characters, who confronted with the absurd. The concept of the absurd is discussed in *The Myth of Sisyphus*, which is a philosophical essay published immediately after *The Outsider*. This book is a reaction against the devastating condition man finds himself in the universe; so, it is used as a framework for the absurd outsider, Meursault.

In *The Myth Of Sisyphus* it is stated that man, who previously lived with a sense of purpose in a meaningful universe, one day when he is around thirty, may be stricken with the sense of absurdity. He, then, becomes an absurd man, who believes that he lives in a universe in which time is hostile to him:

...a day comes when a man notices or says that he is thirty. Thus he asserts his youth. But simultaneously he situates himself in relation to time. He takes his place in it. He admits that he stands at a certain point on a curve that he acknowledges having to travel to its end. He belongs to time, and by the horror that seizes him, he recognizes his worst enemy. Tomorrow, he was longing for tomorrow, whereas everything in him ought to reject it. That revolt of the flesh is the absurd (10-11).

The absurd man, who is attached to the earthly life, revolts against any philosophy that urges him to believe in abstract concepts, such as God, salvation and devotion. For him these concepts are unknowable. The absurd man

demands of himself to live solely with what he knows, to accommodate himself to what he is, and to bring in nothing that is not certain. He is told that nothing is. But this at least is a certainty. And it is with this that he is concerned: he wants to find out if it is possible to live without appeal (39).

Camus states that as revolt exempts man from any commitments and attachments it brings forth “freedom”. Camus argues that before encountering the absurd, man sets for himself goals and he unconsciously confines himself to living towards his aims and ideals. At the same time, he creates for himself a self-image and a certain role, which require him to behave in particular ways. However, after becoming aware of the absurdity of life, he realizes that “he adapted himself to the demands of a purpose to be achieved and became the slave of his liberty” (43). Following Nietzsche’s caution against doing things “for” others and letting himself be gulled with false values (O’Hara 55), he abandons the demands of his ideals and perceives the vanity of his ambition. At this point, the initial themes of existential philosophy keep their entire value: “The return to consciousness, the escape from everyday sleep represent the first steps of absurd freedom” (Camus 44). Ultimately, man attains his true freedom and lives without preconceptions, prejudices, aspirations or hope.

In *The Myth Of Sisyphus* a life without hope and aim demands the absurd man to live the present moments of his life. The absurd man, who has dismissed both the past and the future has to enhance his present pleasures: “If I reject all the ‘wait and sees’ of this world it is as much so as not to renounce my present richness” (quot. in Masters 51). Attachment to present moments requires man to get “the greatest quantity of experiences” (46) and Camus stresses that “what counts is not the best living but the most living” (45).

These are the characteristics of the absurd man as pointed out in *The Myth Of Sisyphus*. So, the best example of the absurd man is Sisyphus, who is a hero in Greek mythology. The gods had condemned Sisyphus to permanently rolling a rock to the top of a mountain, whence the stone would fall back to the valley and the task would begin again. For Camus, he is an admirable hero since he is fully aware of his

hopeless situation but with dignity continues to struggle; he neither tries to evade his punishment nor does he anticipate any help from the gods. Through the example of Sisyphus, Camus contends that man similar to Sisyphus, should be aware of the senselessness of this world, yet without hope derive happiness from his experiences. Thus, like Sisyphus he will get his reward and he will be able to conclude that “all is well” (91). This is the condition of the absurd man, which is fictionalized in the novel, *The Outsider*.

ii.ii.ii. Socio-cultural Atmosphere of Britain in the 1950s

Chapter III is concerned with Charles Lumley, who is a socially alienated character. Therefore, it is essential to depict the social and cultural climate of post-war Britain, which arouses feelings of indignation among young men.

After the Second World War, the social structure of England became more complex than ever. Previously, there were strict lines among the upper, middle, and working classes. However, following the Second World War, the strict class divisions became milder. Namely, one could move from one class to another through education and wealth. However, social mobility did not satisfy either the worker or the middle class man. The latter was disturbed as he wanted to preserve his power and privilege. On the other hand, working class man was annoyed as he was derided by the upper middle class men because of his original social background. Therefore, it was strongly felt that although after the war people could change their class, England was still a class-bound country because the chief determinants of social differences still existed. It was those determinants that pervaded every aspect of the individuals' lives and disturbed some of them immensely. One of the angry men was John Wain and his protagonist, Charles Lumley; so, it is essential to deal with the class distinctions that still caused handicaps for some British men.

The occupation of an Englishman was the most important indicator of class differences. If he was a lawyer, an engineer, a doctor or an academician, it was clear

that he belonged to one of the middle classes; on the other hand, if he was a manual worker evidently he came from the working class.

Moreover, the choice of words, phrases, clichés and the manner of speaking revealed the class one belonged to. The upper middle class man, for instance, was apt to use terms that came from contemporary science, philosophy, literature and psychology. Not only the words and phrases but also the gestures and the tone of voice he used in greeting, taking leave and expressing regret indicated class distinctions. For instance, the tone of a man coming from the bourgeoisie had the obvious mark of clarity and haughtiness whereas the tone of a worker sounded natural and vulgar.

Costumes were also indicators of class differences. They proclaimed the social rank and status of the individual. For instance, it could easily be understood whether one was a lawyer, a doctor, a clergyman, an office clerk or a worker. Clothes were so important that in formal or informal occasions, for instance, if someone had the right dress he did not need to worry about his appearance as the dress provided him with social security.

“Codes of manner” were also determinants of class. Each class prescribed habits and manners and the individual of a certain class had to know his class’s rules of hospitality, wedding and funeral ceremonies, relations with parents and others (Pear 106).

Apart from occupations, speech, clothes and manners, habits were the characteristics of class distinctions. Schlüssel indicates that the upper middle class family was recognized by its social habits, the sort of house it lived in, by the location of the house, by the service in the house, by its furnishings, by the subjects of conversation and by the books that were read. What is more, what was eaten, how, where and with whom were of high significance. Their habits consisted of going to the theatre, concert halls, art exhibitions, luxurious restaurants and hotels. For the working class family, on the other hand, the living room and public houses were the only places where they could socialize (Pear 2-3). These class factors that perpetuated the gap between classes had alienating effects on some men of thought, who lived in the 1950s in England, including John Wain.

Next to social stratifications, the institutionalized aspect of society was also an estranging force for the individuals, who found organizations oppressive and mechanistic. For Lumley, the rigidity of legal proceedings and the dominant nature of the trade unions are among the reasons why he keeps away from society. Ralph Schoenman comments on the strict nature of bureaucratization:

The societies we inhabit today are crippling human beings. We are bludgeoned by the devices of authority into a vast paralysis, an inability to affect events, a fear that our anxieties and aspirations must remain private. We know that our values and institutions are terrible confessions of social bankruptcy, yet we feel it pointless to attempt to cope with our social problems. Men are dependent on vast and impersonal societies. These societies are highly ordered, controlled by powerful autocracies, and they are essentially totalitarian in their organization (quot. in Atkins 41).

These organizations were deemed as antagonistic since they were restrictive and prevented the individual from acting autonomously. Moreover, the educational system was another source of uneasiness and estrangement among some tactful young men. Richard Tawney points out that the educational system of England inoculated the individual with the idea that character and intelligence counted far less than money (Atkins 18). In other words, the individual from the primary school onwards was taught to evaluate others according to their incomes, wealth, occupations and their connections with institutions such as business firms, armies, universities or governmental departments (Atkins 17). Especially the university education did not fulfil the anticipations of the young men as it was not practical and did not equip them with the necessary knowledge that could be carried out into society (Gindin 43). Namely, the unpractical nature of the educational system prevented the individual from finding any employment. Hague remarks that: "...education is often positively detrimental to happiness because there is no appropriate social or career niche awaiting the recipients..." (215) Obviously, being a university graduate but being unable to find a proper occupation alienated some Englishmen from society.

The sharp class distinctions and the unpromising social atmosphere of England increased the feeling of dissatisfaction in John Wain, who was sensitive to the condition of his fellowmen. Hence, he expressed his discontentment in his novel, *Hurry On Down* and was considered to be one of the angry young men of his time. He claims to be the predecessor of the angry young men. He declares:

So if there was a 'movement' at all, which I am inclined to doubt, I cannot be accused of tagging along behind it. I might even be credited-or blamed, if you will- for having *started* it (8).

As one of the angry young men, Wain states that "During the five years of combat, in which social and political arrangements have necessarily been stalemated, an undercurrent of discontent has been gathering- discontent with the England of the Thirties, with its luke-warm snobberies and social fossilizations, its dole-queues, its slumbering Empire, the general feeling that the country is like a gutter choked with dead leaves" (2). Namely, he remarks his dissatisfaction with the established socio-political arrangements of his country, with the continuing class distinctions, the hypocrisy and snobbery of the bourgeoisie and with anything that was high brow and phoney (Smith 3).

Wain conveys his concerns about the struggle of an individual in a fragmented society by writing *Hurry On Down*. He emphasizes his intention in the following way:

When I wrote *Hurry On Down*, the main problem which had presented itself in my own existence was the young man's problem of how to adapt himself to "life," in the sense of an order external to himself, already there when he appeared on the scene, and not necessarily disposed to welcome him; the whole being complicated by the fact that in our civilization there is an unhealed split between the educational system and the assumptions that actually underlie daily life (quot. in Hague 215).

Consequently, the brief explanation of the negative cultural and social atmosphere of Britain in the aftermath of the Second World War and Wain's concerns about man's plight in such a condition make Lumley's outsidership understandable.

ii.ii.iii. Sigmund Freud and Some of His Theories on Human Psychology

C., the protagonist of *Aylak Adam*, is analyzed within the framework of Sigmund Freud's theories about the importance of infantile experiences, the Oedipus complex, the unconscious, repressions, obsessions and transference. As C.'s present outsidership is closely related to his unpleasant experiences with his father during his childhood, it is essential to explain what Freud asserts about this period. According to Freud, the childhood experiences of an individual determine his future identity, behaviour and relationships. He states thus:

The importance of the infantile experiences should not, however, be entirely overlooked, as so often happens, in favour of ancestral experiences or of experiences in adult life; but on the contrary they should be particularly appreciated. They are all the more pregnant with consequences because they occur at a time of uncompleted development, and for this very reason are likely to have a traumatic effect (*A General Introduction to Psychoanalysis* 370-371).

He further claims that if the child is not treated with care, affection, warmth and is confronted with unpleasant experiences, assaults and rejection, he may not achieve a sense of personal security. He becomes “‘fixed’ to a particular point in [his] past, that [he does] not know how to release [himself] from it, and [is] consequently alienated from both present and future” (284). Freud's statement throws light on C.'s alienation and his fragmented identity as C. is constantly pestered by his unhappy past experiences.

Moreover, Freud's theories about the sexual development of an individual and that of the Oedipus complex illuminate the reason behind C.'s unhealthy relationships with women. Freud states that the sexual development of an individual during his childhood is another factor that shapes his adult personality. He claims

that between the ages four and six, the emotional bond between the child and the parent of the opposite sex becomes profound.

However, the close bond between the boy and his mother is broken by the presence of his father. Ultimately, the boy comes to hate his father's authority over his mother, and inwardly wishes his death. From this state originates "the Oedipus complex". Freud says:

...the little man wants his mother all to himself, finds his father in the way, becomes restive when the latter takes upon himself to caress her, and shows his satisfaction when the father goes away or is absent (*A General Introduction to Psycho-analysis* 341).

The child finds out that he cannot defeat his father's authority. In positive Oedipus complex the boy overcomes his feelings of enmity for his father. According to Freud, the task of the child consists of

detaching his libidinal wishes from his mother and employing them for the choice of a real outside love-object, and in reconciling himself with his father if he has remained in opposition to him, or in freeing himself from his pressure, if, as a reaction to his infantile rebelliousness, he has become subservient to him (*A General Introduction to Psycho-analysis* 337).

On the other hand, if the boy cannot achieve his task, he may not be able to form healthy sexual relations with women or he may not really love any woman sincerely in his adult life.

Furthermore, Freud's concept of the "unconscious" throws light on C.'s bizarre behaviour, which makes him unfit for social life. Freud found out that many of his patients did not express their attitudes and feelings consciously; so, he deduced that there must be another layer beyond consciousness, which also influences the personality of an individual. Hence, he divides the psyche between the conscious and the unconscious. The unconscious part is behind self-identity; so, there is a "hidden-self", which is cut off from self-knowledge. Freud drew the concept of the unconscious from the theory of repression. He contends that in

childhood individuals repress some of their infantile experiences and keep them in the unconscious. He states:

Repression,... is the process by which a mental act capable of becoming conscious... is made unconscious and forced back into the unconscious system... These impressions have never really been forgotten, but were only inaccessible and latent, having become part of the unconscious. But sometimes it happens that they emerge spontaneously from the unconscious (A General Introduction to Psycho-analysis 211).

These repressed feelings, emotions and ideas, however, may disrupt the intentions of the individual and they may even directly motivate his thoughts, behaviour and emotions. In order to live a balanced life, man has to stabilize his repressed desires; otherwise the more he represses his wishes, the more he is prone to be overwhelmed by neurosis. This declaration of Freud enables one to realize that C.'s maladjustment to society is attributable to his repressed emotions. His obsessions also can be related to the concept of repression. Freud says that the individual is obsessed when his

mind is occupied with thoughts that do not really interest him, he feels impulses which seem alien to him, and he is impelled to perform actions which not only afford him no pleasure but from which he is powerless to desist. The thoughts (obsessions) may be meaningless in themselves or only of no interest to the patient; they are often absolutely silly; in every case they are the starting-point of a strained concentration of thought which exhausts the patient and to which he yields most unwillingly (*A General Introduction to Psycho-analysis 269-270*).

Clearly, obsessions are irrational thoughts, which constantly force themselves into the consciousness of the individual and contribute to his separation from society and life in general.

Additionally, Freud's theory of "transference" helps clarify the reason why C. is a stranger in society; so, it is necessary to give brief information about this

theory. According to Freud, “transference” is also related to the childhood experiences of a person. It means that something in the present takes the individual to his painful memories and influences his present life and relationships:

The individual self holds a transferential relationship to other people, to social bonds and to the cultural realm more generally. In our emotional attachments to others, from intimate sexual relationships to the organizational structures of authority in public life, the phenomenon of transference is a fundamental dimension of human experience: we people our world, [...] with emotions and fantasies drawn from the past, but projected on to current experience (Elliott 17).

So, Freud’s core concepts and ideas about how an individual’s traumatic past haunts his present being can help one understand C.’s problematic and alienated condition.

To sum up, the thesis analyzes Meursault, who is detached from society because he is an absurd man. Namely, in Camus’s universe, which is empty, absurd and meaningless, Meursault is an indifferent individual, who lacks commitment, positive moral ethics and intimacy with his fellowmen. Then, it examines Charles Lumley, who decides to become an outsider since he disapproves of the inhibiting social structure of his society. He opposes the mannerisms of the middle class milieu, the class stratification and educational system in post-war England. Lastly, C., whose outsidership is the outcome of his psychological disturbances, is analyzed in the light of Freud’s theories.

CHAPTER III

MEURSAULT AS AN ALIENATED ABSURD MAN

Albert Camus, as a thinker and writer, created an absurd protagonist in *The Outsider*, namely, Meursault. He is “a man who has lived a life of the senses in total simplicity and innocent enjoyment, but whom Society eventually roots out, humiliates, and crushes” (Masters 19). The reason why society excludes Meursault is that he, from the beginning till the end of the novel, exemplifies the characteristics of an absurd man, which are delineated in *The Myth of Sisyphus*: He has an indifferent attitude towards life, he lives in the present time and he rebels against the established conventions and beliefs of society.

Meursault is a clerk, who around his thirties, lives a life of indifference. To put it differently, he does not show any interest in what goes on around his life and he does not act in accordance with society’s expectations and customs. Similar to Camus’s absurd man in *The Myth Of Sisyphus*, he “enjoys a freedom with regard to common rules” (44). The way he reacts to the telegram that notifies him of his mother’s death is a striking example. Meursault narrates:

Mother died today. Or maybe yesterday, I don’t know. I had a telegram from the home: ‘Mother passed away. Funeral tomorrow. Yours sincerely.’ That doesn’t mean anything. It may have been yesterday (9).

These words uttered by Meursault in a detached tone give away his character: he is an emotionally indifferent man. He neither feels grief over his mother’s death nor does he weep. Sprintzen thinks that this is not the normal reaction of a son to the news of his mother’s death and asks:

What kind of a person responds in this matter-of-fact way? Are we not at first put off by such casualness? Perhaps even scandalized by our initial encounter with Meursault?

Is not this Meursault a stranger to our normal feelings and expectations? We sense a distance (23).

Indeed, Meursault creates a sense of distance and reveals his absurd character not only by the way he reacts to the news but also by what he does after the news. He goes on to behave as if nothing upsetting has happened. He takes a bus to the old people's home, where his mother used to live. During the whole journey, he sleeps and when he arrives at the home, contrary to the rituals, he refuses to see the body of his mother. He disinterestedly sits by the coffin, drinks coffee, smokes a cigarette and dozes off in the room where his mother's body lies. The following day, during the funeral procession, he focuses solely on the weather, the sun and the landscape. He relates how he noticed that "for quite some time now the countryside had been alive with the humming of insects and the crackling of grass" (20). Then, he narrates the disturbing aspects of nature: "All around me there was still the same luminous sun drenched countryside. The glare from the sky was unbearable" (21). He, in addition, closely observes the attendees of the funeral:

Almost all the women were wearing aprons tied highly round their waists, which made their swollen bellies stick out even more. I'd never noticed before what huge paunches old women can have. The men were almost all very thin and carrying walking-sticks. What struck me most about their faces was that I couldn't see their eyes, but only a faint glimmer among a nest of wrinkles (15).

Meursault's intense focus on the outward appearance of the old people reveals his attachment to what is physical. He, instead of reminiscing about his old days with his mother or praying for her soul, continues to watch attentively his surrounding. He further relates: "I also looked at the warden. He was walking in a dignified way, without a single pointless movement. A few beads of sweat were forming on his brow, but he didn't wipe them off" (21). Moreover, after the burial of his mother he feels "joy" at the thought of "going to go to bed and sleep for a whole twelve hours" (22). His indifferent attitude towards his mother's death continues on the days after

the funeral. He flirts with a former colleague, Marie, and he explains his physical pleasure of the summer, the sky, the sun, the water in the following way:

I was good and as if for fun, I let my head sink back onto her stomach. She didn't say anything and I left it there. I had the whole sky in my eyes and it was all blue and gold. I could feel Marie's stomach throbbing gently under the back of my neck. We lay on the buoy for a long time, half asleep. When the sun got too hot, she dived off and I followed. I caught her up, put my arm round her waist and we swam together (24).

Characteristically, as an absurd man, Meursault enjoys what is connected with the sensual and tangible. He experiences everything through his five senses; that is why his daily life is also devoid of any abstract ideas. It is narrated that he routinely goes to work, takes a nap in the afternoons, has his lunch at the same restaurant and when he does not work, spends the whole afternoon on his balcony, smoking, eating and observing the passers-by. As an outsider, he does not have much interaction with others and he is a detached observer. Here is a remarkable example of how Meursault impartially observes others:

It was a beautiful afternoon. And yet the pavements were grimy and the few people that were about were all in a hurry...I thought they must be heading for the cinemas in the town centre...After that the street gradually became deserted...the sky clouded over and I thought we were going to have a summer storm. It gradually cleared again though. But the passing clouds had left a sort of threat of rain hanging over the street which made it more gloomy. I watched the sky for a long time...At five o'clock there was a lot of noise as some trams arrived...The day advanced a bit more...People were gradually returning from their walks...The street lamps suddenly came on just then and they made the first few stars that were appearing in the night sky look quite pale (25-28).

This passage reveals not only how much Meursault gives importance to the physical aspects of existence but also how much indifferent he is to human activity. He only

narrates what he sees and does not attempt to pass judgments on the people he sees. Hence, his apathy is also evident in his avoidance of making any value judgments. He has freed himself of any kind of biases and evaluations. For instance, his neighbour Salamano always curses and beats his dog. While Céleste and other neighbours find such kind of act “dreadful” (31), Meursault remains neutral; namely, he neither supports nor condemns the way Salamano treats his dog. Besides, everyone thinks that Raymond is an immoral man but, for Meursault, Raymond is like anybody else. Therefore, he does not hesitate to chat with him. He speaks with him just because he finds what he says interesting and does not have any reason why he should not talk to him (32). When Raymond requires Meursault to write a letter that would reveal the infidelity of his mistress, he unhesitatingly fulfils such an improper demand. He incuriously narrates thus: “I did it rather haphazardly, but I did my best to please Raymond because I had no reason not to please him” (36). Likewise, he accepts being “mates” with Raymond: “I didn’t mind being his mate and he really seemed keen on it” (36). These instances display Meursault’s absurd worldview. In the face of a meaningless world, everything is at the same level, one can only have unconditional relationships and remain indifferent under such circumstances.

Meursault’s outsidership is also apparent in his lack of ambition. Ordinary man, however, “lives with aims, a concern for the future or for justification...He weighs his chances, he counts on ‘someday,’ his retirement or the labour of his sons” (Camus 42). However, according to Camus, it is “a sin to denigrate the life that we have and invent a better one, to refuse the present and hope for a future” (Masters 17). Meursault, as an example of Camus’s worldview, does not aspire after the future and is closely attached to the present moment. His disinterest in the future is revealed in his answer to his boss’s offer of a position in Paris. Meursault says:

I said yes but really I didn’t mind. He then asked me if I wasn’t interested in changing my life. I replied that you could never change your life, that in any case one life was as good as another and that I wasn’t at all dissatisfied with mine here...I’d rather not have upset him, but I couldn’t see any reason for

changing my life. Come to think of it, I wasn't unhappy (44).

Meursault's dispassionate response divulges his absurd outlook on life. For him, nothing matters as all the ways of life are the same. As Sprintzen says, in Meursault's life "no hierarchies of value is recognized" (26). This indifferent attitude of Meursault can again be observed when Marie asks him whether he loves her or not. His response is narrated in the following way: "I told her it didn't mean anything but that I didn't think so" (38). Furthermore, upon Marie's marriage proposal he replies:

I explained to her that it really didn't matter and that if she wanted to, we could get married...She then remarked that marriage was a serious matter. I said 'No.'...She just wanted to know if I'd have accepted the same proposal if it had come from another woman with whom I had a similar relationship. I said 'Naturally.' (44-45).

"It didn't mean anything" and "it really didn't matter" are the expressions of an absurd man. For him, social conventions that involve abstract concepts such as love, grief, ambition and commitment are beyond his comprehension as they do not have any physical realities. That is why he responds to the events instinctively and allows himself to be drawn into the sequence of events, which end in his disaster. The most conspicuous event, which exemplifies how Meursault can easily be affected by the immediate experience and physical stimuli, happens on the beach when he confronts the Arab. Before this confrontation, Meursault witnesses that Raymond has a fight with two Arabs and he demands that Raymond give his gun to him so that there will not be any other fights. Raymond hands over the gun to Meursault and returns to the beach hut. Although Meursault says that it was too hot and "unbearable just standing there in the blinding rain that was pouring down out of the sky" he concludes "whether I stayed there or moved, it would come to the same thing" (58), and he chooses to walk on the beach. This remark again discloses Meursault's absurd outlook on life. For him, there does not exist any difference between the two alternatives, whether to stay on the beach or to go back to the beach house, as everything exists on the same level. However, he is so worn out by the intense heat

that he is in a daze. At this moment he sees the Arab for the second time and he says:

The sun was beginning to burn my cheeks and I felt drops of sweat gathering in my eyebrows...And because I couldn't stand this burning feeling any longer, I moved forward... All I could feel were the cymbals the sun was dashing against my forehead and, indistinctly, the dazzling spear still leaping up off the knife in front of me... The sky seemed to be splitting from end to end and raining down sheets of flame. My whole being went tense and I tightened my grip on the gun. The trigger gave, I felt the underside of the polished butt and it was there, in that sharp but deafening noise, that it all started (58-59).

In this quotation, each detail regarding Meursault's physical state before he shoots the Arab implies as if Meursault was not responsible for the death of the Arab. He is unreasonably removed from reality and because of the oppression the sun imposes on him, he cannot think and act tactfully. This emphasizes the irrationality of man's existence in the universe. In an absurd world, under some pressures man may find himself cut off from everything and perform an act that can be considered as criminal but done without any criminal motivation. Camus, in *The Myth Of Sisyphus*, explains the absurd condition of man and the alienating nature of the universe in the following way:

At the heart of all beauty lies something inhuman, and these hills, the softness of the sky, the outline of these trees this very minute lose the illusory meaning with which we had clothed them, henceforth more remote than a lost paradise. The primitive hostility of the world rises up to face us across millennia...that denseness and that strangeness of the world is the absurd (11).

Similarly, Meursault finds himself in a strange world the moment the sun which always was a source of his enjoyment turned against him. In a way it forced him to pull the trigger. In a rational world, however, ordinary man demands rational explanations for the events happening in one's life. He believes in causal

connections between events and he thinks that his actions are purposive, that he does something because he has been motivated by a desire to do it, or because he hopes thereby to achieve something else (Masters 30). Therefore, the absurd condition that Meursault found himself does not make the murder justifiable. Ultimately, he is arrested; put into prison, where his actions and choices are questioned.

A profound breach between Meursault and the ordinary man comes to light during Meursault's interrogation. Meursault is indifferent, calm and direct in his answers; namely, he chooses not to disguise his true feelings and notions. In *The Myth of Sisyphus*, it is indicated that for an absurd mind what is important is integrity (49). For instance, the lawyer warns Meursault that his indifferent attitude at his mother's funeral will turn the jury against him and he advises him to alter his statements about his mother's funeral. Meursault, however, replies frankly:

...by nature my physical needs often distorted my feelings. On the day of my mother's funeral I was very tired and sleepy. So I was not fully aware of what was going on. The only thing I could say for certain was that I'd rather mother hadn't died. But my lawyer didn't seem pleased. He said, 'that's not enough'. He thought for a moment. Then he asked me if he could say that I'd controlled my feelings that day. I said 'No, because that's not true' (65).

The lawyer is disturbed by Meursault's inability to lie about how he felt at his mother's funeral; yet, Meursault is determined to maintain his honesty. Throughout his trial, he neglects all opportunities to pretend grief over his mother's death and express remorse for the man he shot. Therefore, Camus remarks that Meursault gives answers that threaten his existence. Camus writes thus:

....Meursault does not want to make his life simpler. He says what he is, he refuses to hide his feelings and society immediately feels threatened
So one wouldn't be far wrong in seeing *The Outsider* as the story of a man who, without any heroic pretensions, agrees to die for the truth (118-119).

By being honest and unpretentious, he admits that he has been what he was and he acknowledges his own acts. Meursault goes on to reveal his integrity in front of the magistrate who waves the crucifix in his face in an attempt to make him feel remorse:

‘Do you know what this is?’... Then he spoke very quickly and passionately, telling me that he believed in God, that he was convinced that no man was so guilty that God wouldn’t pardon him, but that he must first repent and so become like a child whose soul is empty and ready to embrace everything (67-68).

Upon this warning, Meursault again expresses what he thinks honestly. He replies that he doesn’t believe in God. The magistrate is shocked at this calm answer. Meursault narrates the magistrate’s reaction in a calm way:

He sat down indignantly. He told me that it was impossible, that all men believed in God, even those who wouldn’t face up to Him. That was his belief, and if I should ever doubt it his life would become meaningless. ‘Do you want my life to be meaningless?’ he cried. As far as I was concerned, it had nothing to do with me and I told him so (68).

Meursault’s atheism shocks the magistrate because he believes that the universe is controlled by God and life is meaningful only through God’s existence. On the other hand, for Meursault, life is absurd and there is not any supernatural existence that can help him. He, in a way, depicts a revolt against the concept of deity and asserts that man can only himself make his life meaningful and must himself be fully responsible for his destiny. Therefore, he continues to live the life of indifference and is still concerned with his present existence. In prison, he slowly learns to live in a world that is devoid of the sea, the sun, the sand and Marie. He gives himself the task of enumerating the objects that were in his room, reads the story of a Czechoslovakian man, sleeps, eats and watches the changes of light and darkness. They are all means to make his restricted life meaningful. In this way, he succeeds in adapting himself to his new life and asserting his existence. He realizes that if a man lived for only a day, the memories he acquired would be enough to enable him to

live a hundred years in prison without being bored and he comes to the resolution that there are others unhappier than he is and “you ended up getting used to everything” (75). His preoccupation with the physical world prevents him from having any feelings of guilt about what he has done. Even on the trial day, he behaves as if he were an innocent man and as if he were one of the witnesses. He reveals his emotions thus:

In fact, in a way it would be interesting to watch a trial. I'd never had the chance to see one before.

...

...I think at first I hadn't quite realized that all these people were crowding in to see me. Usually no one took any notice of me. I had to make an effort to understand that I was the cause of all this excitement (81).

Eventually, the conventional men detest him because his calm attitude and his lack of grief over his mother's death threaten the moral basis of society; hence, they neglect him. Meursault says:

Things were happening without me even intervening. My fate was being decided without anyone asking my opinion. From time to time I'd feel like interrupting everyone and saying. 'But all the same, who's the accused? It's important being the accused. And I've got something to say! (95)

When he is asked to speak and clarify his motivation for the crime, he denies having returned to the beach with the deliberate intention of killing the Arab, but no one listens to him. He is unable to make his situation conceivable as the public prosecutor stresses that Meursault killed the Arab consciously and he devises a rational murder scene:

...he'd written the letter in collusion with Raymond as treatment by a man 'of doubtful morality'. [He]'d provoked Raymond's adversaries on the beach. Raymond had been wounded. [He]'d asked him for his gun. [He]'d gone back with the intention of using it. [He]'d shot the Arab as [he]'d planned. [He]'d waited. And to make sure [he]'d done

the job properly. [He]'d fired four more shots, deliberately and at point-blank range and with some kind of forethought (96).

It is apparent that the prosecutor is unable to comprehend that a murder can be committed without any deliberate purpose. In fact, Meursault is not convicted of the murder he committed but he is convicted because of his indifferent attitude he displayed at his mother's funeral. The prosecutor announces that "[he] had no place in a society whose most fundamental rules [he] ignored, nor could [he] make an appeal to the heart when [he] knew nothing of the most basic human reactions" (99). Hence, the magistrate proclaims that Meursault committed a premeditated murder and deserves to be sentenced to death by guillotine.

After this verdict, Meursault tries to find if there is any escape from the execution. He feels lucky every time the day ends without the sounds of the footsteps approaching his cell, because he knows that these sounds are the signs of the men who will take him to the guillotine. Moreover, he thinks that he has the opportunity to file a legal appeal and be freed. However, he soon realizes that his execution is inevitable and there is not any difference between dying by an execution or dying of natural causes. He says:

But everybody knows that life isn't worth living. And when it came down to it, I wasn't unaware of the fact that it doesn't matter very much whether you die at thirty or at seventy since, in either case, other men and women will naturally go on living, for thousands of years even. Nothing was plainer. In fact it was still only me who was dying, whether it was now or in twenty years' time...Given that you've got to die, it obviously doesn't matter exactly how and when. Therefore (and the difficult thing was not to lose track of all the reasoning which that 'therefore' implied), therefore, I had to accept that my appeal had been dismissed (109-110).

According to Meursault, in an absurd world hope does not exist and he cannot delude himself by hoping for the evasion of death. His denial of hope and acceptance of death can be interpreted as his revolt, which is another characteristic

that makes Meursault an alienated man. As pointed out in *The Myth Of Sisyphus*, revolt entails living without hope and religious faith. For the absurd man, “The supernatural seems at best an unsubstantiated hope, at worst a vain delusion. In either case it is distraction that threatens to rob us the weight, the beauty, the intensity of the present, until death takes it from us forever” (quot. in Sprintzen 20). Therefore, contrary to the conventional man, who believes in God and the promise of an eternal life, Meursault as an outsider rejects both abstractions. When the priest asks him how he imagines the other world, he replies thus: “One which would remind me of this life” (113). For Meursault, it is inconceivable that there can be another world better than this one; therefore, he is indifferent to any philosophy of life promising him another life. However, the priest persistently tries to draw Meursault into the realm of the believers and convince him of the existence of God. The priest addresses him thus:

I know how the suffering oozes from these stones. I’ve never looked at them without a feeling of anguish. But deep in my heart I know that even the most wretched among you have looked at them and seen a divine face emerging from the darkness. It is that face which you are being asked to see (113).

This passage is elucidated in *The Myth Of Sisyphus*. Camus points out that man is urged to face God and repent for his sins. However, all the absurd man can reply is that “he fully does not understand that nothing is obvious. He does not understand the notion of sin, he does not have enough imagination to visualize that strange future; and the notion of an immortal life seems to him an idle consideration” (Camus 39). That is why Meursault obstinately rejects the priest’s abstract appeals:

I told him that I’d been looking at these walls for months. There wasn’t anything or anyone in the world I knew better. Maybe, a long time ago, I had looked for a face in them. But that face was the colour of the sun and burning with desire: it was Marie’s face. I’d looked for it in vain. Now it was all over. And in any case, I’d never seen anything emerging from any oozing stones (113-114).

This is the reaction of an outsider, who does not believe in what is not concrete. Meursault, for whom only the earthly existence has worth, continues to declare: “I didn’t have much time left. I didn’t want to waste it on God” (114). This declaration indicates that Meursault chooses to live only in this world and his choice is the embodiment of revolt, which urges “man not to live best but to live most” (Camus 45). As Meursault knows that he has limited time he wants to “use up everything that is given” (Camus 44) and enjoy remembering the time he spent on earth for a little longer. Therefore, when the priest continues to talk relentlessly about God, Meursault grabs him by the collar and exclaims:

He seemed so certain of everything, didn’t he? And yet no one of his certainties was worth one hair of a woman’s head. He couldn’t even be sure he was alive because he was living like a dead man. I might seem to be empty-handed. But I was sure of myself, sure of everything, surer than he was, sure of my life and sure of the death that was coming to me. Yes, that was all I had. But at least it was a truth which I had hold of just as it had hold of me (115).

This outburst against the established beliefs also exemplifies Meursault’s outsidership and his revolt. Meursault emphasizes that he is superior to the priest because he knows himself to be the master of his days, but the priest is a living-dead as he does not have any control over what he believes in. According to Meursault, the priest by surrendering to a higher being avoided the responsibility of choosing what kind of self he would become. He, on the other hand, knows that it is his own responsibility to guide his life and justifies himself in the following way:

I’d been right, I was still right. I was always right. I’d lived in a certain way and I could just as well have lied in a different way. I’d done this and I hadn’t done that. I hadn’t done one thing whereas I done another. So what?...What did other people’s death or a mother’s love matter to me, what did his God or the lives people chose or the destinies they selected matter to me... What did it matter if he was accused of murder or then executed for not crying at his mother’s funeral? (115-116).

Meursault wholeheartedly advocates his indifferent outlook on life and he continues to remain an outsider by believing in the inevitability of death, which obliterates all the significance of other things. His outbursts relieve him and expresses his relief:

I woke up with stars shining on my face.
Sounds of the countryside were wafting in.
The night air was cooling my temples with the
smell of earth and salt. The wondrous peace
of the sleeping summer flooded into me...I
felt ready to live my life again. As if this great
outburst of anger had purged all my ills, killed
all my hopes. I looked up at the mass of signs
and stars in the night sky and laid myself open
for the first time to the benign indifference of
the world. And finding it so much like myself,
in fact so fraternal, I realized that I'd been
happy, and that I was still happy (116-117).

These statements show how Meursault is the perfect example of an absurd man, Camus has discussed in *The Myth Of Sisyphus*. Meursault has come to terms with the absurdity of life and the nothingness of death and is ready to welcome both of them unquestioningly. Therefore, it can be concluded that Camus in *The Outsider* pictures the alienated condition of an absurd man, who like Sisyphus, in full consciousness, accepts the senselessness of his condition and with dignity declares that "all is well".

CHAPTER IV

CHARLES LUMLEY AS A SOCIALLY ALIENATED MAN

At the end of the Second World War, the social condition of England changed extremely. In the past, English society was strictly divided into upper, middle and working classes, and everybody accepted the social rank with which he was born; but, after the war, the strict class distinctions became milder because through industrialization the working class men were better off and through the education they received, they could change their statuses. However, there were still some conventional minded British men, who believed in sharp class distinctions. On the other hand, the educated and sensitive people questioned this belief, and they rebelled against the severe gap between classes. One of the men of thought, who felt bitter about the class-bound society, was John Wain, who expressed his resentment through Charles Lumley, the protagonist of *Hurry On Down*.

Lumley is a twenty-three-year old young man, who has graduated from university with a mediocre degree in History. He is not content to be a graduate as he does not know what to do and where to work. Coming from a middle class family, he knows that his family expects him to have a high ranking profession with a high salary; but Lumley does not have such aspirations. When asked where he is going to find a living wage, he replies:

‘Sorry ...but I’m not making major decisions just now. One thing at a time, you know. At the moment I’m working for an examination-and...trying to live like a normal human being at the same time. When all this comes to an end, I’ll turn my attention to the problem of earning a living, without trying to isolate it from all the other big problems’ (10).

It is clear that the pressure of his success-ridden family makes him restless. He ponders about his problematical condition and puts the blame partially on the education he received. It is stated that “... the University had, by its three years’

random and shapeless cramming, unfitted his mind for serious thinking” (11). Next to the educational system, his parents are Lumley’s main target of criticism. He holds his parents responsible for his predicament. It is indicated that:

...his parents surge into his life, shake it up, wrench it to pieces, and obscure with a fog of emotion everything that he was trying to study under his laboriously constructed microscope of detachment....A suffocating sense of utter inability to communicate, as in those nightmares in which the dreamer sees himself put away for lunacy, had already begun to drench his mind (17-18).

Lack of communication and little exchange of emotion and ideas estrange Lumley from his parents and the milieu they stand for. Hence, after taking his finals he disappears and does not let his parents know about his whereabouts. He also decides to sever himself from his fiancée, Sheila. Upon his visit to her, he confronts with her sister and brother-in-law, Edith and Robert Tharkles, who with their behavior, attitudes and notions are the embodiments of the bourgeoisie, which Lumley does not approve of at all. Lumley is mostly annoyed by their actions and remarks. For instance, he thinks that if he were to suggest Robert Tharkles to go out for a drink before lunch, Robert Tharkles would refuse such a suggestion; instead, he would prefer to open bottles which he would take from a mahogany cabinet (16). Moreover, the Tharkles family disturbs Lumley by frequently asking him which profession he intends to choose as his prospects are of high importance for the middle class men, who are obsessed with status. Lumley states that

In their world it was everyone’s first duty to wear a uniform that announced his status, his calling and his ambitions: from the navy’s thick boots and shirtsleeves to the professor’s tweeds, the conventions of clothing saw to it that everyone wore his identity card where it could be seen (15).

Lumley, on the other hand, has always found the conventions of dressing of his class annoying. His nonconformist attitude is revealed thus:

...even as an undergraduate he had not worn corduroys or coloured shirts. He had not even

smoked a pipe. He had appeared instead in non-committal lounge suits which were still not the lounge suits of a business man, and heavy shoes which were still not the sophisticated heavy shoes of the fashionable outdoor man (16).

Such an indifferent attitude of Lumley towards the expectations of his class disturbs the Tharkles family, who determinately conform to the demands of their classes. It is narrated that:

What annoyed them was that he did not even seem to be trying. Though they could not have put it into words, their objection to him was that he did not wear a uniform ...If, on the other hand, he had seriously adopted the chic disorder of the Chelsea Bohemian, they would at least have understood what he was at (15).

This passage shows how much the middle class people value their rules and are ready to eliminate the one who is against them. For Lumley, on the other hand, not only the way the bourgeoisie dress but also the way they speak is intolerable. As indicated in the first chapter, speech was one of the most important class indicators in Britain. Similarly, Robert Tharkles, a representative of the middle classes, speaks with “smug phrases, the pert half-truths, the bland brutalities” (18). His way of speaking and the content of his speech appear to Lumley to be ready-made, emotionless and artificial. Moreover, Lumley thinks that the gestures and facial expressions of the bourgeois reflect the pretentious nature of his class. For instance, Lumley discloses that Robert Tharkles wears the stiff brown moustache in order to give dignity to his face. Lumley, who hates ostentation, thinks that such a moustache looks as if it were clipped from the face of an Airedale (19). He finds any kind of artificiality so disturbing that he cannot curb his thoughts and reflects his contempt by asking Tharkles:

‘I was just wondering why no one’s ever found it worth while to cut off that silly moustache of yours and use it for one of those brushes you see hanging out of windows next to the waste pipe’ (19).

These utterances terminate Lumley's visit as neither he, who is a misfit, nor the Tharkles family, who is the perpetuator of class conventions cannot stay in the same room any longer. Ultimately, Lumley feels relieved to be out of their residence and to have broken with Sheila, who is also the representative of the middle classes, which Lumley detests:

... he saw behind her eyes the eyes of her mother, solemn, spectacled, judging him; in the bones of her chin he saw the chin of her father, jutting and scraped clean of its graying stubble below a tight, fussy mouth. No! ... now he saw her not merely growing old, but growing daily more and more of a piece with the prim, hedged gravel from which she flowered (20).

It is the insincerity, rigidity and blind obedience to the rules that alienate Lumley from his middle class milieu. He does not speak their language, he does not dress as they do; what is more, he is not success oriented. Therefore, he resolves that he cannot live happily among them and he goes to a working class bar, which is a place completely different from what he is accustomed to because he comes from an environment, where he is expected to

...bow over books, listen to instruction, submit to correction, be endlessly moulded and shaped; edge his way for years between the delicate areas of other people's sensibilities. One step too far in any direction and some one or other of them will be 'hurt', offended, disappointed. His schoolmasters shaking their heads, his father perplexed and angry, his mother wheedling or sulking....how they had all trampled over him!(28)

To put it differently, he was brought up in a culture, which has taught him to be silent, polite, and a conformist. The pub, on the other hand, is full of workers, who are arrogant and impolite. In such an environment, he cannot get his drink and he is always curtly thrust aside just as he opens his mouth to give his order. Through this experience, Lumley sees the huge gap between the working class and the middle class men:

This establishment... was peopled by raw, angular personalities who had been encouraged by life to develop their sharp edges. His sharp edges, on the other hand, had been systematically blunted by his upbringing and education. From the nursery onwards, he had been taught to modulate the natural loudness of his voice, to efface himself in every possible way, to defer to others. And this was the result! He had been equipped with an upbringing devised to meet the needs of a more fortunate age, and then thrust into the jungle of the nineteen-fifties (24-25).

As pointed out earlier, England of the 1950s was still a class-bound society. An individual of a particular class was trained from his early age onwards to function only in and for his own class. Since Lumley's upbringing and educational training taught him to be self-effacing and did not let him confront the struggles of life, he is at a loss in a working class environment, where people are self-assertive. C. W. Mills's analysis of the educational system in modern societies is relevant to the reasons behind Lumley's helpless condition in the face of practical everyday life. Mills argues thus:

...in the hands of 'professional educators,' many schools have come to operate on an ideology of 'life adjustment' that encourages happy acceptance of mass ways of life rather than the struggle for individual and public transcendence (222).

Evidently, the society and educational system of post-war England were so restrictive that any diversity and openness were denied and not approved of. Lumley also admits that rather than being encouraged to take creative initiatives in his life he has always been indoctrinated with "the sacred law of self-effacing, mute compliance" (27). Although the working class environment conveys Lumley the message that "he is imprisoned in his own class, he is not one of them, and he is condemned to solitary confinement if once he strayed from his own kind" (25), he decides to live like a working class man, and gives up his middle class attributes. He begins working as a window cleaner. He reflects that the job, for the first time, has

allowed him to be independent of his teachers and parents. His sense of being the master of his own life is reflected thus:

His heart gave a great leap of joy as he climbed backwards down the ladder, holding the pail expertly in his left hand. He seemed to have been doing it all his life: perhaps, in all but a literal sense, that was true. His life had only really begun a week ago. Until then he had merely been an offshoot, a post-script, to the lives of several other people. This new life was really his own (30-31).

Although he chooses to live his new life among the working class people, he decides not to be one of them as he strives after a classless society. His decision is not to

form roots in his new stratum of society, but remain independent of class, forming roots only with impersonal things such as places and seasons, or, in the other end of the scale, genuinely personal attachments that could be gently prized loose from all considerations involving more than two people (38).

This declaration is the evidence of Lumley's being an outsider both among the bourgeoisie and the working class. Accordingly, he keeps people at arms length, avoids conversations and intimacy. For instance, in a bar, he changes his place three times because some men attempt to start a conversation with him (38). Additionally, on a train, when he confronts the parents of George Hutchins, one of his previous school friends, he becomes terrified and runs out of the compartment:

In despair he stood up, dragged his case down from the rack, gabbled 'Must get ready getting out next station,' and fled down the corridor in search of a fresh compartment...fearing to stand in the corridor lest Mr and Mrs Hutchins should come out and see him, spent the forty minutes that remained of his journey cowering in the lavatory (14).

Instead of mingling with people, Lumley, like Meursault, who is watching people on his balcony, becomes a passive observer of the people around him and narrates his observations in detail:

The sun was hot by now, and the park presented its usual summer appearance: families sprawled on the grass, children ran swiftly up and down imitating aeroplanes, chattering as they neared one another to represent machine-gun fire; hundredweights of waste paper lay in heaps, waiting for a breeze start them on their long pilgrimage; broken bottles glinted in the sun, and every few yards lay a young couple in what appeared to the averted gaze to be the last throes of sexual enjoyment (39).

His unwillingness to take part in any pastime with other people and his detachment from them exemplify Lumley's aloofness.

Moreover, Lumley accepts whatever life offers to him and he lets chance govern his life since he as an outsider has exempted himself from the responsibilities and the demands of his class. For instance, once, he comes across Edwin Froulish, a college acquaintance and his wife Betty, and he moves into their cottage. Living with the Froulish family does not mean that Lumley has become an insider. He moves to their cottage because he believes that it will enable him to escape from the problem of his environment and of the clash of ideas. The reason behind his decision is disclosed thus:

He, who had rejected and been rejected by both the class of his origin and the life of the 'worker', might find the classless setting of his dreams in sharing a roof with a neurotic sham artist and a trousered tart (43).

As a protester against social norms, Lumley is not willing to settle down; hence, home does not have any meaning for him: "The notion that Home was an idea to be respected, an object to be slaved for, did not trouble him; he had cast it aside with the other relics of his upbringing" (49). The roof he shares with the Froulish couple only answers his practical needs; it serves as a place to store his few possessions, to take his meals, and to sleep in at night (49). Indeed, Lumley cannot have a stable and orderly life with Edwin Froulish, because he is the representative of a class conscious society; namely, he is an intellectual snob. Lumley is alienated from men who are snobs, because they preserve the notion of class distinctions by aspiring

after social and intellectual positions. As Pear observes, intellectual snobs like to talk about “semi-exclusive technical terms and esoteric phrases” (131). Similarly, Froulish wants to be regarded as a high brow man and likes to exhibit himself with self-important behavior and pompous speeches. Lumley, who supports practicality and reality, cannot tolerate anything that is idealistic, abstract or romantic. That is why he thinks Froulish makes a fool of himself with his nonsensical poems:

‘A king ringed with slings,’...’a thing
without wings but brings strings and sings.
Ho, the slow foe! Show me the crow toe I
know, a beech root on the beach, fruit of a
rich bitch, loot in a ditch, shoot a witch, which
foot?’ (65)

This poem, which sounds showy and farcical, alienates Lumley from the intellectual snob, who wastes his time by dealing with meaningless topics.

As an outsider, in a working class environment, Lumley regards the trade unions as estranging factors. Mills’s comment on the institutions of modern societies justifies Lumley’s alienation. According to Mills, organizations manipulate man, which makes him feel helpless and ineffectual (in Josephson 23). Similarly, Lumley, who is a keen observer of post-war Britain, knows that powerful organizations

... belonged to the sinister societies known as
Unions, and that anyone who tried to earn a
living with his hands without the blessing of
the Union was in a very dangerous position
(51-52).

It is explicit that the social system provides only one choice for the individual; namely, to be a member of a union, which prevents him from any self-initiative activity and liberty. Rather than letting himself be crushed by the system, Lumley accepts the partnership offer of a Lancashire worker, Ern Ollershaw. As an estranged man, Lumley does not develop any friendship with his partner. Their relationship is grounded on material concerns; so, at the end of each day they meet to share the money they earned. The partnership does not last long since Ollershaw is arrested because of his involvement in thievery. Lumley attends Ollershaw’s trial and again experiences the rigidity of the system, which vindicates his estrangement. He narrates how hastily the proceeding is dealt with:

...no defence was offered, no legal wrangling was necessary, nothing was to be done but state the facts, hear Ern's plea of Guilty, and sentence him (89).

After the speed of the proceeding, for Lumley, the next most shocking feature of the legal system is the casual attitudes of the lawyers and the magistrate. Lumley says that the trial

was evidently seen as a business transaction. Ern had placed such-and-such an amount of illegal conduct on one balance of the scales; the law would place a corresponding weight of punishment on the other, and equilibrium would be restored (89).

The unreliable and unjust nature of the legal system, which resembles a commercial transaction, and the lawyers' "rapid, detached handling of the business, their evident lack of personal concern with what to others were matters of supreme importance" (89), are also alienating reasons for Lumley.

Lumley is not allowed to work independently, without being a member of a trade union; therefore, he terminates his job as a window cleaner and becomes an expert delivery driver. Meanwhile, he falls in love with a woman, Veronica, who is from the upper middle class; thus, the class issue, which he tries to escape from, threatens him once more:

...she clearly moved in circles that demanded money as a condition of entry-money, good clothes, social position. Men he despised, men like Robert Tharkles and Hutchins, would stand more chance than he did. Any crawling vermin who happened to have his pockets well lined could leave him standing in the race. He began to think increasingly about money. The poison was doing its work (77).

In order to earn enough money and come closer to Veronica, Lumley goes through experiences which contribute to his alienation more and more. At the root of his alienation, as stated before, lies the class bound society. Firstly, the class system forces him to attain a high status; since, as a worker, he cannot be in the same circle

with Veronica. Only on the condition that he is successful and has money can he get acquainted with her. Therefore, it is the class system that forces him to get involved in the drug-smuggling business, which will make him rich. Eventually, he feels an “aching emptiness” (97) and becomes “helpless, and aghast” (109) as he has fallen prey to an immoral system for the sake of ascending to a higher class. The following words expressed by Fromm about the plight of modern man, who has lost his touch with everything, clarify also Lumley’s predicament:

The person who is mainly motivated by his lust for power, does not experience himself any more in the richness and limitlessness of a human being, but he becomes a slave to one partial striving in him, which is projected into external aims, by which he is “possessed”... His actions are not his own; while he is under the illusion of doing what *he* wants, he is driven by forces which are separated from his self, which work behind his back; he is a stranger to himself, just as his fellow man is a stranger to him...he has completely lost himself as the centre of his own experience; he has lost the sense of self (quot. in Josephson 59).

English society, which places great importance on status, enhances Lumley’s resentment and sharpens his feelings of alienation. For instance, he attends a party with the hope of seeing Veronica but he strongly feels that he is not one of those at the party since they are ostentatious and showy. He comments on them thus:

The sounds he could hear were made by people who had assembled to have a good time, but they might easily have been cries of anguish. Mr Blearney’s voice, grating on as he told one of his stories, might have been the endless mumbling delirium of a man in great pain. The roars of laughter which punctuated it, reaching him muffled through two closed doors, sounded like the bellowing of a herd of cattle driven towards the slaughter-house. One woman shrieked at intervals as if she were being disemboweled (109-110).

The way they talk is so unnatural that Lumley continues to reveal their hypocrisy in the following way:

...their appearance, in general, gave the impression of what is usually known as Bohemianism, but without its redeeming features; they looked studiously theatrical instead of harmlessly eccentric, and gave no impression, *en masse*, of intelligence or sensitivity (110).

The phoney attitudes and the masks that those people wear disturb Lumley extremely. He, who detests disguising his true feelings and notions, reveals that he once worked as a window cleaner. However, this openness causes the party to be a disaster for him. The class-conscious upper middle class men tease him and laugh at him. Lumley's unfortunate experience is narrated thus:

Charles: 'Sorry...I hate having to go, but I have to be back at work. I have got a job to do tonight.'

Elsa: 'Sounds like a burglar.'

A big-faced man: 'No, no, baby, he's just going to clean a few more windows...He finds it more profitable to clean them at night. They pay him to go away then.' (119)

After his escape from the pretentious people, Lumley ceases to work as a drug-dealer because the organization he is involved in is raided by the police and he gets injured. He is taken into a hospital and this is the beginning of a new life for him. Even after his physical cure is completed, he does not leave this place and accepts working as an orderly in the hospital. He finds the hospital atmosphere simple and natural. He further explains why he chooses to stay there:

Anonymity, obscurity, a relief from strain, the situation was exactly what he had prescribed for himself. Finally, he found with gratitude that hospital life, being so grotesquely unlike anything in the world outside, did not admit of any of *the usual social classifications*. It was not considered strange that he should be working at a manual occupation and still sounding his aitches (165).

This setting is not only devoid of any social stratification but it is also free from any “false pretensions for rank, prestige, and privileges were settled automatically” (165). Such a considerate and classless setting is what Lumley has always sought after. Nevertheless, even here, where he feels secure, he cannot escape from status-conscious people. A former school acquaintance, Burge, sees Lumley sweeping the floors and he feels shocked. As a mouthpiece of middle class men, he demands Lumley to live up to his potentials and justify his education. He says:

‘That sort of work ought to be done by people who are born to it. You had some sort of education, some sort of upbringing, though I must say you don’t bloody well behave like it. You ought to have taken on some decent job, the sort of thing you were brought up and educated to do, and leave this bloody slop-emptying to people who were brought up and educated for slop-emptying.’ (174)

Lumley, who is sensitive to social discrimination and social injustice, rebukes the biased mentality of the bourgeois in the following way:

And I don’t want your silly Edwardian notions of an upper-class Herren-volk thrown up at me, either. By “letting the side down” all you mean is that the nigger-driving sahib oughtn’t to do anything that reveals that he shares a common humanity with the niggers he drives. That idea’s dead everywhere in the minds of people like you.’ (174)

His attack is directed against unfair class differences and he wants the conventional upper middle class people to give up their prejudices. Burge, however, is intolerant of any opposing ideas that threaten his place in society. It is stated that upon hearing Lumley’s criticism he clenches his fist and shrieks waving his fist wildly: ‘You’re talking just like a bloody Socialist. Workers of the world, unite!’ (175) Supporters of Burge immediately cluster round Lumley and look at him with hostility. Nevertheless, Lumley continues to cast aspersions on both the ineffectual educational system of England and the hypocritical middle class people:

‘I despise you on two counts,’ he continued rapidly and fiercely. ‘First, because my

education, which you throw in my face, was an education along humane lines that didn't leave me with any illusions about the division of human beings into cricket teams called Classes, and secondly because while you've been living this inane life of-of good mixing, beer-drinking, and slapping the nurses' bottoms on night duty, I've been out, out in the world learning the truth about things' (174).

The worldviews of Burge and Lumley demonstrate the fact that post-war Britain is divided between the ones who want to maintain class consciousness and the ones, who want to eliminate any class differences. That is why Lumley, who is a protester against the class-bound society, is thrown out by Burge and his friends. John Wain remarks that "The outsider was outside, and they were inside" (176). Eventually, as the perpetrators of a class-bound society are in the majority the others, who are like Lumley, naturally feel estranged from society.

Despite this unfortunate experience, Lumley continues to work as an orderly and gets acquainted with Mr. Braceweight, who is a well-to-do man. Lumley respects him because he openly acknowledges that he was once class conscious and was unable to judge people on their personal values:

'I'm thinking about people now: and yet when I try to think about people I've known in the past, I find I can't really remember them. I've never really noticed anybody. Not noticed what kind of person he was: just whether he was a good business man, a sound employee, or a serious rival' (178-179).

Lumley wishes that everyone like Mr Braceweight questions himself and sheds his biases against lower classes.

In the hospital setting, which contains people from every class, Lumley gets to know Rosa, the daughter of a working class family. He flirts with her and gets the opportunity to familiarize himself with a working class life style. During his visit to Rosa's family, he likes their natural, sincere and modest way of living but he at the same time immediately notices how their demand on life is quite small. He ponders about and comments on their physical and cultural environment:

Every road, every junction and square, was the same as every other. The low brown houses watched him as he walked past. 'One of us is your home,' they muttered to him. 'You'll find Rosa in the kitchen and the bed upstairs in the front room, the photographs talking to each other in the cold parlour, the lavatory down the backyard, for ever and ever, Amen.' Well, what of it? He would be safe and hidden. Nothing ever happened in houses like this, nothing except things people could understand. No problems, no art, no discussions and perplexities, just birth, death, eating, resting, sitting in front of the fire on Sunday afternoons with the *News of the World*. The factory sirens, instead of birds, would wake him in the morning, he would leave off his collar and tie and grow fat round the middle (190).

This thorough and long pondering about the working class way of life reveals that Lumley would be a misfit in a working class environment as well. He is estranged from their mental apathy and undemanding life style. He, on the other hand, is so full of energy and enthusiasm that he knows, if he marries Rosa, the working class atmosphere will drain his energy; therefore, he resolves to break up with her.

After splitting with Rosa, Lumley decides to be Mr Braceweight's chauffeur. For this new job, he leaves the hospital and settles into Mr Braceweight's eighteenth-century farmhouse, which is in the countryside of middle England. Still, in this new environment, one of Lumley's former acquaintances does not leave him in peace. This time George Hutchins, who through education, aspires to be a member of middle class, disturbs Lumley. He urges Lumley to get a job in a preparatory school for a start. Lumley, a non-conformist, angrily retorts: "I don't want honest work. I'm like you, I prefer to be a parasite. A louse on the scalp of society" (205). After a while, he contemplates that, "This dream of semi-retirement, of dignified parasitism in the service of a good rich man in Technicolor landscape, was foreign to his nature" (223). Lumley definitely knows that he does not want to waste himself in the country. He has a life to live and a way to make in the world. Therefore, he leaves the countryside, and returns to city life. He is still

decided to remain out of the system and not to “go to the Labour Exchange,” and to “steer clear of anything that involved officialdom, registration, all that stuff” (228). It is evident that the complicated official systems that have a lot of rules and procedures have an alienating impact on him.

In the next chapter of his life, Lumley gets involved with the director of Golden Peach Club, Mr Blearney. After getting familiarized with Mr Blearney, he critically assesses the working and middle classes. He thinks that there is an unbridgeable gap between the two classes as the upper middle class men still look down on the ordinary men and manipulate them. He speaks about the exploitative employers and plight of the employees thus:

When the mass did the right thing, they were ‘the public’...; when they did not react satisfactorily, they were simply ‘them’...; and in time of lowered circumstances, you simply preyed on the less reputable impulses to which the mass was subject, when its members became plain suckers... This secret society, unconsciously sworn to the task of providing the vibrations that caused wear and tear in the structure of normal living, consciously pledged to working themselves to a standstill at anything that did not look like normal work, this invisible Trade Union, had been waiting for Charles ever since he first failed to take root in the cliff-side of a shattered bourgeoisie (233).

As a socially alienated man, Lumley emphasizes his uneasiness and displeasure regarding the existing inequality and exploitation in his society. The extant rigid pattern of class stratification makes him resentful. Meanwhile, Mr Blearney accepts Lumley as a chucker-out and his duty is to watch over and expel troublemakers from the Golden Club. However, after a while, he is driven by boredom and frustration; and he comes to hate the attendants of the Club. According to him “they were all got up to look like identical marionettes; thin, waxy faces, hair cropped to the length of a matchstick, drape jackets, and Windsor ties” (237). Luckily, one day the trouble maker whom Lumley has to deal with turns out to be Froulish, who is a gag writer. Froulish offers Lumley to join his team and become a gag writer as well. Lumley

welcomes the proposal and signs a three year contract with Mr Blearney, who says that what Lumley wants is

‘Neutrality’... ‘It’s the type who wants neutrality who comes into our racket. Doesn’t want to take sides in all the silly pettiness that goes on. Doesn’t want to spend his time scratching and being scratched. Wants to live his own life.’ (248)

Lumley concurs with Mr Belarney’s comment. He considers that “So far, he had set himself target after target that had proved out of reach: economically, the quest for self-sufficient poverty; socially, for unmolested obscurity; emotionally, first for a grand passion and then for a limited and defined contentment” (249). Lumley reconsiders and reevaluates his condition thus:

Neutrality; he had found it at last. The running fight between himself and society had ended in a draw; he was no nearer, fundamentally, to any *rapprochement* or understanding with it then when he had been a window-cleaner, a crook or a servant; it had merely decided that he should be paid, and paid handsomely, to capitalize his anomalous position (250).

According to Schluëssel “neutrality” is a world, “where there is no challenge, no competition, and hence no-external-struggle, and where, finally no one is allowed to offend, or as much as disturb the fragile self-image” (14). Lumley, in the end, realizes that he cannot abandon the middle class, where he has been born and brought up with:

He stood up and walked to the centre of the room. If an animal who was tame, or born in captivity, went back to what should have been its natural surroundings, it never survived. If it was a bird, the other birds killed it, but usually it just died. Here was his cage, a fine new one, air conditioned, clean, commanding a good view, mod. cons., main services (251).

In conclusion, Wain portrays a protagonist, who has become an outsider, because of his anger at sharp social distinctions of Britain, the ineffectual

educational system, the pretentious manners of the upper middle class people and the sterile life style of the working class men. However, in the end, all through his experiences and relationships with all sorts of people from every stratum of society, Lumley discovers that there is no escape from society and one's social role. He can neither join nor renounce society; hence, he compromises with society in the end.

CHAPTER V

C. AS A PSYCHOLOGICALLY ALIENATED MAN

Yusuf Atılgan is a twentieth century Turkish writer, who under the influence of existentialist philosophy, wrote books that deal with the absurdity of life, irrationality of events, contingency of life, lack of communication and loneliness. In order to convey these themes, he has created characters that are lonely, unhappy, restive, perverted and alienated. *Aylak Adam*'s protagonist C., too, is a neurotic and an obsessive man, who cannot adapt himself to society and lives a detached life; hence, this chapter analyzes C.'s outsidership and explains the reasons behind C.'s outsidership within the framework of Freud's theories.

C. is a twenty-seven-year old young man, who is alienated from social conventions, codes of conduct and societal expectations. The reasons behind his estrangement from society and people can be attributed to his unhappy childhood experiences, which as Freud states, are likely to have traumatic effects on the individual. C. has never known his mother because she died when he was one year old. He was brought up by his aunt Zehra and his father. Actually, he says that his father was mostly absent from home, which did not disturb him as his father's presence made him always restless. He rarely kissed C., but when he did, C. was repelled by this act because his father's harsh moustaches hurt his tender cheeks. C. remembers him mostly with his cold attitude and his telling Zehra, "Put this child to bed¹" (125). C. narrates that his father was such an authoritarian man that an unbearable silence would pervade the house whenever they dined. He further says that when he broke the silence his father would stare at him in such a hostile way that he would cower. Freud's following statements shed light on C.'s fear of his father. According to Freud

To the son the father is the embodiment of
social compulsion to which he so unwillingly

¹ "Yatır çocuğu"

submits, the person who stands in the way of his following his own will and of his early sexual pleasures (341).

C. hates his father as he denies C. liberty and enjoys fondling his aunt Zehra. Moreover, C.'s encounters with his father's indecent affairs with other women have harrowing effects on him. One of these terrible encounters is explained thus:

During his childhood, in the old house their maidservants would frequently be replaced by another. Some nights he would hear screams, whispers and the creaks of the bedstead. One day, he saw his father in the kitchen: He was standing behind a woman and he put his arms around the woman's hips. He was bending down over her tightly as if he would snap. When C. dropped the glass he was holding, they straightened up immediately. They were frightening ²(12).

For C., his father's deeds are definitely reprehensible and alienating. Moreover, his verbal and physical attacks have a negative impact on C.'s psyche. C. says that his father would beat C. whenever he interrupted his affairs with the maidservants. Furthermore, he would both reproach and flap C. whenever C. returned home with some bruises and scratches on his face. He had to listen to his father's grumblings: "You will see this child will not grow up and become a responsible member of society³" (126). C.'s frequent confrontations with unpleasant assaults, rejections and humiliating remarks by his father prevent him from achieving a sense of personal security; thus, as a twenty-seven-year old man, he is an outsider. He spends most of his time merely watching people and reporting what they do. The following passage is an example of C.'s observations as an aloof man:

I looked around myself with interest. Men have newly got shaved and women have newly made themselves up. They were

² Çocukluğunda, eski evde sık sık hizmetçi değişirdi. Bazı geceler kesiliveren bağırma, fısıltılar, somya gıcırtiları duyardı. Bir gün mutfakta babasını görmüştü: Kopacak gibi gergin, sırtı kamburlaşmış, arkadan kadının kalçalarına sarılmış. Elindeki bardak düşünce doğruluvermişlerdi. Korkunçtular.

³ "Görürsünüz, adam olmayacak bu çocuk."

untroubled. Even the beggar whose legs were amputated and the sockless newsboy who went blue were unworried ⁴(9).

C. only watches other people and is not interested in any interaction with anyone. For instance, when a taxi driver asks C.'s opinion about an accident, C. replies that he does not know anything about it and gets inwardly furious. He thinks thus: "He had to listen to this man until Mirgün. He could not tolerate it. Why on earth did I get on this cab? In Osmanbey he got out of the car⁵" (54). Moreover, C. hates barber shops where people frequently gossip and try to talk to him. Therefore, he develops tactics in order not to be talked to. He relates thus:

Once when only in order to avoid speaking, he mumbled something in English, the guy half in English half with hand movements began a curious buffoonery and in the end he could get from C. extra two and a half lira. C. took out one lira and put it on the edge of the table. "If you do not talk until you finish shaving, this lira will be yours; if you talk I will take it back," he said ⁶(55).

As an outsider, throughout the novel, he is also plagued with the feeling of powerlessness. He says: "Again the unwieldy feeling of boredom settled inside me"⁷ (9). The feeling of emptiness again haunts C. and he thinks thus: "Where shall I go? If only the police would suspect me and take me to the station. It would be a different night"⁸ (39). He, at times, feels so depressed that he wishes he did not exist. It is stated that "He was angry because he lived in this dirty world, because he

⁴ Çevreme ilgiyle baktım. Erkekler yeni traş olmuşlar, kadınlar yeni boyanmışlardı. Yüzleri tasasızdı. Caminin dirseğindeki bacakları kesik dilenci, soğuktan morarmış, çorapsız gazeteci çocuk bile öyleydiler.

⁵ Mirgün'e dek bu adamı dinleyecekti. Dayanamazdı. "Ne bok yemeğe bindim buna?" Osmanbey'de arabayı durdurup indi.

⁶ Bir kere salt konuşmaktan kurtulmak için İngilizce bir şeyler geveleyince, herif yarı Türkçe yarı el işareti acayip bir şaklabanlığa başlamış, sonunda fazladan iki buçuk lirasını almıştı. Pantolon cebinden bir lira çıkarıp masanın ucuna koydu. "-Tıraş bitinceye kadar konuşmazsan bu teklik senin olur; konuşursan geri alırım," dedi .

⁷ Yine lök gibi oturdu içime o deminki sıkıntı.

⁸ Nereye gideceğim? Keşke polis kuşkulanıp karakola götürseydi beni. Değişik bir gece olurdu.

was made to do the things he did. If only he could cry! But he could not. Even after his ear was torn he could not cry”⁹ (91). Furthermore, as a psychologically alienated man, he is emotionally unbalanced and easily loses his temper. For instance, he gets annoyed during his conversation with a woman, who claims to have worked at their house as a maidservant. The conversation between C. and the woman develops in the following way:

The maid: I took you for your father. I was a maid in your house. You are just like your father. You only do not have a moustache.
C: Go away; I am not like my father.
The maid: Why are you getting angry? Is it something sinful to take after one’s father? Your father was very clever.
C: Piss off! I don’t want it.
The maid: Whether you want it or not, you are like him. Look, how you stare at my legs.
C: No, no shut up!
The woman laughs. A horrible anger swells inside him¹⁰ (22).

C. reveals his alienation not only by reacting nervously and shying away from any contact but also by rebelling against the conventions of society. He associates the rules, conventions and expectations of society with his father; so, he cannot think or act healthily. To begin with, he does not want to have any proper job like everybody else. He explains the logic behind his decision in the following way:

His father used to say “Work consoles”. C. did not want such a consolation. What people called as work was to write something, to give lessons, to brandish a hammer. The driver who blew his horn differently from others, the blacksmith who brandished his hammer in a different way repeated themselves the next day. Life for them meant habit and comfort. The majority feared effort and innovation.

⁹ Bu pis dünyada yaşadığı, ona bu yaptıklarını yaptırdıkları için kızgındı. Bir ağlasaydı! Ama ağlayamazdı. Kulağı yırtıldığı zaman bile ağlayamamıştı.

¹⁰ “Baban sandım seni. Sizin evde hizmetçiydim ben. Tıpkı baban gibisin. Bir bıyıkların eksik.” “Defol, babama benzemem ben.” “Niye kızılıyorsun? Babaya çekmek kötü bir şey mi? Yaman adamdı senin baban.” “Defol! İstemiyorum.” “İstesen de istemesen de onun gibisin sen. Bak nasıl bakılıyorsun bacaklarıma.” “Hayır hayır sus!” kadın gülüyor. Korkunç bir öfke kabarıyor içinde.

How easy it was to follow them! If he wanted he could give lessons at a school during the day and sleep with quiet and beautiful women at night. Without effort he could do it. But he knew: he wouldn't be satisfied with it. He needed other things. Even desperately trying to overcome difficulties was nice¹¹ (41).

So, in order to escape from living a life of habits, he passes his time as an idle man, who constructs absurd pastimes for himself. He narrates that for one week he kept himself busy searching after the tailors, who had previously beaten him. He says that his aim was only to explain to them that their deed was unjustifiable. When he could not find the tailors he fabricates another nonsensical pastime. He relates:

Four days ago when on a street sign I read the name 'Two Oxen Street', I gave myself a job. I should collect the street names and think over them... I worked three days for this job; I quitted it yesterday afternoon...Now I am again an idle man¹²(14).

What C. regards as "work" is to collect the names of streets and think about the reasons why they are called "Two Oxen Street", "Lion's Bed Street", "Row of Cypress Avenue"¹³(15). When he gets bored with this activity, he decides to devote himself to writing. Hence, he works until late midnight and concentrates upon every single word and sentence of his writing. After three weeks, the moment he realizes that his occupation has become banal, he tears what he has written. Ultimately, unable to hold on to life as a writer, he continues to spend his time in restaurants,

¹¹ "İş avutur, " derdi babası. O böyle avuntu istemiyordu. Bir örnek yazılar yazmak, bir örnek dersler vermek, bir örnek çekiç sallamaktı onların iş dedikleri. Kornasını ötekilerden başka öttüren bir şoför, çekicini başka ahenkle sallayan bir demirci bile ikinci gün kendi kendini tekrarlıyordu. Yaşamının amacı alışkanlıktı, rahatlıktı. Çoğunluk çabadan, yenilikten korkuyordu. Ne kolaydı onlara uymak! Gündüzleri okulda ders verir, geceleri sessiz, güzel kadımlarla yatardı, istese. Çabasız. Ama biliyordu: Yetinemeyecekti. Başka şeyler gerekti. Güçlüğü umutsuzca zorlamak bile güzeldi.

¹² ...dört gün önce bir sokak levhasında 'İki Öküzler Sokağı' adını okuduğum zaman kendi kendimi bir işe atadım. Şehrin sokak isimlerini toplayacak, bunlar üstüne düşünecektim... Üç gün çalıştım bu işte; dün öğlen bıraktım... Şimdi yine aylakım.

¹³ İki Öküzler Sokağı', 'Aslan Yatağı Sokağı' ya da 'Sıra Serviler Caddesi'

cafes, theatre or cinema saloons, art exhibitions or mostly in streets roaming till he gets tired.

The exaggerated attitudes and codes of conduct of society have also an alienating effect on C.. As he thinks they are superficial and insincere, he opts to keep himself aloof. For instance, Sami, one of his friends, invites him to lunch at his mother's. C. thinks that if he accepts the invitation, he will encounter such trite clichés: “‘Please! Don't take off your shoes.’ You do not remove them but then you suppose that they got angry with you because you did not take them off. Especially the artificiality of inquiries after your health¹⁴...” (16) He knows that he will feel uneasy in such a social circle; therefore, in order to avoid all these exaggerated greetings, he rejects Sami's offer. Furthermore, during their first meeting Güler, who is one of his lovers, addresses him with a formal you. He objects to her thus: “‘I got bored with a formal “you”. I regard it as unnatural and superfluous. I do not talk to someone whom I cannot call by an informal “you” in my second conversation. What do you think?¹⁵” (63)

Moreover, C. is estranged from people who have become habit-ridden. He calls them “those with packages¹⁶” (39). He harshly criticizes them thus:

In the evenings you return home with packages. There is someone who waits for you. You are unworried. How easily you get relieved. You don't feel empty. Why can't I be like you? Am I the only one who thinks? Is it only me who is lonely?¹⁷(39)

According to Kolcu, the people C. calls “those with packages” are the bourgeoisie and working class men, who display their joy of life by carrying some packages of food and gifts (56). C., on the other hand, cannot understand how they live

¹⁴ “‘-Rica ederim, çıkartmayın ayakkaplarınızı.’ Çıkarmazsınız ama çıkarmadınız diye kızdıklarımı sanırsınız. Hele hatır sormanın yapmacığı...”

¹⁵ “‘Bütün bu ‘sizler’, ‘iz’ ler, ‘uz’lardan sıkılıyorum ben. Yapmacık, fazlalık gibi gelirler bana. İkinci konuşmamda ‘sen’ diyemeyeceğim biriyle bir daha konuşmam. Ne dersin(iz)?”

¹⁶ Eli paketliler

¹⁷ Akşamları elinizde paketlerle dönersiniz. Sizi bekleyenler vardır. Rahatsızsınız. Hem ne kolay rahatlıyorsunuz. İçinizde boşluklar yok. Neden ben de sizin gibi olamıyorum? Bir ben miyim düşünen? Bir ben miyim yalnız?

complacently. He goes even further and calls the men who are content and ordinary as “ants” ¹⁸(156). They live according to the pattern set forth for them. In other words, they repeat themselves and are occupied with their mundane jobs. C. thinks: “Everything is the same as ever: the noise of the cars and indifferent people, who with their upraised collars, walk fast” ¹⁹(16). However, for C., to repeat oneself is something to be condemned. Therefore, he escapes even from being a patron. For instance, when he meets Güler at the same café for five times, he is disturbed. It is stated that:

He feared to become habituated to this place.
If he continued like this, this table would
become a sacred thing of their love. To have a
permanent place was bad. Then, man would
live not according to his own wishes but
according to the demands of the place ²⁰(72).

This passage exemplifies how C. is afraid of settling down like an ordinary man.

C.’s outsidership is most striking when the subject of marriage is brought up. The concepts of household and marriage remind C. of his father, who means authority and the established order of society. As a result, he regards these abstractions as suffocating and inhibiting. Such a worldview prevents him also from establishing healthy relationships with women. For instance, when Güler, like every average girl, expresses her dream of a house, which consists of three rooms, one kitchen, the man she loves and two children, C. does not react as she expects. Güler had thought that he would get excited and rejoice at the idea of marriage and she assumed that he would say:”“ Immediately tomorrow, we should move to a house.²¹””(80). Contrary to her expectation, C. replies derisively: ““Why, so that the man should abandon his family, the children should be stricken with

¹⁸ Karıncalar

¹⁹ “Her şey her zamanki gibiydi: motor gürültüsü; kalkık yakalı, hızlı yürüyen, kayıtsız insanlar” (16).

²⁰ Alışmaktan korkuyordu. Böyle giderse bu masa sevgilerinin kutsal yeri olacaktı. Bir yerleri olması kötüydü. Sonra insan kendinin değil, o yerin isteğine uygun yaşamaya başladığı.

²¹ “Yarımdan tezi yok, seninle o evde oturmaya başlayalım.”

diphtheria?²²”(72) When the subject of marriage is brought up for the second time, C. likens marriage to a tragedy. He says that marriage is

a tragedy with three acts. The first act: Mountains are completely flat. The second act: How many hills! The third act: the plain is marshy. Gentleman, that’s all for today. Good night. Tomorrow, we’ll be waiting for you ²³(79).

Marriage also means for him submitting oneself to a man whose duty is to unite them in one of the tedious offices (121). Apparently, as he never experienced a happy household, he is far away from the notion of marriage. Additionally, he cannot make love to Güler, which can also be related with his unhappy childhood experiences with his father. During his intercourse with Güler, C. becomes uneasy because he thinks that they are being watched. He says to Güler:

While you were getting undressed, you thought about what other people would say and how your father would become shocked when he heard about your relationship...In this blue void, even our flesh cannot make love. Because even in this insulated and dark room others are with us. But one day you will come to me having dismissed your father and others from your mind ²⁴(88).

In his opinion, Güler thinks that she is watched by her father, who represents the conventions and morals of society (Kolcu 42). Besides, he realizes Güler is obsessed with the idea of marriage and cannot completely be with him; so, he terminates this relationship.

C.’s unfortunate childhood experiences alienate him even from Ayşe, whom he really loved. During their flirtation, he thinks that with Ayşe his life has become

²² “Adam bırakıp kaçsın, çocuklar kuşpalazına tutulsunlar diye mi?”

²³ Üç perdelik dram. Birinci kısım: Dağlar dümdüz. İkinci kısım: Ne çok tepe! Üçüncü kısım: Ova bataklık. Bugünlük bu kadar baylar. İyi geceler. Yarın yine bekleriz.

²⁴ “Soyunurken, babanın duyunca, nasıl şaşıracağını, başkalarının neler diyeceğini düşündün...Bu mavi boşlukta etimiz bile sonuna dek sevişemiyor. Çünkü bu ses geçmez, ışık sızmaz odada bile başkaları bizimle birlik. Ama bir gün babanı, başkalarını kovup geleceksin.”

routinized since they are most of the time with each other. They routinely eat and drink together and have sexual intercourse. Such kind of life makes him realize that he has come to lead the life of a married man. He reflects:

Gradually were they becoming like the married couples, who walk arm in arm and share the same bed? He could not tolerate it. There must have been a way to avoid living as a man and wife.²⁵(123).

Moreover, he says that his relationship with Ayşe has made him one of “those with packages”, whom he has always derided. He expresses the change in himself thus:

I sat too much; no, I lay on the bed too much. I became afraid of sweat and weariness. I was untroubled. I was like “those with packages” and those who were fond of their comfort. I was like others even when I shouted at Ayşe ‘There aren’t others; only we are there’. Why are you laughing? For a month haven’t I carried grapes home? Haven’t I bought the grapes from the same grocer’s? That day, didn’t I become happy when the bushy-browed greengrocer stretched out the huge paper bag and said “You love white grapes. They were about to finish so I reserved these for you.” While I was paying I saw myself in the mirror of the shop with packages in my hands and I became embarrassed. I couldn’t recognize myself²⁶ (136).

C., on the other hand, does not want to be a common man, who is the head of a family and is responsible for his wife and children. Furthermore, due to his hatred towards his father, he cannot tolerate Ayşe’s devotion to her father. The moment he discovers that Ayşe values her parents and looks forward to seeing her father, he

²⁵ Gitgide, yakınlıkları yalnız kolkola yürümelerinde, aynı yataktayatmalarında kalmış karı-kocalara mı benzeyeceklerdi? Dayanamazdı buna. Bir kurtuluş yolu olmalıydı.

²⁶ Çok oturdum; hayır çok yattım. Terden, yorgunluktan korktum. Rahattım. Rahatına düşkünlerden, eli pakettillerden bir ayrılığım yoktu. Ona “ötekiler yok; ikimiz varız” diye bağırdığımda bile ötekiler gibiydim. Neden gülüyorsun? Bir ay akşamları eve üzüm taşımadım mı? Üzümü hep aynı manavdan almadım mı? O gün bu kalın kaşlı manav bana kocaman kesekağıdını uzatıp, “-Razakı seversiniz siz. Bitecek gibiydi de ayırdım”; deyince sevinmedim mi? Adama parasını verirken kendimi dükkanın aynasında, kucağımda kesekağıdıyla görünce utandım. Sanki aynadaki ben değildim.

decides to break up with her. According to Kolcu, C. cannot bear Ayşe's father as well because he thinks that her father is the representative and preserver of the conventions of society (42). Consequently, as C.'s peace is totally broken, he ends his affair immediately.

Since his father has a moustache, C. associates all men with moustaches with his father and hates them all. This hatred is another factor that contributes to C.'s feeling of alienation from anybody else. C.'s hatred for the men who have grown moustaches can be explained by Freud's theory of "transference". Freud asserts that something in the present takes the individual to his painful memories and influences his present life and relationships (17). Likewise, throughout the novel, C. depicts men with moustaches as criminals. For instance, he declares that the tailors who beat him had moustaches (9). Moreover, when he witnessed an accident which injured a child, he again stressed that the driver who drove over the little boy had a moustache. The way the moustached driver behaves is reported thus:

A face coming out of the front window of the car was shouting. "-They will make me a murderer! Who is the mother of this bastard?" He was with a moustache²⁷ (64).

C. takes it for granted that moustached men are vulgar and impolite. This prejudiced attitude demonstrates to what extent C. is troubled by his past experiences with his father, which prevents him from thinking like everybody else.

The other factor that makes C. an outsider might be related to Freud's theory of the Oedipus complex. C. during his childhood had a strong attachment towards his aunt Zehra, who is a mother figure. C. expresses his devotion to his aunt thus: "Aunt Zehra brought me up. I used to love her with a jealous and selfish love. Things were either good or bad depending on whether they spoiled our pleasant times or not"²⁸ (126). He continues to express his devotion to his aunt in the following way:

²⁷ Arabanın ön penceresinden uzanmış surat bağıryordu. "-Katil olacağız be. Yok mu bu piçin anası?" Bıyıklıydı.

²⁸ "Beni Zehra teyzem büyüttü. Onu kıskanç, bencil bir sevgiyle severdim. Olaylar onunla yalnızlığımızı bozup bozmadıklarına göre iyi ya da kötüydüler."

'I used to get angry with the neighbors who used to come to our house. You cannot imagine the torment of the Sundays and holidays when my father stayed at home²⁹!' (126)

He loves his aunt so much that in order to spend more time with her, he refuses to play outside with other children. C. says: "'Until I began to attend school I rarely went outside³⁰.'" (126). In fact, C.'s outsidership is formed in his childhood. Even as a child, he isolated himself from the outside life and created a world, in which only he and his aunt lived. For C., his aunt was his first and strongest love object so much so that he became restive and unhappy in the presence of his father:

It was not definite whether he would come home for dinner. We used to wait until seven. When the hour hand was nearing seven, my heart would beat fast...How I was overcome by the feeling of hopelessness! ... Almost every night the moment father stepped in the house, he would sever me from the games I played with my aunt and from the happiness of her tales. He would say "Put the child to bed". I experienced the instant transition from excessive happiness to excessive grief because in her lap I would forget all about my father's existence. In bed, I used to think about the injustice of his severing me from my aunt³¹ (125-126).

C. definitely suffers from the Oedipus complex. He thinks that his father separates his aunt from him; therefore, he forms a defiant attitude towards his father. Due to his jealousy of his father, C. wants to kill him so that he cannot take his aunt. He confesses thus: "Some nights in my dreams, I used to kill my father many times. Not

²⁹ "Eve gelen komşu kadınlara kızardım... Babamın gündüzleri evde kaldığı pazarların, bayram günlerinin azabı!"

³⁰ "Okula başladığım yıla değin, sokağa pek seyrek çıkardım."

³¹ Akşamları yemeğe gelip gelmeyeceği belli olmazdı. Saat yediye dek beklerdik. Vakit yaklaştı mı yüreğimde bir çarpıntı başlardı...Nasıl kararırdu içim!...hemen her gece babam eve girer girmez beni, teyzemle oynadığımız oyunlardan, masalların mutluluğundan ayırırdı. "Çocuğu yatır!" derdi. Büyük sevinçlerden büyük kederlere birden geçişi öğreniyordum. Çünkü onun kucagındayken babamın varlığını unutmuş olurdum. Yatakta, beni ondan ayırmasındaki haksızlığı düşünürdüm.

because of my ear, but because he attacked my aunt Zehra. I used to put the guilt on him³².” (127) C.’s jealousy of and hatred for his father sharpened when one day he saw his father fondling his aunt. He relates thus:

My father was embracing my aunt with one hand lifting her skirt, and with his other hand he was caressing her bare legs. “-Zehra your legs!” he said. I was about to faint. When I rushed out and flung onto them, her legs were still bare. “Leave her alone, leave her alone!” I cried. I bit his hand. Instantly, he clung to my left ear. I felt a nasty, burning pain. My aunt said “Ah, What have you done? His ear is torn, Scoundrel! You tore his ear (127).

This incident was a turning point in C.’s life because after this event, C.’s enmity for his father increased but his love for his aunt did not decrease. In his present life, he pursues after the woman, who is like his aunt who has blue eyes, graceful legs and who is affectionate. However, he cannot realize that there is no woman, who is exactly like his aunt. As mentioned before, he breaks up with Güler, who has blue eyes and Ayşe, who has graceful and tanned legs. The same failure can be observed in his search for a woman who can give him affection. Once, he thinks that he has found the right woman but she turns out to be a prostitute. Nonetheless, he does not give up the idea of being with this woman because he assumes that she can be a substitute for his aunt Zehra and provide him with the peace and affection his aunt used to lavish on him. He takes her to his house in order to evoke his past experiences with his aunt. Like a child, he leans his head against her bosom and asks her to caress his head and tell him something about her childhood. Then, he wants her to kiss the tip of his nose. C. sees that the woman cannot substitute his aunt and he instantly pays her money and sends her away. It is obvious that C.’s mind is still fixed on the moments he shared with his aunt; so, he has difficulties in adapting himself to his present life.

C.’s outsidersness that is closely related to his unhappy experiences with his father can also be observed when the following utterances echo in his mind: “His ear

³² “Kimi geceler düşümde babamı korkunç ölümlerle birkaç kere öldürürdüm. Kulağım için değil, Zehra teyzeme saldırdı diye. Bütün suçu ona yükliyordum.”

is torn, his ear is torn, his ear is torn³³”. Similarly, his father’s shameless acclaim occasionally pesters him: “Zehra, your legs! Tonight I will kiss your legs”³⁴. When he is with Güler roaming around he is still plagued by these words: ““Zehra, your legs! My ear! Tonight I will kiss your legs, you know³⁵”” (86). C.’s restless condition, which makes him a stranger, can be illuminated by Freud’s concepts of “the unconscious” and “repression”. Freud indicates that the repressed impressions are never forgotten and they sometimes emerge automatically from the unconscious, which is cut off from self-knowledge. According to Freud, these feelings may overthrow the intentions of the individual and derange his well being.

Furthermore, the upsetting experiences cause C. to develop many obsessions, which also contribute to his alienation. Freud states that an obsessed man is preoccupied with thoughts and behavior that do not really interest him and that are alien to him. Hence, obsessions are irrational thoughts that constantly force themselves into the consciousness of the individual and cause his separation from society and life in general. Likewise, C. is preoccupied with deeds and thoughts which do not have any logical explanations. For example, he scratches his ear when he is confused and embarrassed. Moreover, he is concerned with other people’s ears and develops odd ideas about them. It is recounted that on the bus he thinks as:

He saw that in an instant the man’s ears moved. He would often think that ears are the ugliest organs on man’s head. How ridiculous they are especially when looked from behind. I know, they are there in order that man may hear but could not they have another shape? How? He did not know. It would be best if man had been created without any ears. Then, he would perhaps hear with the skin of his

³³ Babam bir koluyla teyzemin etekliğini kaldırıp sarmış, öteki eliyle çıplak bacaklarını okşuyordu. “-Zehra, şu bacakların yok mu?” dedi. Çevrem kararır gibi oldu. Fırladım. Üstlerine atıldığımda bacaklar hala çıplaktılar. “-Bırak onu, bırak!” diye bağırdım... Elini ısırđım... Birden sol kulağıma yapıştı. Pis, yakıcı bir acı duydum. Teyzem, “Ah, ne yaptın?” diyordu. “Kulağı yırtıldı! Alçak, kulağı yirttin onun! Kulağı yırtıldı.”

³⁴ “Zehra, şu bacakların yok mu?.. Bu gece bacaklarını öpecem.”

³⁵ “Zehra, şu bacakların yok mu!..’ Kulağı! Bu gece bacaklarını öpecem, biliyorsun...”

face; or similar to an insect with his hair ³⁶...
(96)

Furthermore, C. is preoccupied with women's legs. They give him a sense of terror as they remind him of his father. He knows that his father was infatuated with women's legs and C. is afraid of becoming like him. For instance, during his flirtation with Güler, wherever they go, he feels uneasy and behaves abnormally because the presence of Güler's legs disturbs him. He wants to fondle them but cannot. C.'s uneasiness is recounted thus:

He did not only touch her legs. Why would she bring them with her whenever she came to him? It was always the same. His ear would burn when his palm would get pins and needles with the desire of fondling and squeezing her legs. He could not touch them. Later on again, in the cab, while they were going to the Bosphorus, Güler's leg touched his. He did not draw away his leg. He wanted that they reached their destination at once ³⁷(83).

Although C. is disturbed by the presence of Güler's legs, he cannot help gazing at them and remembers the painful event between his father and his aunt. It is stated that he scratches his ear and "When they started to walk again, he would always look at her legs. His father was also like him; besides, he was twisting his moustache. His [C.'s] ear would itch ³⁸ (50). His preoccupation with women's legs recurs when he is at a seaside resort. He gazes at them and thinks:

The woman shook off her feet...in the end she
scattered the sand heap and stretched her legs.
They seemed to be restless. Did they know

³⁶ Adamın kulaklarının bir an kıpırdadığını görmüştü. İnsan kafasında en çirkin yerin kulaklar olduğunu sık sık düşünürdü. Hele arkadan bakıldı mı nasıl gülünçtüler! Anladık, kişi duysun diye vardılar ama bir başka biçimleri olamaz mıydı? Nasıl? Bilmiyordu. En iyisi kişinin kulaksız yaratılmasıydı. O zaman belki yüzünün derisiyle duyardı; ya da böcekler gibi kıllarıyla...

³⁷ Yalnız bacaklarına dokunmuyordu. Neden ona her gelişinde bacaklarını da getirirdi? Hep böyle olurdu. Onları okşama, sıkma isteğiyle avcu karıncalanmaya başlayınca bir kulağı yanardı. Dokunamazdı. Sonra gene, bindikleri takside Boğaziçi'ne giderlerken, Güler'in bacağı onunkinden değdi. Çekmedi. Yol çabuk bitsin istiyordu.

³⁸ Yeniden yürümeye başladıkları zaman hep onun bacaklarına bakıyordu. Babası da öyleydi. Üstelik bıyıklarını burardı. Kulağı kaşındı.

they were being gazed at? He could not take his eyes off them. Then, the woman stood up. Her legs came towards him. Her legs stopped near him ³⁹(103).

His obsession with women's legs is so exaggerated that he appears as a strange man. Gradually, he overcomes his fear of women's legs and begins to touch them. Ayşe notices his infatuation with her legs and asks why he always kisses her legs. Upon this question, the image of his father appears in his mind and he remembers his father's words: "Ah, Zehra your legs!⁴⁰" (125). Although all his preoccupations, repressed feelings and emotions make him unfit to live in a conventional society, he still hopes to find his ideal lady as he desperately needs love, warmth and affection. When a friend says to him that the woman he searches for does not exist, C. denies such an idea: "-She exists! If she didn't, I wouldn't exist either. She lives in this city. I'll find her one day"⁴¹ (152). Luckily for him, while he is looking out of the window of a café, he suddenly sees a woman with blue eyes. It is related that

Suddenly, his headache stopped. With a strange feeling of joy and a madly urgency he stood up. It was the woman he sought. What stopped his headache was not the aspirin he took with the orange juice but his seeing her face⁴². (157).

C. immediately leaves the café and follows the woman. However, she runs away and gets on a bus, C., at a loss, causes an accident and misses the opportunity of getting acquainted with her. Eventually, the novel ends with C.'s search for his ideal woman. It is stated that:

³⁹ Kadın, ayaklarını silkip, ...sonunda yığını dağıtıp bacaklarını uzattı. Sanki tedirgindiler. Kendilerine bakıldığını mı biliyorlardı? Gözlerini onlardan ayıramıyordu. ...Sonra kadın ayağa kalktı... Bacaklar ona doğru geldi. ...Bacaklar yakınında durdu.

⁴⁰ "-Zehra, şu bacakların yok mu?"

⁴¹ '-Var! O olmasaydı ben olmazdım. Bu şehirde yaşıyor. Bir gün bulucam onu.'

⁴² Birden başımın ağrısı kesildi. İçinde acayip bir sevinç, delice bir telaşla kalktı. Aradığı oydu. Başımın ağrısını böyle kesiveren, portakal suyuyla birlik içtiği aspirin değil, onun yüzünü görmesiydi.

Instantly, the pain in his left temple recurred. He slackened himself as if he surrendered to this absurd, derisive system which caused him to lose the woman whom he had just found. Now they could do to him whatever they wished. The policeman who stood near him shook his arm and contrary to his expectation asked in a mild tone:

-What happened? Tell me.

-I was going to catch the bus...

He was silent. It was unnecessary to talk.

From now on, he would not mention her to anyone. He knew; they wouldn't understand him⁴³ (159).

After this incident, C. finally comes to realize the fact that in the modern world, where everyone is wrapped up in his habits, there is no one that can understand him. Therefore, there remains nothing else for him except detaching himself from society. Consequently, in *Aylak Adam*, Atılgan pictures a man, who under the influence of his painful past experiences, tries to survive in an indifferent and mechanized society as an outsider.

⁴³ Birden sol şakağındaki ağrı yeniden başladı. Yıllardır aradığını bulur bulmaz yitirmesine neden olan bu saçma, alaycı düzene boyun eğmiş gibi kendini koyuverdi. Şimdi ona istediklerini yapabilirlerdi. Yanındaki polis kolunu sarsıp, ummadığı yumuşak bir sesle sordu:

-Ne oldu? Anlat.

-Otobüse yetişecektim...

Sustu. Konuşmak gereksizdi. Bundan sonra kimseye ondan söz etmeyecekti. Biliyordu; anlamazlardı.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION:

A COMPARATIVE STUDY THAT REVEALS THE DIFFERENCES AND SIMILARITIES OF THESE OUTSIDERS IN QUESTION

Throughout the previous chapters, the study has analyzed characters, who have lived in the twentieth century as outsiders because of the adverse effects of industrialization and the two world wars on their psyches. It has been disclosed how the outsidership of man in the twentieth century was of universal significance among men of different, cultural, historical and intellectual backgrounds. In other words, Meursault, a Frenchman, is alienated from anyone and anything in life because he is an absurd man; Charles Lumley, an Englishman, is a misfit since the social conditions of post-war England have made him restless and outrageous and lastly, C., a young Turkish man, is an outsider since in a convention-bound society, there is not anyone who can relieve him from his conflicts and neurosis which stem from his traumatic childhood experiences. Despite these differences behind their alienation, the characters converge at being “uprooted”, “uncommitted” and “rebellious”.

vi.i. Uprootedness

The protagonists, Meursault, Lumley and C. can be defined as uprooted since they do not have any close relations, friends and they also have very loose ties with them. Their uprootedness is self-imposed. That is, each character consciously and willingly chooses to break away from others and rejects any contact with them. Meursault, as pointed out in the second chapter, has a mother but he does not live with her since he institutionalizes her because of a trivial reason. He says that he

sent his mother away because he did not have enough money to have her looked after by a nurse; and he adds that he did not expect anything more of her (85). As his bond to his mother is tenuous, he rarely visits her and receives the news of her death calmly. In addition, he does not mourn for her and continues to live as if nothing has happened.

Similarly, Lumley is an uprooted man whose relationship with his parents is revealed to be problematic. He complains that they always tried to impose upon him the strict rules of their middle class culture and never tried to understand him. Hence, after his graduation, he decides not to return home but to roam around towns where he cannot be identified. He describes himself as a “fugitive”, who is travelling “without a passport” (12). Similar to Meursault and Lumley, C. is a deracinated man. His mother died when he was one year old and his father and aunt Zehra are also dead. Nonetheless, it turns out that he has had relatives; but he has tried to avoid them. For instance, one day his lawyer informs him that his cousin came to demand some money. Upon hearing the word cousin, C. gets infuriated and says:

-I hope you didn't give any money to him.

-No. You ordered me not to give it. But I pitied him. He says that he has kids...and once he sees you, he is sure, you will help him.

-I won't. I don't want to see him, either. I'm not the farmhouse of my relatives⁴⁴ (66).

The quotation reveals how C. sees his relative as a nuisance and how he is determined not to have any relationship with him.

All these estranged men do not only separate themselves from their most close relatives, they at the same time sever themselves from their friends, acquaintances and society in general. Meursault, to begin with, rarely mingles with people. He does not have any close friends or confidants with whom he can share his thoughts. When he speaks with anybody it is generally for the sake of convenience. For instance, when he is with Salamano or Raymond, it is not he who ignites the

⁴⁴ -Vermediniz ya?

-Hayır. Verme demiştiniz. Ama acıdım ona. Çoluk çocuk diyor...Onu bir görsem, bilirim, yardım edecek bana diyor.

-Etmem. Görmek de istemiyorum. Akraba çiftliği değilim ben.

conversation; namely, either Raymond or Salamano talks to him about their problems. Similarly, he spends time with Marie because he is only physically attracted to her. Never does he experience any emotional intimacy with her. As Celeste puts it at the court, Meursault is a withdrawn man, who speaks only when he is asked a question (83).

Correspondingly, Lumley avoids conversations and companionship. For instance, even though he lives with the Froulish couple and establishes a partnership with Ollershaw, he promises himself that "...he must form no roots in his new stratum of society, but remain independent of class, forming roots only with impersonal things such as places and seasons" (38). By shying away from any contact with people, Lumley refuses to belong either to the middle classes or to the working class. However, as Hague points out Lumley soon discovers that he cannot retreat from society all together and in the end he remains as a "half-outsider" (213).

Like Meursault and Lumley, C. is estranged from society and others. Because of his unhappy childhood experiences, he does not have confidence in people and hates close relationships. He pours out his feelings thus:

I couldn't get on well with friends. I
witnessed their inevitable hypocrisy...
Everyone seemed to be satisfied with the
transitory familiarity of a train journey.
Talking about money! I didn't like it⁴⁵(127).

This quotation discloses C.'s hatred for people and justifies his indifference to any relationship. Although he closes himself to men, he is open to women, who resemble his aunt Zehra in terms of eye color, tanned and shaped legs and tenderness. However, his liaisons with women do not last long as he has not overcome his Oedipus complex and is plagued with his past experiences. Finally, it can be asserted that the outsiders the study deals with are uprooted men who constantly avoid conversations and lead solitary lives. They spend most of their time as detached observers. It has been previously disclosed that each of them elaborately narrates what others do, what they wear and how they live sometimes in a critical and condescending manner or sometimes in an objective and indifferent tone.

⁴⁵ Arkadaşlarla anlaşamıyordum. İnsanların kaçınılmaz ikiyüzlülüğünü görüyordum... Herkes tren yolculuğundaki süreksiz tanışıklıkla yetinir gibiydi. Çok para lafları! Hoşlanmıyordum.

vi.ii. Uncommittedness

Uncommittedness is the second characteristic that the alienated protagonists share. Meursault does not feel committed towards achieving any goal since for the absurd mind life does not have any value and any meaning. Therefore, concepts such as advancement, progression and ambition seem to be trivial for him. He reflects his absurd worldview when he is offered a promotion by his boss. Meursault nonchalantly rejects such a gratifying proposition because he believes that there is not any meaning in what he does and everything has the same value. Moreover, his uncommittedness can be observed when Marie broaches the issue of marriage. Again, he says that he did not mind marrying her and he could marry her if she wants to. Obviously, life for him is meaningless and nothing has any significance. Consequently, he is a free man who chooses to lead a life that is consistent with his own interests and desires.

Lumley, too, leads a free life. He has realized the fatuity of human ambition and has become unlike those who are slaves of their aims. He never asks himself what he ought to do, he simply and happily drifts, in the direction the current takes him (181). Hence, despite his university education, he chooses to work as a window cleaner, driver, orderly and chucker-out. His uncommittedness is mostly revealed during his conversation with Mr Braceweight. The exchange begins in the following way:

‘Have you always worked in hospitals Mr Lumley?’...

‘No,’... ‘I was an export delivery driver before this. Drove motor-cars for a living.’

... ‘I suppose you left it and came into this work because you had a special interest-er-in this direction?’

‘Not particularly. I was a patient here and I took the job because I hadn’t anything other.’

This conversation continues as:

‘You were out of work, then?’...

‘Well, yes. Not that it really bothered me much. Something reasonable always turns out once you’ve abandoned the idea that one

particular job is the only one you're cut out for' (177-8).

Lumley's indifferent worldview can also be observed in his handling the subject of marriage. Lumley as a nonconformist and detester of the class notion cannot get married since marriage means belonging to one class, settling down and obeying the rules and conventions of society.

Likewise, C., who is psychologically detached from society, is an uncommitted man. He does not welcome the idea of having a proper occupation, marriage and following a routinized life. Thus, when his conventional girl friend Güler narrates that she dreams of a blissful family with a house of three rooms, one kitchen and two children, C. does not hesitate to leave her. He breaks away from Ayşe for the same reason. When he realizes that Ayşe is devoted to her father and the moments he spends with Ayşe begins to resemble "those with packages", whom he mocks, he feels alienated from her. As C. comes from a dysfunctional family, the idea of marriage appears like a nightmare to him and therefore he is unable to construct any healthy relationships with women.

All in all, uncommittedness makes these outsiders be easily guided by chance. They live their lives as it comes. Thus, unlike the ordinary man, who believes in the causal connections between events and whose actions are purposive; the outsiders allow themselves to be drawn into a sequence of events.

vi.iii. Rebellion

The alienated men, whom this study has analyzed, are all rebels who resist authority, tradition and allegiance to any established beliefs. Meursault, as an absurd man does not obey the conventions of society. For instance, he does not mourn for his late mother or express any kind of regret. His actual rebellion emerges when he confronts the attorney and later the priest. He thinks that his actions do not need any justification by a transcendental being. Hence, when the prosecutor shows him the crucifix and asks him whether he believes in God, he answers in the negative. He acknowledges Camus's belief that one must make life in this world meaningful and

be responsible for one's deeds. Such kind of a worldview makes him an honest man who rejects any kind of pretence and who never gives false accounts even at the cost of severe punishments. Moreover, he believes that his actions have consequences only in this world; therefore, he rebels against the idea of afterlife. As indicated earlier, he is sincerely attached to earthly life and dies happily as he has recognized that he has lived a happy life.

Lumley is also a nonconformist: he reacts against any political doctrines and political ideology. He thinks about the men of the thirties in the following way:

...how they failed from the start because their rejection was moved by the desire to enter, and be at one with, a vaguely conceived People, whose minds and lives they could not even begin to imagine, and who would in any case, had they ever arrived, have made their lives hell...he had always been right about *them*, right to despise them for their idiotic attempt to look through two telescopes at the same time: one fashioned of German psychology and pointed at themselves, the other Russian economics and directed at the English working class (38).

Lumley reveals his anger against the people of the thirties as they were easily gulled by the political leaders and allowed themselves to be used for their fatuous ideals.

Moreover, because he is discontented with the class oriented mindset of England of the 1950s, he rebels against the sharp class distinctions of society. He does not follow its codes of manners such as wearing a uniform, speaking standard English, eating and drinking in luxurious restaurants and having a well-paid occupation. Next to the class divisions, he reacts against the educational system, which is ineffectual and does not prepare the individual for the stark realities of day-to-day living. He expresses his anger by returning to his university he graduated from in order not to apply for a position as an instructor but in order to get a job as a window cleaner. Additionally, he unhesitatingly speaks negatively about intellectual snobs, their desire for wealth and material possessions, their blind adherence to the class structures and undue privileges.

Similar to the above mentioned estranged men, C. is a rebel as well. Due to his anger towards his father, he is disengaged from conventions such as marriage, family and having an occupation. He criticizes his fellowmen because of their superficial life styles. Moreover, he expresses his repugnance against the idea of being married thus:

What do they have in common? Except rubbing their fleshs against each other on certain days of the week. They nonetheless tolerate it. Because they are convinced of the obligation of living together. What makes me different is not to believe in this idea. This is the source of my distress and joy. Instead of tolerating it, I prefer to find refuge in my loneliness. One person suffices. A society that is formed by two people who love each other dearly. As we are social creatures, aren't best societies the ones that that are cozy, unproblematic and consisting of two persons?⁴⁶ (112)

These are the opinions that reveal C.'s unconventionality and prove the reason why he remains an outsider all through the novel.

In conclusion, the study has revealed that Meursault, Lumley and C. though outsiders of different reasons, reveal their reactions in the same way. They firstly build walls around themselves and choose to have tenuous relations with the people around them. Then, they prefer to live a life which lacks purpose and direction towards progression. Lastly, they disclose the reasons behind their alienation either through their attitudes or through their openly and sharply expressed ideas

⁴⁶ Ortak neleri var? Haftanın belli günleri et ete sürtmekten başka? Gene de dayanıyorlar.Çünkü birlikte yasama zorunluluğuna inanmışlar. İste benim onlardan ayrıldığım buna inanmamam. Sıkıntımın da, sevincimin de kaynağı bu. Gücün dayanmaktansa yalnızlığıma kaçırım. Bana tek insan yeter. Sevisen iki kisinin kurduğu toplum. Toplumsal yaratıklar olduğumuza göre, insan toplumlarının en iyisi bu daracak, sorunsuz, iki kişilik toplumlar değil mi?

REFERENCES

Primary Sources

Atılğan, Yusuf. *Aylak Adam*. İstanbul :Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2000

Camus, Albert. *The Outsider*. Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, 1988

Wain, John. *Hurry On Down*. Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, 1960

Secondary Sources

Atkins, John Alfred. *Six Novelists Look At Society : An Enquiry Into The Social Views Of Elizabeth Bowen, L. P. Hartley, Rosamund Lehman, Christopher Isherwood, Nancy Mitford, C. P. Snow*. London : Calder, 1977

Barnes, Hazel Estella. *Humanistic Existentialism : The Literature of Possibility*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1962

Camus, Albert. *The Myth Of Sisyphus, and other essays*. New York, Vintage Books, 1955

Christensen, Naomi. "L'Etranger: The Unheroic Hero." *College English* 24 (Dec., 1962): 235-236

Daniel, Jean. "Innocence In Camus and Dostoievsky." *Camus's L'etranger : Fifty Years On*. Ed. King, Adele. London : Macmillan, 1992. 24-35

Day, Gary. *Class*. London; New York: Routledge, 2001

- Elliott, Anthony. *Psychoanalytic Theory : an Introduction*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002
- Engelberg, Edward. *Solitude and Its Ambiguities In Modern Fiction*. New York: Palgrave, 2001
- Esslin, Martin. *The Theatre of The Absurd*. Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Books, 1961
- Favre, Fratz. "L'Etranger and 'Metaphysical Anxiety'" *Camus's L'etranger : Fifty Years On*. Ed. King, Adele. London : Macmillan, 1992. 36-46
- Freud, Sigmund. *On Sexuality: Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality and Other Works*. New York: Penguin Books, 1977
- Freud, Sigmund. *A General Introduction to Psycho-analysis*. New York:Clarion Books, 1969.
- Fromm, Erich. "Alienation Under Capitalism." *Man Alone; Alienation In Modern Society*. Ed. Eric and Mary Josephson. New York, Dell Pub. Co., 1962. 56-73
- Fromm, Erich. *Beyond the Chains of Illusion: My Encounter with Marx and Freud*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2006
- Hackel, Sergei. "Raskalnikov through the Looking-Glass: Dostoevsky and Camus's "L'Etranger." *Contemporary Literature* 9 (Spring, 1968): 189-209
- Hague, Angela. "Picaresque Structure and The Angry Young Novel." *Twentieth Century Literature* 32 (Summer, 1986): 209-220
- Hall, H. Gaston. "Aspects of the Absurd." *Yale French Studies* 25 (1960): 26-32

Hallie, Philip. "Camus and the Literature of Revolt." *College English* 16 (Oct., 1954): 25–32

Head, Dominic. *The Cambridge Introduction To Modern British Fiction, 1950-2000*. Cambridge, U.K. ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002

Hinchliffe, Arnold. *The Absurd*. New York, Barnes & Noble 1969

Hochberg, Herbert. "Albert Camus and the Ethic of Absurdity." 75 (Jan., 1965): 87

Josephson Eric and Mary. "Introduction" *Man Alone; Alienation In Modern Society*. Ed. Eric and Mary Josephson. New York, Dell Pub. Co., 1962. 9-53

King, Adele "Introduction: After Fifty Years, Still A Stranger" *Camus's L'etranger : Fifty Years On*. Ed. King, Adele. London : Macmillan, 1992. 1-13

Knapp, L. Bettina. *Critical Essays On Albert Camus*. Boston, Mass.: G.K. Hall, 1988

Kolcu, Ali İhsan. *Yusuf Atılgan'ın Roman Dünyası*. İstanbul: Toroslu Kitablığı, 2003

Laslett, Peter. "The World We Have Lost." *Man Alone; Alienation In Modern Society*. Ed. Eric and Mary Josephson. New York, Dell Pub. Co., 1962. 86-87

Longstaffe, Moya. "A Happy Life and A Happy Death: The Quest of Camus's Etranger." *The French Review* 64 (Oct., 1990): 54-68

- Lord, Ursula. *Solitude versus Solidarity in the Novels of Joseph Conrad: Political and Epistemological Implications of Narrative Innovation*. Montreal; Buffalo, [N.Y.]: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1998
- MacIver, Robert. "The Great Emptiness." *Man Alone; Alienation In Modern Society*. Ed. Eric and Mary Josephson. New York, Dell Pub. Co., 1962. 144-149
- Manly, M. William. "Journey to Consciousness: The Symbolic Pattern of Camus's L'Etranger" *PMLA* 79 (Jun., 1964): 321-328
- Marx, Karl. *Collected Works*. New York : International Publishers, 1975
- Masters, Brian. *Camus: A Study*. London, Heinemann Educational; Totowa, N.J., Rowman and Littlefield, 1974
- McCarthy, Patrick. *Albert Camus, The Stranger*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988
- Naci, Fethi. *On Türk Romanı*. İstanbul : Ok yay., 1971.
- Nigel, Gray. *The Silent Majority; A Study of The Working Class in Post-War British Fiction*. London: Vision,1973
- O'Connor, Van William. "John Wain: The Will to Write." *Wisconsin Studies in Contemporary Literature* 1 (Winter, 1960): 35-49
- O'Hara, Shelley. *Nietzsche Within Your Grasp*. Hoboken, NJ : Wiley Pub., 2004
- Overy, R. J. *The Inter-War Crisis 1919-1933*. Longman, 2007.
- Pear, Tom Hatherley. *English Social Differences*. London, Allen & Unwin,1955

- Schachtel, G. Ernest. "On Alienated Concepts Of Identity." *Man Alone; Alienation In Modern Society*. Ed. Eric and Mary Josephson. New York, Dell Pub. Co., 1962. 73–83
- Schluëssel, Angelika. "Making A Political Statement Or Refusing to Grow Up- Reflections On The Situation Of The Academic Youth In Postwar British." *The American Journal Of Pschoanalysis* 65 (December, 2005)
- Sefler, F. George. "The Existential vs. The Absurd: The Aesthetics of Nietzsche and Camus." *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 32 (Spring, 1974): 415-421
- Sprintzen, David. *Camus, A Critical Examination*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1988
- St. Aubyn, F. C. "A Note on Nietzsche and Camus." *Comparative Literature* 20 (Spring, 1968): 110-115
- Storr, Anthony. *Freud: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2001
- Stout, Richard T., *People*. New York, Harper & Row, 1970
- Tierney, Brian. *The Industrial Revolution in England—Blessing or Curse to the Working Man?* New York. Random House, 1967
- Townsend, Peter. "Isolation, Loneliness And The Hold On Life." *Man Alone; Alienation In Modern Society*. Ed. Eric and Mary Josephson. New York, Dell Pub. Co., 1962. 326-329
- Trundle, Robert C. *Beyond Absurdity : The Philosophy of Albert Camus*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1986
- Wendt, Albert. "Discovering The Outsider." *Camus's L'etranger : Fifty Years On*. Ed. King, Adele. London : Macmillan, 1992. 48-50
- Wilson, Colin. *The Outsider* . Los Angeles: J.P. Tarcher, 1967

Camus himself has said that Meursault was intended to be a character that was aware of the absurd throughout the novel, and it seems likely that, on some level, this is the case. Meursault himself is often considered "The Outsider", and yet in many ways the novel's title is ironic; Meursault's realisation of the absurdity of life gives him a divine knowledge of the world, and it is those who desperately cling to messianic ideologies and religious doctrines, for whom the world is but a transitory stepping stone on the road to eternity, that are the true outsiders. The notion of authenticity and the absurd expounded in *The Outsider* is evidence of Camus's early perception of the concept, and draws on Nietzsche's work, a debt which Camus himself acknowledges.